

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND  
RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 2007

---

MAY 15, 2006.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of  
the Union and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, from the Committee on  
Appropriations, submitted the following

R E P O R T

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 5386]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, Environmental Protection Agency, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007. The bill provides regular annual appropriations for the Department of the Interior (except the Bureau of Reclamation), the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other related agencies, including the Forest Service, the Indian Health Service, the Smithsonian Institution, and the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

CONTENTS

---

	<i>Page number</i>	
	<i>Bill</i>	<i>Report</i>
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR:		
Bureau of Land Management .....	2	9
United States Fish and Wildlife Service .....	11	24
National Park Service .....	19	37
United States Geological Survey .....	27	55
Minerals Management Service .....	30	61
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement .....	32	65
Bureau of Indian Affairs .....	34	69
Departmental Offices .....	43	79

	<i>Page number</i>	
	<i>Bill</i>	<i>Report</i>
General Provisions, Department of the Interior .....	51	90
<b>TITLE II—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY:</b>		
Science and Technology .....	63	94
Environmental Programs and Management .....	63	101
Office of Inspector General .....	64	113
Buildings and Facilities .....	65	115
Hazardous Substance Superfund .....	65	117
Leaking Underground Storage Tank Program .....	66	123
Oil Spill Response .....	66	127
State and Tribal Assistance Grants .....	66	129
Administrative Provisions .....	72	139
General Provisions, Environmental Protection Agency .....	73	
<b>TITLE III—RELATED AGENCIES:</b>		
Forest Service, USDA .....	73	139
Indian Health Service, DHHS .....	88	165
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences .....	96	173
Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry .....	96	173
Other Related Agencies: .....	98	174
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality .....	98	174
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board .....	98	175
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation .....	99	175
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development .....	100	176
Smithsonian Institution .....	100	176
National Gallery of Art .....	104	181
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts .....	106	183
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars .....	106	184
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities .....	106	184
Commission of Fine Arts .....	109	188
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation .....	109	189
National Capital Planning Commission .....	110	189
United States Holocaust Memorial Museum .....	110	189
Presidio Trust .....	111	190
White House Commission on the National Moment of Remem- brance .....	111	190
<b>TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS</b> .....	111	190
<b>TITLE V—SUSPENSION OF ROYALTY RELIEF</b> .....	126	192

### COMPARISON WITH BUDGET RESOLUTION

Section 308(a)(1)(A) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), as amended, requires that the report accompanying a bill providing new budget authority contain a Statement detailing how the authority compares with the reports submitted under section 302 of the Act for the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year. This information follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	Sec. 302(b)		This bill—	
	Discretionary	Mandatory	Discretionary	Mandatory
Budget authority .....	25,889	54	25,889	58
Outlays .....	26,906	54	26,906	58

## SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The Committee has conducted hearings on the programs and projects provided for in the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations bill for 2007. The hearings are contained in 8 published volumes totaling over 10,000 pages.

During the course of the hearings, testimony was taken at 12 hearings on 10 days, not only from agencies which come under the jurisdiction of the Interior Subcommittee, but also from private citizens, and, in written form, from Members of Congress, State and local government officials, and private citizens.

The bill that is recommended for fiscal year 2007 has been developed after careful consideration of all the facts and details available to the Committee.

## BUDGET AUTHORITY RECOMMENDED IN BILL BY TITLE

Activity	Budget estimates, fiscal year 2007	Committee bill, fiscal year 2007	Committee bill com- pared with budget estimates
Title I, Department of the Interior: New Budget (obligational) authority .....	\$9,612,568,000	\$9,664,186,000	+\$51,618,000
Title II, Environmental Protection Agency: New Budget (obligational) authority .....	7,315,475,000	7,572,870,000	+257,395,000
Title III, related agencies: New Budget (obligational) authority .....	8,604,072,000	8,707,069,000	+102,997,000
Grand total, New Budget (obligational) authority .....	25,532,115,000	25,944,125,000	+412,010,000

TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, AND RELATED AGENCIES

In addition to the amounts in the accompanying bill, which are reflected in the table above, permanent legislation authorizes the continuation of certain government activities without consideration by the Congress during the annual appropriations process.

Details of these activities are listed in tables at the end of this report. In fiscal year 2006, these activities are estimated to total \$3,568,891,000. The estimate for fiscal year 2007 is \$3,658,910,000.

The following table reflects the total budget (obligational) authority contained both in this bill and in permanent appropriations for fiscal years 2006 and 2007.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, AND RELATED AGENCIES  
TOTAL BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEARS 2006–2007

Item	Fiscal year 2006	Fiscal year 2007	Change
Interior, environment, and related agencies appropriations bill .....	\$26,085,934,000	\$25,944,125,000	–\$141,809,000
Permanent appropriations, Federal funds .....	3,045,310,000	3,169,787,000	+124,477,000
Permanent appropriations, trust funds .....	578,600,000	641,809,000	+63,209,000
Total budget authority .....	29,711,612,000	29,755,721,000	+44,109,000

## REVENUE GENERATED BY AGENCIES IN BILL

The following tabulation indicates total new obligational authority to date for fiscal years 2005 and 2006, and the amount recommended in the bill for fiscal year 2007. It compares receipts gen-

erated by activities in this bill on an actual basis for fiscal year 2005 and on an estimated basis for fiscal years 2006 and 2007. The programs in this bill are estimated to generate \$17 billion in revenues for the Federal Government in fiscal year 2007. Therefore, the expenditures in this bill will contribute to economic stability rather than inflation.

Item	Fiscal year—		
	2005	2006	2007
New obligational authority .....	\$27,017,724,000	\$26,087,702,000	\$25,944,125,000
Receipts:			
Department of the Interior .....	12,362,043,000	16,543,864,000	16,628,022,000
Forest Service .....	506,251,000	365,870,000	369,020,000
Total receipts .....	12,868,294,000	16,909,734,000	16,997,042,000

#### APPLICATION OF GENERAL REDUCTIONS

The level at which sequestration reductions shall be taken pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, if such reductions are required in fiscal year 2007, is defined by the Committee as follows:

As provided for by section 256(1)(2) of Public Law 99–177, as amended, and for the purpose of a Presidential Order issued pursuant to section 254 of said Act, the term “program, project, and activity” for items under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Subcommittees on the Department of the Interior, Environmental Protection Agency, and Related Agencies of the House of Representatives and the Senate is defined as (1) any item specifically identified in tables or written material set forth in the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, or accompanying committee reports or the conference report and accompanying joint explanatory statement of the managers of the committee of conference; (2) any Government-owned or Government-operated facility; and (3) management units, such as National parks, National forests, National fish hatcheries, National wildlife refuges, research units, regional, State and other administrative units and the like, for which funds are provided in fiscal year 2007.

The Committee emphasizes that any item for which a specific dollar amount is mentioned in any accompanying report, including all increases over the budget estimate approved by the Committee, shall be subject to a percentage reduction no greater or less than the percentage reduction applied to all domestic discretionary accounts.

#### FEDERAL FUNDING OF INDIAN PROGRAMS

The Committee recommends appropriations of new budget authority aggregating \$5.9 billion for Indian programs in this bill in fiscal year 2007. This is an increase of \$62 million above the budget request and an increase of \$204 million above the amount appropriated for fiscal year 2006. Spending for Indian services by the Federal Government in total is included in the following table.

[In thousands of dollars]

Approps bills	FY 2005 actual	FY 2006 enacted	FY 2007 budget request
Department of Agriculture .....	941,973	948,068	954,969
Army Corps of Engineers .....	23,798	22,829	22,829
Department of Commerce .....	30,046	23,524	23,524
Department of Defense .....	18,000	18,000	237
Department of Education .....	2,514,369	2,561,947	2,592,639
Department of Health & Human Services .....	4,390,986	4,480,692	4,646,339
Department of Housing & Urban Development .....	641,392	686,668	689,040
Department of the Interior .....	2,918,680	2,832,497	2,819,962
Department of Justice .....	219,855	228,639	230,295
Department of Labor .....	89,032	67,804	64,066
Department of Transportation .....	315,153	348,594	388,897
Department of Veterans Affairs .....	567	325	615
Environmental Protection Agency .....	238,988	220,998	202,555
Small Business Administration .....	3,500	4,347	4,200
Smithsonian Institution .....	49,047	51,280	53,428
Department of the Treasury .....	4,000	4,000	0
Other Agencies & Independent Agencies .....	148,733	166,249	40,108
Grand Total .....	12,528,119	12,667,771	12,733,703

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY

Clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives states that:

Each report of a committee on a bill or joint resolution of a public character, shall include a statement citing the specific powers granted to the Congress in the Constitution to enact the law proposed by the bill or joint resolution.

The Committee on Appropriations bases its authority to report this legislation from Clause 7 of Section 9 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America which states: "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of Appropriations made by law. \* \* \*"

Appropriations contained in this Act are made pursuant to this specific power granted by the Constitution.

#### REPROGRAMMING GUIDELINES

The Committee has revised the reprogramming guidelines to modify the threshold and approval requirements for the National Park Service construction account. This added flexibility is provided in light of the volatile nature of the construction market and the need to manage projects in a timely way consistent with the contracting requirements of the Federal Acquisition Regulations.

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

1. *Definitions.*—

(a) "Reprogramming," as defined in these procedures, includes the reallocation of funds from one budget activity to another. In cases where either the House or Senate Committee report displays an allocation of an appropriation below the activity level, that more detailed level shall be the basis for reprogramming. For construction accounts, a reprogramming constitutes the reallocation of funds from one construction project (identified in the justification or Committee report) to

another. A reprogramming shall also consist of any significant departure from the program described in the agency's budget justifications. This includes proposed reorganizations even without a change in funding.

(b) "Committees" refer to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and, specifically, the Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies.

2. *Guidelines for Reprogramming.*—

(a) A reprogramming should be made only when an unforeseen situation arises; and then only if postponement of the project or the activity until the next appropriation year would result in actual loss or damage. Mere convenience or desire should not be factors for consideration.

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

(c) Reprogramming should not be employed to initiate new programs or to change allocations specifically denied, limited or increased by the Congress in the Act or the report. In cases where unforeseen events or conditions are deemed to require changes, proposals shall be submitted in advance to the Committees, regardless of amounts involved, and be fully explained and justified.

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

(e) Proposed changes to estimated working capital fund bills and estimated overhead charges, deductions, reserves or holdbacks, as such estimates were presented in annual budget justifications, shall be submitted through the reprogramming process.

3. *Criteria and Exceptions.*—Any proposed reprogramming must be submitted to the Committees in writing prior to implementation if it exceeds \$500,000 annually or results in an increase or decrease of more than 10 percent annually in affected programs, with the following exceptions:

(a) With regard to the tribal priority allocations activity of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Operation of Indian Programs account, there is no restriction on reprogrammings among the programs within this activity. However, the Bureau shall report on all reprogrammings made during the first 6 months of the fiscal year by no later than May 1 of each year, and shall provide a final report of all reprogrammings for the previous fiscal year by no later than November 1 of each year.

(b) With regard to the Environmental Protection Agency, State and Tribal Assistance Grants account, reprogramming requests associated with States and Tribes applying for partnership grants do not need to be submitted to the Committees for approval should such grants exceed the normal reprogramming limitations. In addition, the Agency need not submit a re-

quest to move funds between wastewater and drinking water objectives for those grants targeted to specific communities.

(c) With regard to National Park Service construction, the threshold is \$2,000,000 or 25 percent per project. For actions between \$500,000 and \$2,000,000, or between 10 and 25 percent, the Service should notify the Committee when it redirects dollars between projects or reduces the scope in order to accomplish contract awards. Reallocations that will result in a project cancellation or deferral must be submitted in writing through the Department. In lieu of scope reductions, the Service may apply other non-operational funding resources towards the implementation of a construction project if the use of such funds has been approved through the normal requirements for the other fund sources (such as recreation or concessions fees, Federal Lands Highways funds or maintenance improvement funds) and the aggregate application is within these reprogramming thresholds.

4. *Quarterly Reports.*—

(a) All reprogrammings shall be reported to the Committees quarterly and shall include cumulative totals.

(b) Any significant shifts of funding among object classifications also should be reported to the Committees.

5. *Administrative Overhead Accounts.*—For all appropriations where costs of administrative expenses are funded in part from ‘assessments’ of various budget activities within an appropriation, the assessments shall be shown in justifications under the discussion of administrative expenses.

6. *Contingency Accounts.*—For all appropriations where assessments are made against various budget activities or allocations for contingencies the Committees expect a full explanation, as part of the budget justification, consistent with section 405 of this Act. The explanation shall show the amount of the assessment, the activities assessed, and the purpose of the fund. The Committees expect reports each year detailing the use of these funds. In no case shall a fund be used to finance projects and activities disapproved or limited by Congress or to finance new permanent positions or to finance programs or activities that could be foreseen and included in the normal budget review process. Contingency funds shall not be used to initiate new programs.

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

8. *Assessments.*—No assessments shall be levied against any program, budget activity, subactivity, or project funded by the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act unless such assessments and the basis therefore are presented to the Committees and are approved by such Committees, in compliance with these procedures.

9. *Land Acquisitions and Forest Legacy.*—

(a) Lands shall not be acquired for more than the approved appraised value (as addressed in section 301(3) of Public Law 91-646) except for condemnations and declarations of taking,

unless such acquisitions are submitted to the Committees for approval in compliance with these procedures.

(b) Subsection (a) does not apply to the National Park Service for tracts with an appraised value of \$500,000 or less.

10. *Land Exchanges*.—Land exchanges, wherein the estimated value of the Federal lands to be exchanged is greater than \$500,000, shall not be consummated until the Committees have had a 30-day period in which to examine the proposed exchange.

11. *Appropriations Structure*.—The appropriation structure for any agency shall not be altered without advance approval of the Committees.

#### ALLOCATING CONGRESSIONAL FUNDING PRIORITIES

The Committee continues to be concerned that the agencies funded by this Act are not following a standard methodology for allocating appropriated funds to the field where Congressional funding priorities are concerned. When Congressional instructions are provided, the Committee expects these instructions to be closely monitored and followed. The Committee directs that earmarks for Congressional funding priorities be first allocated to the receiving units, and then all remaining funds should be allocated to the field based on established procedures. Field units or programs should not have their allocations reduced because of earmarks for Congressional priorities without direction from or advance approval of the Committee.

#### FOCUSING ON CORE PROGRAMS

The Committee's fiscal year 2007 budget recommendations reflect the necessity to stay within a constrained allocation in this time of conflict in Iraq and homeland security concerns. The recommendations are also sensitive to the need to address the budget deficit. The Committee's recommendations reflect the belief that: (1) proposed cuts to many core programs are unacceptable; (2) large increases for grant programs are unrealistic; (3) reductions to Indian health, welfare and education programs are unacceptable; (4) critical forest health programs must be continued; (5) untested and unproven grant programs and new land acquisition are a low priority; and (5) large, expensive partnership projects that have not been approved in advance by the Committee are unacceptable because they result in additional operational costs and displace critical backlog maintenance requirements.

The 9 largest agencies in this bill have absorbed about \$800 million in pay costs and over \$440 million in other fixed cost increases, such as rent, utility, and fuel costs, over the past 6 years. As a result, the 9 largest agencies in the bill have received over \$1.2 billion in "hidden" decreases over the 6-year period from 2001 through 2006. These fixed cost and other funding absorptions have had a dramatic effect on critical staffing for the land management agencies in particular. For example, over the past 2 years, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has lost 600 staff, which equates to a 7% staffing reduction. Fixed cost absorption by the remaining 28 smaller agencies and accounts in the bill is also creating program and staffing shortfalls in those agencies. The Committee urges the Administration to fund full pay and fixed cost increases in each fu-

ture budget request to stem the staffing and program declines experienced by the agencies throughout the bill.

Reductions to programs in Indian Country, including education grants, welfare, road maintenance, fire protection and Indian school and hospital construction funding have been restored to the maximum extent possible given the overall funding available in the Committee's recommendations for fiscal year 2007. The budget documents continue to indicate that talks regarding a possible settlement of the Cobell case. However, there has been a continued use of Bureau of Indian Affairs, Operation of Indian Programs (OIP) appropriation to pay for ongoing litigation support costs. This, does not in anyway, maintain our commitment to American Indian and Alaska Natives and the critically needed education and health programs that are central to our ability to meet those commitments.

The Committee appreciates the need for information technology improvements, enterprise services networks, and implementing portions of the President's management agenda. However, to date, a lot of funding has been dedicated to these initiatives without a well thought-out and reasonable approach to addressing requirements. Commercially available systems, through the private sector, should be used to the maximum extent possible rather than building customized new systems. Likewise, the Committee does not endorse the practice of assessing costs against programs to build bigger administrative bureaucracies in response to new administrative and technology requirements or the practice of reducing program budgets on the basis of presumed future savings. These costs should be clearly justified and requested under administrative accounts and any future savings associated with administrative improvements should be demonstrated before budget reductions are proposed. While portions of the Administration's management agenda may indeed be useful, funds should not be taken from all agencies to provide centralized funding for the various lead agencies. If funding is needed for government wide initiatives, it should be requested and managed by each lead agency.

The Committee has made difficult choices in formulating its fiscal year 2007 budget recommendations. Each agency funded in the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies bill needs to examine its way of doing business in these constrained fiscal times and focus on its core, proven programs and on better management of resources.

## TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

The Bureau of Land Management is responsible for the multiple use management, protection, and development of a full range of natural resources, including minerals, timber, rangeland, fish and wildlife habitat, and wilderness on about 261 million acres of the Nation's public lands and for management of 700 million additional acres of Federally-owned subsurface mineral rights. The Bureau is the second largest supplier of public outdoor recreation in the Western United States.

Under the multiple-use and ecosystem management concept the Bureau administers more than 18,000 grazing permits and leases and nearly 13 million livestock animal unit months on 214 million

acres of public rangeland, and manages rangelands and facilities for 56,000 wild horses and burros, 261 million acres of wildlife habitat, and over 117,000 miles of fisheries habitat. Grazing receipts are estimated to be about \$14.8 million in fiscal year 2007, the same as the estimate for fiscal year 2006 and actual receipts of \$14.5 million in fiscal year 2005. The Bureau also administers about 55 million acres of commercial forests and woodlands through the "Management of Lands and Resources" and "Oregon and California Grant Lands" appropriations. Timber collections (including salvage) are estimated to be \$47.0 million in fiscal year 2007 compared to estimated collections of \$33.7 million in fiscal year 2006 and actual collections of \$26.9 million in fiscal year 2005. The Bureau has an active program of soil and watershed management on 175 million acres in the lower 48 States and 86 million acres in Alaska. Practices such as revegetation, protective fencing, and water development are designed to conserve, enhance, and develop public land, soil, and watershed resources. The Bureau is also responsible for fire protection on the public lands and on all Department of the Interior managed lands in Alaska, and for the suppression of wildfires on the public lands in Alaska and the western States.

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$847,632,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	863,244,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	867,738,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+20,106,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	+4,494,000

The Committee recommends \$867,738,000 for management of lands and resources, \$4,494,000 above the budget request and \$20,106,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

(dollars in thousands)				
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended Request	Recommended versus Enacted Request
<b>Management of Lands and Resources</b>				
<b>Land Resources</b>				
Soil, water and air management.....	33,838	32,053	32,753	-1,085
Range management.....	69,870	68,279	68,779	-1,091
Forestry management.....	10,404	10,464	10,864	+460
Riparian management.....	22,124	21,598	21,848	-276
Cultural resources management.....	15,015	18,136	16,636	+1,621
Wild horse and burro management.....	36,362	36,351	36,351	-11
Subtotal, Land Resources.....	187,613	186,881	187,231	-382
<b>Wildlife and Fisheries</b>				
Wildlife management.....	28,166	28,387	28,387	+221
Fisheries management.....	12,314	12,418	12,418	+104
Subtotal, Wildlife and Fisheries.....	40,480	40,805	40,805	+325
<b>Threatened and endangered species.....</b>				
Recreation Management	21,254	21,435	21,435	+181
Wilderness management.....	16,559	16,215	16,715	+156
Recreation resources management.....	48,572	47,550	50,300	+1,728
Subtotal, Recreation Management.....	65,131	63,765	67,015	+1,884
				+3,250

	(dollars in thousands)			
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted Request
<b>Energy and Minerals</b>				
Oil and gas.....	88,962	115,308	112,808	+23,846
Coal management.....	9,159	9,246	9,246	+87
Other mineral resources.....	10,036	10,151	10,951	+800
Subtotal, Energy and Minerals.....	108,157	134,705	133,005	+24,848
Alaska minerals.....	2,263	---	---	-2,263
<b>Realty and Ownership Management</b>				
Alaska conveyance.....	40,002	35,234	35,234	-4,768
Cadastral survey.....	15,790	13,951	13,751	-2,039
Land and realty management.....	33,186	33,331	33,831	+645
Subtotal, Realty and Ownership Management.....	88,978	82,516	82,816	-6,162
<b>Resource Protection and Maintenance</b>				
Resource management planning.....	49,527	49,142	49,142	-385
Resource protection and law enforcement.....	18,942	18,556	20,100	+1,158
Hazardous materials management.....	15,889	15,933	15,933	+44
Subtotal, Resource Protection and Maintenance.....	84,358	83,631	85,175	+817
<b>Transportation and Facilities Maintenance</b>				
Operations.....	6,179	6,247	6,247	+68
Annual maintenance.....	31,571	30,977	31,227	-344
Deferred maintenance.....	38,896	38,157	38,157	-739
Subtotal, Transportation/Facilities Maintenance.....	76,646	75,381	75,631	-1,015

+250

(dollars in thousands)				
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted Request
Land and resources information systems.....	17,949	17,585	17,585	-364
Mining Law Administration				
Administration.....	32,696	32,696	32,696	---
Offsetting fees.....	-32,696	-32,696	-32,696	---
Workforce and Organizational Support				
Information systems operations.....	21,139	18,728	18,728	-2,411
Administrative support.....	50,680	50,560	50,560	-120
Bureauwide fixed costs.....	73,627	77,895	77,895	+4,268
Subtotal, Workforce and Organizational Support..	145,446	147,183	147,183	+1,737
Challenge cost share.....	9,857	9,357	9,857	+500
Rescission (P.L. 109-148).....	-500	---	---	+500
<b>Total, Management of Lands and Resources.....</b>	<b>847,632</b>	<b>863,244</b>	<b>867,738</b>	<b>+4,494</b>

*Land Resources.*—The Committee recommends \$187,231,000 for land resources, \$350,000 above the budget request and \$382,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. Changes from the budget request include increases of: \$700,000 in the soil, water and air management subactivity for the Upper San Pedro River, AZ, partnership; \$500,000 in range management for invasive species work; \$400,000 in forestry as a general increase; and \$250,000 in riparian management to work on the Santa Ana River wash project, CA. The recommendation includes a decrease of \$1,500,000 in cultural resources management for the requested new cultural resources enhancement initiative. The Committee recommends that the Bureau's managers of the Southern Nevada Public Lands Act projects consider a grant application for hydroacoustic mapping of Lake Tahoe which would aid the lake conservation effort.

*Wildlife and Fisheries.*—The Committee recommends \$40,805,000 for wildlife and fisheries as requested, an increase of \$325,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The Committee notes that the funding limit for the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation matching fund program is reduced to \$2,750,000, a reduction of \$250,000 below the request.

*Threatened and Endangered Species.*—The Committee recommends \$21,435,000 for threatened and endangered species as requested, an increase of \$181,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

*Recreation Management.*—The Committee recommends \$67,015,000 for recreation management, \$3,250,000 above the budget request and \$1,884,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The wilderness subactivity includes \$500,000 above the request to offset the requested program reduction. Changes from the budget request in recreation resources management include increases of: \$500,000 for the San Jacinto and Santa Rosa National Monument plan implementation; \$500,000 for implementation of various California desert plans; \$250,000 for Imperial Dunes management, CA; \$500,000 above the base for operation of various national scenic and historic trails, and a \$1,000,000 general increase to assist management of units of the national landscape conservation system.

The Committee directs the Bureau to include in subsequent budget justifications a clear exposition of funding requests in all subactivities and accomplishments of the trails system as well as the Bureau's participation in the system of national scenic and historic trails. The Committee expects that the funding increase for national scenic and historic trails will become part of the base requested in the future.

*Energy and Minerals.*—The Committee recommends \$133,005,000 for energy and minerals, \$1,700,000 below the budget request and \$24,848,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The recommendation includes the full increases requested for energy programs and projects, including increases, above the enacted, of \$9,244,000 for energy permitting at non-pilot offices, \$3,300,000 for oil shale leasing, \$425,000 for gas hydrates, and \$739,000 for National Petroleum Reserve Alaska well capping. The Committee recommendation reduces the request for Alaska north slope oil and gas energy by \$2,500,000; this reduction should be taken from the remediation of old wells. The Committee notes that this rec-

ommendation therefore includes \$9,900,000 above the enacted funding level for exploration and development of energy located on Alaska's north slope, including the National Petroleum Reserve and the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge, if authorized. The other minerals subactivity includes an increase of \$800,000 above the request to facilitate development of policy and operations for potash and oil and gas development in New Mexico. As requested, funds are not provided for the Alaska minerals subactivity.

*Realty and Ownership Management.*—The Committee recommends \$82,816,000 for realty and ownership management, \$300,000 above the budget request and \$6,162,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. This includes a \$200,000 reduction, which is funding transferred to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for the Nez Perce Tribe/Snake River water rights settlement. The recommendation includes \$500,000 above the request to help implement sections 121 and 122 of the Steens Mountain Act (P.L. 106–399). The Committee urges the Bureau to comply with the Steens Mountain Act and allow landowner, lessee and inholder access to their property within the boundary of the Steens Mountain Cooperative Management and Protection Area, OR.

*Resource Protection and Maintenance.*—The Committee recommends \$85,175,000 for resource protection and maintenance, \$1,544,000 above the budget request and \$817,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The Committee recommendation includes an increase of \$1,000,000 to the base for law enforcement activities along the southwestern border in New Mexico, Arizona, and California, and a general program increase of \$544,000. The Committee notes that the Bureau's base budget includes previous funding increases for California desert rangers, a vital public service because of the incredibly high seasonal use of public lands in California.

*Transportation and Facilities Maintenance.*—The Committee recommends \$75,631,000 for transportation and facilities maintenance, \$250,000 above the budget request and \$1,015,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The \$250,000 increase within the annual maintenance subactivity is to enhance the system of National scenic and historic trails.

*Land and Resource Information Systems.*—The Committee recommends \$17,585,000 for land and resource information systems, the same as the budget request and \$364,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

*Mining Law Administration.*—The Committee recommends \$32,696,000 for mining law administration as requested. Offsetting fees are equal to the amount made available to support this activity.

*Workforce and Organizational Support.*—The Committee recommends \$147,183,000 for workforce and organizational support, the same as the budget request and \$1,737,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

*Challenge Cost Share.*—The Committee recommends \$9,857,000 for the Bureau's traditional challenge cost share program, the same as the fiscal year 2006 enacted funding level and \$500,000 above the budget request. The Committee notes that the Bureau has very successfully used this funding to leverage private contributions and provide numerous projects which enhance public lands and public service.

*Bill language.*—Language is included in Title IV.—General Provisions concerning E-government initiatives and competitive sourcing studies.

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$755,286,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	769,560,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	769,253,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+13,967,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	-307,000

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted	Request
(dollars in thousands)					
-----					
Wildland Fire Management					
Preparedness.....	268,839	274,801	274,801	+5,962	---
Fire suppression operations.....	230,721	257,041	257,041	+26,320	---
Other operations					
Hazardous fuels reduction.....	208,113	199,787	199,787	-8,326	---
Burned area rehabilitation.....	24,116	24,286	24,286	+170	---
State and local fire assistance.....	9,852	---	---	-9,852	---
Fire facilities.....	7,734	7,338	7,338	-396	---
Joint fire science.....	5,911	5,911	6,000	+89	---
Subtotal, Other operations.....	255,726	237,718	237,411	-18,315	-307
Total, Wildland Fire Management.....	755,286	769,560	769,253	+13,967	-307
					=====

The Committee recommends \$769,253,000 for wildland fire management, \$307,000 below the budget request and \$13,967,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The appropriation includes \$274,801,000 for preparedness, \$257,041,000 for fire suppression operations, \$199,787,000 for hazardous fuels reduction, \$24,286,000 for burned area rehabilitation, \$7,338,000 for fire facilities and \$6,000,000 for the joint fire science program.

The Committee is concerned that the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior do not have a suitable or comprehensive plan and strategy to deal with the Nation's wildfire management needs. The previous momentum for the national fire plan seems to have waned within the Administration based on the selective recognition of its main features. Accordingly, the Committee directs the wildland fire management council, in partnership with the State wildfire agencies, to develop and implement a comprehensive and cohesive strategy that identifies long-term options and funding needed to respond to wildfire needs. This strategy should incorporate previous documents suggested by the States, and should indicate how the various planning tools, such as fire program analysis and LANDFIRE, fit. The strategy should address all four of the original national fire plan goals, as well as the research and development needs and management needs required to support this effort. As a beginning, the Committee requires a report by the two departments, by January 31, 2007, providing the tactical details on how this fundamental plan, with associated funding needs, will be produced by June 30, 2007.

*Wildfire Preparedness.*—The Committee recommends \$274,801,000 for wildfire preparedness as requested, an increase of \$5,962,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The Committee is concerned that the Department maintains sufficient readiness with its preparedness program. Accordingly, bill language is provided in Title IV, which limits competitive sourcing activities for wildfire program activities. While contracting is encouraged for wildfire management activities, at this time it is not warranted to spend limited resources and time to fulfill competitive sourcing quotas. The Committee also expects that the Department will be very cautious in using limited preparedness funding for its ready reserve program, and only provide Federal funds to support non-Federal firefighters where it is clear that there are measurable benefits.

The Committee is very concerned about the cost and utility of the fire program analysis system that is being jointly developed with the Forest Service. It is not clear why this system is so expensive, and furthermore, it is not clear that the system being developed will actually be useful for its original purpose of determining the most cost efficient and effective distribution of firefighting resources. The overall goals of the system still are important to achieve so the Committee is not prepared at this time to halt development. However, the Committee has included bill language which limits funding for this effort unless and until the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture certify in writing that the fire program analysis system will be completed in a timely fashion and include the full participation of State partners. The Committee understands that expert, independent technical reviews are currently underway, but it is especially critical that management par-

ticipate at a high level to ensure the public that overarching goals are attainable in a cost effective manner.

*Wildfire Suppression Operations.*—The Committee recommends \$257,041,000 for wildfire suppression operations as requested, an increase of \$26,320,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted funding level. The Committee recommendation fully meets the 10-year average expenditure which actually occurred, adjusted for inflation. The Committee remains concerned about the high costs of large fire incidents. The Department of the Interior, along with the Forest Service, should ensure that cost containment is an important priority when suppressing wildland fires. Therefore, the Committee directs the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service to continue reports required previously and to examine, using independent panels, any individual wildfire incident which results in expenses greater than \$10,000,000.

*Hazardous Fuels.*—The Committee has provided \$199,787,000 for hazardous fuels reduction work as requested, a decrease of \$8,326,000 below the fiscal year 2006 level. Within the allocation, the Committee directs that no less than \$4,500,000 be used for fire safe councils and community-based projects in California; this funding level is similar to that provided in earlier years for this important partnership.

The Committee commends the Department for its work on the hazardous fuels program but it is still not clear that funding is being used to address the Nation's highest priority fuels projects. The Committee continues to stress that the Department must coordinate all hazardous fuels activities with the Department of Agriculture, State fire agencies, and community wildfire protection plans. The Committee expects the Department to provide a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations before distributing funds to the bureaus which indicates clearly how funding is prioritized and allocated to bureaus, to regions or States, and to projects. Furthermore, all subsequent budget justifications for this program should clearly indicate the budget formulation process and provide the recommended funding split and projected accomplishments by bureau, and by region or State. The Committee reiterates its previous directions for the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture to have a common hazardous fuels allocation process to ensure funding goes to areas which protect communities, lives, property, and ecosystems, and which rewards successful field units that design projects in accordance with community wildfire protection plans or their equivalent and includes partnerships with States and others. The Departments need to implement in fiscal year 2007 additional program metrics beyond merely acres treated; these metrics must account for important tactical goals including protection of communities and populations, as well as mechanical treatments and biomass removed.

*Rehabilitation.*—The Committee recommends \$24,286,000 as requested for the burned area rehabilitation and restoration program, an increase of \$170,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The Committee notes that this funds the native plant materials program at the fiscal year 2006 level. The Committee encourages the Department and the Bureau to direct the native plant program to work closely with other programs which disrupt vegetation, especially the oil and gas program.

*State and Local Fire Assistance.*—The Committee has accepted the Administration's request to eliminate funding for the State and local fire assistance program. However, the Committee has accordingly increased the funding for volunteer and State fire assistance within the Forest Service wildland fire management appropriation. The Committee expects that the Forest Service will work closely with Interior bureaus to ensure that assistance funding goes for the most meritorious State and local fire department projects. These rural and local fire units are extremely important for the Nation's readiness and they should be commended for their hard work and success at initial attack and shared participation during emergencies. The Committee also expects that fire assistance provided through the Federal Emergency Management Agency will carefully consider the needs and success of rural fire assistance providers.

*Fire Facilities.*—The Committee has provided \$7,338,000 for fire facilities, a decrease of \$396,000 below both the request and the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. This reduction eliminates the last project on the budget justification project list; this project should be considered under the Southern Nevada Public Lands Act.

*Joint Fire Sciences Program.*—The Committee has provided \$6,000,000 for the joint fire science program, an increase of \$89,000 above both the request and the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The Committee stresses that it is vital that both the Interior Department and the Forest Service work on these research efforts jointly, and that the program continue to stress practical solutions and collaborate with the Nation's forestry schools and other partners.

*Bill Language.*—Language is included under the wildland fire management account as in previous years. Additional language is included in Title IV, which limits funding for the fire program analysis system unless both Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture certify that this project will be completed in a timely manner and will include State partners, and which limits competitive sourcing for wildland fire management.

#### CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$11,750,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	6,476,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	11,476,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	- 274,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	+5,000,000

The Committee recommends \$11,476,000 for construction, \$5,000,000 above the budget request and \$274,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The increase above the budget request is for the Santa Ana River wash cooperative conservation program with the County of San Bernardino, CA.

#### LAND ACQUISITION

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$8,621,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	8,767,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	3,067,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	- 5,554,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	- 5,700,000

The Committee recommends \$3,067,000 for land acquisition, a decrease of \$5,554,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level, and a decrease of \$5,700,000 below the budget estimate.

The Committee recommends the following distribution of funds:

Coachella Valley, CA .....	\$500,000
Subtotal .....	500,000
Acquisition Management .....	1,567,000
Emergencies and Hardships .....	1,000,000
Total .....	\$3,067,000

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$108,451,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	112,408,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	111,408,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+2,957,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	-1,000,000

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

(dollars in thousands)				
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted Request
Oregon and California Grant Lands				
Western Oregon resources management.....	95,270	99,122	98,122	+2,852
Western Oregon information and resource data systems..	2,141	2,161	2,161	+20
Western Oregon transportation & facilities maintenance	10,742	10,821	10,821	+79
Western Oregon construction and acquisition.....	298	304	304	+6
Total, Oregon and California Grant Lands.....	108,451	112,408	111,408	+2,957
				-1,000

The Committee recommends \$111,408,000 for the Oregon and California grant lands, \$1,000,000 below the budget request and \$2,957,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$10,000,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	10,000,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	10,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	0
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The Committee recommends an indefinite appropriation of not less than \$10,000,000 to be derived from public lands receipts and Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act lands grazing receipts. The Committee has retained bill language as in previous years even though the Administration had requested its deletion. Receipts are used for construction, purchase, and maintenance of range improvements, such as seeding, fence construction, weed control, water development, fish and wildlife habitat improvement, and planning and design of these projects.

SERVICE CHARGES, DEPOSITS, AND FORFEITURES

The Committee recommends an indefinite appropriation estimated to be \$25,483,000, the budget request, for service charges, deposits, and forfeitures. This appropriation is offset with fees collected under specified sections of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 and other Acts to pay for reasonable administrative and other costs in connection with rights-of-way applications from the private sector, miscellaneous cost-recoverable realty cases, timber contract expenses, repair of damaged lands, the adopt-a-horse program, and the provision of copies of official public land documents.

MISCELLANEOUS TRUST FUNDS

The Committee recommends an indefinite appropriation estimated to be \$12,405,000, the budget request, for miscellaneous trust funds. The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 provides for the receipt and expenditure of moneys received as donations or gifts (section 307). Funds in this trust fund are derived from the administrative and survey costs paid by applicants for conveyance of omitted lands (lands fraudulently or erroneously omitted from original cadastral surveys), from advances for other types of surveys requested by individuals, and from contributions made by users of Federal rangelands. Amounts received from the sale of Alaska town lots are also available for expenses of sale and maintenance of town sites. Revenue from unsurveyed lands, and surveys of omitted lands, administrative costs of conveyance, and gifts and donations must be appropriated before it can be used.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommendation includes the administrative provisions as requested, plus a new provision which allows refunds or rebates received on an ongoing basis from an information technology vender to be deposited into the Bureau's management of lands and resources fund to be used to offset the Bureau's costs in-

curred in providing this service. The requested provisions includes a new item which provides a technical change to mining law which clarifies the time of day annual work on claims must be registered, and extending claim maintenance fees.

UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

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

The Service manages nearly 96 million acres across the United States, encompassing a 545-unit National Wildlife Refuge System, additional wildlife and wetlands areas, and 69 National Fish Hatcheries. A network of law enforcement agents and port inspectors enforce Federal laws for the protection of fish and wildlife. In 2003, the Service celebrated the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the National Wildlife Refuge System.

Throughout the Service's budget, the Committee has recommended reductions to grant programs in order to restore funding for mission-essential Federal programs managed by the Service. This was a difficult but necessary decision to slow the staffing decline the Service has experienced over the past two years. Given the constrained allocation for fiscal year 2007, the Committee cannot sustain past levels for grant programs at the expense of mission-essential programs.

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$1,001,435,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	995,594,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	1,016,669,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+15,234,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	+21,075,000

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted	Request
Resource Management					
Ecological Services					
Endangered species					
Candidate conservation.....	8,619	8,063	8,163	-456	+100
Listing.....	17,630	17,759	17,759	+129	---
Consultation.....	47,997	49,337	50,018	+2,021	+681
Recovery.....	73,562	65,879	70,670	-2,892	+4,791
Subtotal, Endangered species.....	147,808	141,038	146,610	-1,198	+5,572
Habitat conservation.....					
Habitat conservation.....	98,357	90,509	96,404	-1,953	+5,895
Environmental contaminants.....	10,874	11,077	11,077	+203	---
Subtotal, Ecological Services.....	257,039	242,624	254,091	-2,948	+11,467
Refuges and Wildlife					
Refuge operations and maintenance.....					
Refuge operations and maintenance.....	382,501	381,738	388,682	+6,181	+6,944
Migratory bird management.....	38,236	41,339	40,384	+2,148	-955
Law enforcement operations.....	56,062	57,282	57,506	+1,444	+224
Subtotal, Refuges and Wildlife.....	476,799	480,359	486,572	+9,773	+6,213
Fisheries					
Hatchery operations and maintenance.....					
Hatchery operations and maintenance.....	57,189	61,125	61,125	+3,936	---
Fish and wildlife management.....	59,299	53,487	60,234	+935	+6,747
Subtotal, Fisheries.....	116,488	114,612	121,359	+4,871	+6,747

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended Enacted	Recommended versus Request
(dollars in thousands)					
General Administration					
Science excellence.....	493	493	493	---	---
Highly Pathogenic Avian Flu Strategy.....	---	7,398	7,398	+7,398	---
Central office administration.....	39,530	39,297	39,297	-233	---
Regional office administration.....	40,690	41,592	41,592	+902	---
Servicewide administrative support.....	27,496	32,398	32,398	+4,902	---
National Fish and Wildlife Foundation.....	7,656	7,656	5,000	-2,656	-2,656
National Conservation Training Center.....	17,966	19,171	18,175	+209	-996
International affairs.....	9,880	9,994	10,294	+414	+300
Subtotal, General Administration.....	143,711	157,999	154,647	+10,936	-3,352
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148).....	7,398	---	---	-7,398	---
Total, Resource Management.....	1,001,435	995,594	1,016,669	+15,234	+21,075

The Committee recommends \$1,016,669,000 for resource management, an increase of \$21,075,000 above the budget request and \$15,234,000 above the fiscal year 2006 level. Changes to the budget request are detailed below.

*Ecological Services.*—The Committee recommends \$254,091,000 for ecological services, an increase of \$11,467,000 above the budget request.

Changes for endangered species candidate conservation programs include increases of \$300,000 for Idaho sage grouse and \$300,000 for the fisher (*Martes pennanti*) and a general program decrease of \$500,000.

There is an increase of \$681,000 to address unmet need in the consultation program.

Increases for recovery programs include \$146,000 to restore the base program, \$800,000 for wolf monitoring that is transferred from the habitat conservation program, \$700,000 for wolf monitoring in Idaho, \$1,500,000 for Pacific salmon grants to be administered through the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, \$500,000 for Florida manatee protection and recovery, \$150,000 for Northern Aplomado falcon recovery efforts through the Peregrine Fund, \$500,000 for Southern sea otter recovery, and \$495,000 for grizzly bear conservation that is moved from the habitat conservation program.

For the Partners for Fish and Wildlife program, there are decreases \$495,000 for grizzly bear conservation and \$800,000 for wolf monitoring that have been moved to the recovery program and increases of \$1,400,000 for the Washington regional fisheries enhancement groups, \$500,000 for the environmental data quality and access project with the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (salmon recovery), \$180,000 for technical assistance at the New Jersey Meadowlands; \$750,000 for restoration in the Tunkhannock, Bentley, and Bowman's Creek watersheds in Pennsylvania, \$500,000 for Georgia streambank restoration, \$500,000 for nutria eradication at the Blackwater NWR, MD, and \$1,500,000 to continue the study of Colorado River flow and aquatic habitats from Longhorn Dam to Matagorda Bay.

In project planning, increases include \$270,000 to restore the FERC review/relicensing program, \$550,000 for the Middle Rio Grande Bosque initiative, \$100,000 to continue operations at the Cedar City, UT ecological services office, and \$140,000 to restore the base program.

In coastal programs there are increases of \$500,000 for Coastal Barrier Resource System map digitization and \$300,000 to restore funding for the Tampa and Florida panhandle field offices.

*Refuges and Wildlife.*—The Committee recommends \$486,572,000 for refuges and wildlife, an increase of \$6,213,000 above the budget request.

In refuge operations, there is a net increase of \$4,444,000; which includes a decrease of \$4,278,000 for the departmental challenge cost share program and increases of \$622,000 to restore funds associated with the proposed "management savings" reduction, \$3,500,000 for refuge operating needs/staffing shortfalls, \$1,500,000 to continue the Spartina grass control program at the Willapa NWR, WA, \$1,000,000 to continue cooperative projects with friends groups on invasive species control, \$1,000,000 to restore the visitor

facility enhancement program, and \$1,100,000 to restore the refuge law enforcement program.

In refuge maintenance, there is an increase of \$2,500,000.

In migratory bird management, there is a decrease of \$955,000 for the joint ventures program.

In law enforcement operations, there are increases of \$124,000 to restore the operations base program and \$100,000 to restore the maintenance base program.

*Fisheries.*—The Committee recommends \$121,359,000 for fisheries, an increase of \$6,747,000 above the budget request. For fish and wildlife management, increases include \$1,177,000 to restore funds associated with the proposed general reduction, \$75,000 to restore the aquatic nuisance species program, \$500,000 to restore the Great Lakes fish and wildlife restoration program, \$1,500,000 for Washington State salmon mass marking of hatchery fish, \$400,000 for Washington salmon enhancement activities to be divided equally between the Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group and Long Live the Kings, \$250,000 for the Regional Mark Processing Center, \$660,000 for the Potomac River Snakehead Management Plan, and \$185,000 for the South River, MD brown bullhead cancer study. There is also an increase of \$2,000,000 to restore the marine mammals program.

*General Administration.*—The Committee recommends \$154,647,000 for general administration, a net decrease of \$3,352,000 below the budget request. For the National Conservation Training Center, there is an increase of \$804,000 to restore base funding and a decrease of \$1,800,000 for performance training. For the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, there is a decrease of \$2,656,000. In the international affairs program there is an increase of \$300,000 for the wildlife without borders program.

*Bill Language.*—The Committee recommends continuing bill language earmarking funding for the endangered species listing program. A total of \$17,759,000, as requested, is earmarked for listing, of which \$12,581,000 is earmarked for critical habitat designation.

The Committee agrees to the following:

1. The Department reported to the Committee that 100 percent of non-pay related fixed costs were funded in the budget request; however, no fixed cost increases were requested for facilities owned by the Service, such as those at National Wildlife Refuges and National Fish Hatcheries. This practice of excluding fixed cost funding for Service-owned buildings has exacerbated the staffing situation in the Service, and 600 positions have been lost over the past 2 years. The Service should budget for all facility fixed cost increases and not just for fixed costs increases for leased space in GSA owned buildings. The Department should fully support the Service in this effort.

2. The Service reported to the Committee that it spent \$708,000 on competitive sourcing efforts in the first half of fiscal year 2006 and that it will not exceed the \$980,000 budgeted for these studies for the entire fiscal year. The Committee cautions the Service that there is a statutory limitation on how much can be spent for competitive sourcing studies by the Department of the Interior and that limitation applies to the full cost for competitive sourcing, including “developing, implementing, supporting, managing, monitoring, and reporting on competitive sourcing, including personnel,

consultant, travel, and training costs associated with program management.”

3. Funds provided for specific programs, such as invasive species control, and in specific accounts, such as endangered species recovery, should not be diverted to address operational funding deficiencies or realigned to other budget line items, even if the realignment is less than the reprogramming threshold, unless the Committee is notified in advance and approves such realignment.

4. The Service proposed administrative reductions in many programs using an activity based costing methodology. The Committee notes that activity based costing is used throughout the Department of the Interior but no other bureau used this system to impose arbitrary reductions to programs and neither should the Service in the future. The Committee has restored many of the proposed reductions and expects the Service to achieve savings, to be used to offset the others, by establishing Service Support Centers in the regions and eliminating unnecessary rental space as explained in the next two items.

5. The Service should pursue the establishment of Service Support Centers to achieve administrative efficiencies; similar to the arrangement between Region 1 in Portland, OR and the California/Nevada Operations Office. By consolidating personnel, contracting and other administrative functions in certain Regions, the Service should be able to halt or slow the loss of FTEs in the field. The Service should report to the Committee by December 31, 2006, with a plan for instituting Service Support Centers, including the expected costs and savings over time.

6. Also, to achieve administrative savings, the Service should strictly enforce standard space requirements for all employees and eliminate excess rental space.

7. Staffing for ecological services has undergone considerable downsizing over the past 2 years; whereas the demand for those programs continues to increase. The Service should examine using other Service program resources to help address the backlog of consultation and recovery activities and should work with the States to direct a portion of the State Wildlife Grant funds to address candidate conservation requirements.

8. Funds provided for wolf monitoring in Idaho include the \$400,000 in the budget request and an additional \$700,000 recommended by the Committee. The total of \$1,100,000 includes \$715,000 for the Idaho Office of Species Conservation and \$385,000 for the Nez Perce Tribe.

9. The Peregrine Fund should be funded at \$550,000 in fiscal year 2007, which includes \$150,000 for Northern Aplomado Falcon recovery activities.

10. Funds for the Klamath River Basin Restoration Program should be used for restoration efforts and should not be used for the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force or for the Klamath Fisheries Management Council unless these two Federal Advisory Committees are reauthorized. Administrative costs should be minimized to the greatest extent possible.

11. Increased funding recommended for National Wildlife Refuge operating needs should be used to pay critical energy and other cost increases and to fill the most critical staffing vacancies.

12. Funds provided for the ongoing Willapa NWR Spartina eradication program include \$300,000 for eradicating Spartina in Grays Harbor County, WA.

13. The Committee is aware of the Fergus Falls Wetlands Management District's Prairie Wetland Learning Center's innovative environmental education program. Programs such as these are a critical component in providing students with the tools they need to become informed and enthusiastic about the future of America's wildlife resources.

14. The Service should work with the Boys and Girls Clubs of America to encourage participation in activities at National Wildlife Refuges and National Fish Hatcheries. Coordination with the Boys and Girls Clubs and other youth organizations will be mutually beneficial to the youth who participate and the Service and should ultimately increase public awareness and support for Service programs.

15. The Committee understands that the Service is considering further "complexing" of National Wildlife Refuges as a result of declining staff resources. Currently 188 of the 545 NWRs are unmanned and there are 116 refuge complexes, in which staff service 2 or more refuges. The Committee is concerned that there may already be too many refuge complexes and expects the Service to consult with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations prior to instituting any new NWR complexes.

16. No program increase is provided for joint venture programs. The Committee will consider funding increases after completion and review of the program assessment being conducted by the Service.

17. The Service should continue and intensify its efforts to collect reimbursements for fisheries mitigation efforts and use those funds to address habitat restoration and conservation. The fiscal year 2008 budget justification should include an update on the Service's efforts in this area. Additional reimbursements received may be used to fill critical staffing vacancies in the fisheries program.

18. The Committee continues to expect the Service to address inequities in field station funding in the fisheries program when allocating base budget increases. The Service should consider reimbursable funding; incorporate the results of the workforce planning effort; and maintain salary and benefit costs, as a percent of total budget, at the same levels for each field station.

19. The Committee continues to believe that the Service's science initiative needs to be closely coordinated with, and jointly funded by, the U.S. Geological Survey.

20. West Nile virus remains a serious health threat. Diagnoses of and fatalities from the virus have increased nationwide, with a high concentration of human illness and fatality occurring in California, and the Centers for Disease Control predict further increases. The Service should address vector control in California and other highly susceptible areas by managing wetlands to minimize mosquito production and should focus on water control infrastructure and operations and maintenance activities that optimize the management of wetlands.

21. Funding provided in 2007 for Avian Influenza, in addition to monitoring and testing of birds in Alaska, should be used for vector control efforts in other areas. The Service should keep the Com-

mittee advised, through periodic briefings, on its efforts to halt the spread of Avian Influenza.

#### CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$75,216,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	19,722,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	39,756,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	- 35,460,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	+20,034,000

The Committee recommends \$39,756,000 for construction, a decrease of \$35,460,000 below the fiscal year 2006 level and an increase of \$20,034,000 above the budget request.

The Committee agrees to the following distribution of funds:

(Dollars in thousands)

Project	Description	Budget request	Committee recommendation	Difference
Allegheny NFH, PA .....	Raceway Restoration & Covering [cc] .....	0	\$1,500	\$1,500
Wichita Mountains WR, OK .....	Lake Rush Dam Rehabilitation [cc] .....	\$375	375	0
National Elk Refuge, WY .....	Old Timbers Lake Dam Rehabilitation—Phase II [d/cc].	545	545	0
Leavenworth NFH, WY .....	Nada Dam, Upper Snow Dam & Lower Snow Dam—Phase II [cc].	500	500	0
Jackson NFH, WY .....	Seismic Rehabilitation of Two Buildings—Phase III [ic].	3,499	3,499	0
Office of Aircraft Services (Migratory Bird Surveys).	Replacement of Survey Aircraft—Phase II	500	1,000	500
Jordan River NFH, MI .....	Replace Effluent Settling System .....	800	800	0
Klamath Basin NWR Complex, CA .....	Water Supply & Management—Phase VI	1,735	1,735	0
Midway Atoll NWR .....	Fuel Farm Replacement [cc] .....	0	2,500	2,500
Neosho NFH, MO .....	Visitor Center [c] .....	0	2,534	2,534
Northwest Power Planning Area .....	Fish Screens, etc .....	0	4,000	4,000
Servicewide .....	Bridge Safety Inspections .....	570	570	0
Servicewide .....	Dam Safety Programs & Inspections .....	717	717	0
Servicewide .....	Visitor Contact Facilities and Facility Enhancements.	1,000	10,000	9,000
Subtotal, Line Item Construction .....		10,241	30,275	20,034
Nationwide Engineering Services:				
Cost Allocation Methodology .....		2,456	2,456	0
Environmental Compliance .....		1,000	1,000	0
Other, non-project specific Nationwide Engineering Services.		5,795	5,795	0
Seismic Safety Program .....		100	100	0
Waste Prevention, Recycling, Environmental Management.		130	130	0
Subtotal, Nationwide Engineering Services.		9,481	9,481	0
Total .....		\$19,722	\$39,756	\$20,034

The Committee agrees to the following:

1. The Service should use a standardized design approach for all visitor center construction and should request funds for the highest priority projects. The National Wildlife Refuge visitor center priority construction list should be updated to remove completed projects; a similar list should be developed for National Fish Hatchery visitor centers; and the two lists should be integrated so that construction priorities are clearly identified.

2. Funds for ongoing construction projects and for projects not yet started that were transferred to respond to hurricanes and other emergencies must be repaid using a portion of the \$162,400,000 provided in the two hurricane supplemental appropriations for the Service.

LAND ACQUISITION

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$27,990,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	27,079,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	19,751,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	- 8,239,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	- 7,328,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$19,751,000 for land acquisition, a decrease of \$8,239,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level, and a decrease of \$7,328,000 below the budget estimate.

The following table shows the Committee's recommendations:

Cape May NWR, NJ .....	\$1,000,000
Eastern Shore NWR, VA .....	2,300,000
Great Swamp NWR, NJ .....	1,000,000
Highlands Conservation Act, CT/NY/NJ/PA .....	1,000,000
Rachel Carson NWR, ME .....	500,000
Silvio Conte NFWR, CT/MA (Johnson Tract) .....	3,000,000
<hr/>	
Subtotal .....	8,800,000
Acquisition Management .....	7,171,000
CAM .....	1,802,000
Inholdings .....	478,000
Emergencies & Hardships .....	1,500,000
<hr/>	
Total .....	\$19,751,000

LANDOWNER INCENTIVE PROGRAM

The landowner incentive program provides funds to States, territories and tribes for matching, competitively awarded grants to establish or supplement landowner incentive programs that provide technical and financial assistance to private landowners. The purpose of these incentive programs is to restore and protect habitat of Federally listed, proposed, and candidate species under the Endangered Species Act and other at risk species on private lands. Eligible grantees include the States, the District of Columbia, Indian Tribes, Puerto Rico, Guam, the U.S. Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa.

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$21,667,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	24,400,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	15,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	- 6,667,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	- 9,400,000

The Committee recommends \$15,000,000 for the landowner incentive program, a decrease of \$6,667,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level and \$9,400,000 below the budget request.

PRIVATE STEWARDSHIP GRANTS

The private stewardship grants program provides grants and other assistance to individuals and groups engaged in local, pri-

vate, and voluntary conservation efforts that benefit federally listed, proposed, and candidate species, and other at risk species.

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	7,277,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	9,400,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	7,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	-277,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	-2,400,000

The Committee recommends \$7,000,000 for private stewardship grants, a decrease of \$277,000 below the fiscal year 2006 level and \$2,400,000 below the budget request.

#### COOPERATIVE ENDANGERED SPECIES CONSERVATION FUND

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

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$80,001,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	80,001,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	80,507,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+506,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	+506,000

The Committee recommends \$80,507,000 for the cooperative endangered species conservation fund, an increase of \$506,000 above both the fiscal year 2006 enacted level and the budget request. Changes to the budget request include an increase of \$5,573,000 for habitat conservation plan land acquisition and a decrease of \$5,067,000 for the Nez Perce/Snake River water rights settlement that has been funded under the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

*Bill Language.*—Bill language is recommended deriving only the species recovery land acquisition and HCP land acquisition portions of this account from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, instead of deriving the entire funding from the LWCF as proposed in the budget request.

The Interior and Environment bill portion of the funding for fiscal year 2007 associated with the Nez Perce Settlement is included in full in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Indian Land and Water Claim Settlements and Miscellaneous Payments to Indians appropriation account.

#### NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE FUND

Through this program the Service makes payments to counties in which Service lands are located, based on their fair market value. Payments to counties are estimated to be \$20,702,000 in fiscal year 2007 with \$14,202,000 derived from this appropriation and \$6,500,000 from net refuge receipts estimated to be collected in fiscal year 2006.

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$14,202,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	10,811,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	14,202,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	0
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	+3,391,000

The Committee recommends \$14,202,000 for the National wildlife refuge fund, which is equal to the fiscal year 2006 enacted level and an increase of \$3,391,000 above the budget request.

#### NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION FUND

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

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$39,412,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	41,646,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	36,646,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	-2,766,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	-5,000,000

The Committee recommends \$36,646,000 for the North American wetlands conservation fund, a decrease of \$2,766,000 below the fiscal year 2006 level and \$5,000,000 below the budget request. Decreases to the budget request include \$4,800,000 for wetlands conservation grants and \$200,000 for program administration.

Funds for this program are not derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund as proposed by the Administration.

#### NEOTROPICAL MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION

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

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$3,941,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0
Recommended, 2007 .....	4,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+59,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	+4,000,000

The Committee recommends \$4,000,000 for the neotropical migratory bird conservation program, an increase of \$59,000 above the fiscal year 2006 level and \$4,000,000 above the budget request.

The Administration proposed \$3,960,000 for this program as part of the multinational species conservation fund.

This program provides critically needed resources for conservation of neotropical migratory birds. The Committee notes that the Secretary of the Interior recently named the members of the advisory committee that will assist with program implementation. The Committee recommends that the Service transfer administrative responsibility for neotropical migratory bird conservation to the international affairs program. The international program has proven experience in effectively coordinating with the countries outside the U.S. that are the focus of a large part of the neotropical migratory bird program. Also, the Committee believes that project oversight will be better accomplished through the international program, which currently oversees projects in other countries through the wildlife without borders program and the multinational species conservation program.

#### MULTINATIONAL SPECIES CONSERVATION FUND

This account combines funding for programs under the former rewards and operations (African elephant) account, the former rhinoceros and tiger conservation account, the Asian elephant conservation program, and the great ape conservation program.

The African Elephant Act of 1988 established a fund for assisting nations and organizations involved with conservation of African elephants. The Service provides grants to African Nations and to qualified organizations and individuals to protect and manage critical populations of these elephants.

The Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994 authorized programs to enhance compliance with the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) and U.S. or foreign laws prohibiting the taking or trade of rhinoceros, tigers, or their habitat.

The Asian Elephant Conservation Act of 1997 authorized a grant program, similar to the African elephant program, to enable co-operators from regional and range country agencies and organizations to address Asian elephant conservation problems. The world's surviving populations of wild Asian elephants are found in 13 south and southeastern Asian countries.

The Great Ape Conservation Act of 2000 authorized grants to foreign governments, the CITES secretariat, and non-governmental organizations for the conservation of great apes.

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$6,404,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	8,217,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	6,057,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	- 347,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	- 2,160,000

The Committee recommends \$6,057,000 for the multinational species conservation fund, a decrease of \$347,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level and \$2,160,000 below the budget request. Changes to the budget request include a decrease of \$3,960,000 for neotropical migratory birds (which is funded in a separate account) and increases of \$300,000 for African elephant conservation, \$300,000 for Asian elephant conservation, \$500,000 for rhinoceros and tiger conservation, \$300,000 for great ape conservation, and

\$400,000 for marine turtle conservation. The Committee expects these funds to be matched by non-Federal funding to leverage private contributions to the maximum extent possible.

#### STATE AND TRIBAL WILDLIFE GRANTS

The State and tribal wildlife grants program provides funds for States to implement wildlife management and habitat restoration for the most critical wildlife needs in each State. States submitted comprehensive wildlife conservation plans in 2005. States are required to provide at least a 50 percent cost share for implementation grants and a 25 percent cost share for planning grants. Beginning in fiscal year 2006, the vast majority of these funds should be used to implement the State plans.

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$67,492,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	74,666,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	50,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	- 17,492,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	- 24,666,000

The Committee recommends \$50,000,000 for State and tribal wildlife grants, a decrease of \$17,492,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level and \$24,666,000 below the budget request. Within the amount provided, \$5,000,000 is for competitively awarded grants to Indian tribes.

*Bill Language.*—Bill language is continued specifying that each State or eligible entity has two years to enter into specific grant agreements. If fiscal year 2007 funds remain unobligated at the end of fiscal year 2008, the unobligated funds will be reapportioned to all States and eligible entities, together with any new appropriations provided in fiscal year 2009. Bill language also is included providing direction on redistributing funds for States with disapproved plans. Language is not included earmarking \$5,000,000 for a competitive grants program for the States. The Committee endorses this approach but is unable to provide the additional funding for fiscal year 2007.

The Committee agrees to the following:

1. The Service should ensure that grant funds are used for species of greatest conservation need and, specifically, for habitats and actions identified in the approved plans.
2. For wildlife conservation plans to be successful, the implementing officials need to “reach out” to the Federal, State, county, and local government, and private landowners within the State or Territory to ensure that habitat projects are consistently planned and implemented regardless of land ownership and to ensure that funds are leveraged to the maximum extent possible. This communication needs to occur at the grassroots level and not be limited to headquarters or regional coordination. For example, conservation actions included in approved plans that involve Federal lands should be coordinated with the Federal officials responsible for specific activities in the field and should be focused on important wildlife habitat. Wildlife agency staff and conservation partners should meet regularly to evaluate progress. The Committee recommends the use of a facilitator to ensure that meetings achieve results. This could be achieved through facilitation training of wildlife agency staff in the State or Territory.

3. The Service should develop guidance for the States and Territories to facilitate implementation of approved plans and should require regular performance reporting to measure the success of plan implementation.

4. Cooperative projects that involve two or more States should be encouraged when habitat crosses State lines.

5. The Service should encourage each State to develop a standardized mapping system so that States are documenting and measuring the same things in the same ways and comparisons across States are meaningful.

6. The results of State wildlife projects (what works and what doesn't) should be shared so that successful projects in one State can be replicated in other States and unsuccessful approaches in one State are not repeated in other States.

7. States should update their plans as needed and not necessarily on a fixed schedule.

8. Defenders of Wildlife conducted an independent assessment of most of the plans submitted and identified different strengths in different elements for many States. The assessment also identified 12 exemplary plans. The assessment should be useful to States as they continue to refine their plans.

9. The Service should approve plan revisions to ensure that the same standards continue to be applied across all States.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

The mission of the National Park Service is to preserve unimpaired the natural and cultural resources and values of the national park system for the enjoyment, education, and inspiration of this and future generations. The National Park Service cooperates with partners to extend the benefits of natural and cultural resource conservation and outdoor recreation throughout this country and the world.

The National Park Service, established in 1916, has stewardship responsibilities for the protection and preservation of the heritage resources of the national park system. The system, consisting of 390 separate and distinct units, is recognized globally as a leader in park management and resource preservation. The national park system represents much of the finest the Nation has to offer in terms of scenery, historical and archeological relics, and cultural heritage. Through its varied sites, the National Park Service attempts to explain America's history, interpret its culture, preserve examples of its natural ecosystems, and provide recreational and educational opportunities for U.S. citizens and visitors from all over the world. In addition, the National Park Service provides support to tribal, local, and State governments to preserve culturally significant, ecologically important, and public recreational lands.

OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$1,718,940,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	1,742,317,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	1,754,317,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+35,377,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	+12,000,000

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted Request
(dollars in thousands)				
-----				
Operation of the National Park System				
Park Management				
Resource stewardship.....	352,394	362,447	358,696	+6,302 -3,751
Visitor services.....	346,704	344,814	343,862	-2,842 -952
Maintenance.....	593,074	601,800	599,800	+6,726 -2,000
Park support.....	297,607	298,190	297,880	+273 -310
Park Base Increase.....	---	---	20,000	+20,000 +20,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148).....	525	---	---	-525 ---
Subtotal, Park Management.....	1,590,304	1,607,251	1,620,238	+29,934 +12,987
External administrative costs.....				
Total, Operation of the National Park System....	1,718,940	1,742,317	1,754,317	+35,377 +12,000
=====				

The Committee recommends \$1,754,317,000 for operation of the National Park System, an increase of \$35,377,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level and \$12,000,000 above the request. The Committee has appropriated an additional \$12,000,000 for base increases above the request as well as denied most of the programmatic increases in the budget in order to provide a total of \$20,000,000 for park base increases. The additional funds should be allocated in the following manner; \$15,000,000 for across the board increases to all parks and \$5,000,000 for critical needs.

The Committee made this difficult choice despite the fact that many of the programmatic increases had merit. Unfortunately, because of inadequate budget requests, the parks have had to absorb \$61,000,000 over the last six years in mandatory pay costs. This figure is exclusive of the other cost impacts cited by GAO including unfunded retirement and health benefit increases, and mandates for homeland security and information technology security. Despite the additional \$300,000,000 provided by this Committee for park operations above the budget requests since 2001, along with revenue from the recreational fee program, the cumulative effect of these cuts has resulted in a reduction in visitor services. The park base must remain a priority above all other needs until this situation is resolved.

*Park Base Increase.*—The Committee has provided \$20,000,000 for park base increases. This is in addition to the \$21,000,000 in the budget for pay and fixed cost increases.

*Resource Stewardship.*—The Committee recommends \$358,696,000 for resource stewardship, a decrease of \$3,751,000 below the request and \$6,302,000 above the enacted level. Included in this amount are increases of \$651,000 for air tour management plans and \$1,000,000 to complete the vital signs inventory and monitoring networks. The Committee accepts the following reductions in the budget: \$222,000 for support of Mammoth Cave Science center and \$296,000 for vanishing treasures. Also included is \$4,644,000 for uncontrollable expenses.

*Visitor Services.*—The Committee recommends \$343,862,000 for visitor services, a decrease of \$952,000 below the request and \$2,842,000 below enacted. Included in this amount are increases of \$750,000 for FLETC training and \$900,000 to improve concessions contracting oversight. The Committee reluctantly accepts the reduction of \$1,600,000 related to future film revenue. The Committee strongly urges the Department to avoid these types of reductions in the future. There is a reduction in fixed costs of \$2,892,000 due to realignment of funds.

*Maintenance.*—The Committee recommends \$599,800,000 for maintenance, a decrease of \$2,000,000 from the request and an increase of \$6,726,000 above enacted. Included in this amount is an increase to cyclic maintenance of \$8,000,000. The Committee reluctantly accepts the \$10,000,000 reduction to the repair and rehabilitation program. The Committee would have assuredly restored this cut if it were not for the tight fiscal times and emphasis on park base increases. The Committee cautions the Department about recommending a further cut to this program in the fiscal year 2008 budget. It will be restored: taking funds from Departmental Management. Also included is \$8,726,000 for uncontrollable costs.

Within the amount provided for maintenance, there is \$200,000 for continued landscape work at Gettysburg NMP, \$428,000 for work at Amistad NRA, \$300,000 for rehabilitation work along the GW Parkway, \$330,000 to complete a trail project at Saratoga NB, \$295,000 for architectural work at Ford's Theatre, \$250,000 for a pipe replacement at Fort Necessity NB and \$200,000 for boundary survey work at Indiana Dunes NL. The Committee understands that the Service plans to fund the following projects in fiscal year 2007: \$600,000 in projects at San Juan NHS and \$500,000 in projects at Indiana Dunes NL.

*Park Support.*—The Committee recommends \$297,880,000 for park support, a decrease of \$310,000 below the request for partnership program oversight. These funds have been provided in the construction account. This amount is also \$273,000 above the enacted level. Included in this amount is an increase of \$120,000 for Roosevelt-Campobello International Park. The Committee accepts the following decreases: \$2,463,000 for the Lewis and Clark cost share program, \$719,000 for the Lewis and Clark traveling exhibition, \$33,000 for Beringia support, \$1,423,000 for service-wide training, \$247,000 for wild and scenic river partnerships and \$1,762,000 for non-recurring IT funding. Also included is \$6,800,000 for uncontrollable costs. The Committee expects the Service to continue to allocate one-third of the funds provided for the challenge cost share program to the National Trails System.

*External Administrative Costs.*—The Committee recommends \$134,079,000 for external administrative costs, a decrease of \$987,000 below the request and \$5,443,000 above the enacted level. Included in this amount is an increase of \$1,644,000 for working capital fund changes. Also included is \$3,799,000 for uncontrollable expenses.

*South Florida Initiative.*—The Committee continues to support the restoration of the Everglades and the protection and preservation of the national parks and national wildlife refuges located in South Florida. Since this initiative began over a decade ago, the Committee has provided over \$1 billion in funding to the Department of the Interior and its bureaus for restoration projects and activities. Restoration programs funded by the Committee include land acquisition for Federal and State areas, water quality improvements—including acquisition of lands for Storm Water Treatment Area 1 East—science, the South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force, Modified Water Deliveries, removal of invasive exotics and other habitat restoration projects, and the Department's participation in implementing the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan.

The Committee appreciates the progress that has been made to restore the Everglades. The intergovernmental restoration effort is the largest of its kind ever undertaken and there are significant challenges in its implementation. The Committee notes that the Congress provided that the Department of the Interior shall have an enhanced role in implementing the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan (CERP). This is based on the fact that the primary federal interest in this plan is the restoration of the federally-managed Everglades. The Committee appreciates the efforts the State of Florida has made to provide up-front funding to move forward portions of a number of the key projects that were authorized

in the Water Resources Development Act of 2000. The Committee has provided Federal funding to acquire lands in many of the project areas that are the subject of the State's Acceler8 initiative. These projects include, among others, the Everglades Agricultural Area storage reservoir, Picayune Strand restoration (Southern Golden Gates Estates), and the C-43 west reservoir (Berry Groves). The Committee urges the Department of the Interior to be an active participant in this process to ensure that the projects will achieve the necessary restoration goals.

The Committee recognizes that one of the most significant challenges facing the intergovernmental restoration effort is realizing water quality that is protective of the Everglades environment. The State of Florida is to be commended for its efforts to construct and operate nearly 41,000 acres of storm water treatment areas (STAs) that are removing nutrients from the waters discharged from the Everglades Agricultural Area into the Everglades, including Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge and Everglades National Park. Further the State has implemented best management practices which have exceeded expectations in terms of removing phosphorus at its source. The Committee also understands that the State is expanding the STAs by 18,000 acres and implementing additional work that will take additional time to complete. The Committee is encouraged that additional work is underway.

Despite this progress, the Committee remains deeply concerned that more work needs to be done to achieve the necessary improvements in water quality. The Committee's views are consistent with those of the Departments of the Interior, Army and Justice, and the Environmental Protection Agency, which together jointly submitted a report to the Congress, as required by the Committee, noting that the State of Florida has not fully achieved all of its obligations in the consent decree in *United States v. South Florida Water Management District*. The joint federal report notes that the State has not fully met its requirements to reduce phosphorus loads to A.R.M. Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge; that the interim levels for total phosphorus concentration at the refuge have been exceeded once or more each year since the interim levels went into effect; and that more work is needed.

The State's own reports indicate that additional work is necessary to realize discharges that are protective of the Everglades. For example, the 2006 South Florida Environmental Report, which is prepared by the South Florida Water Management District, indicates that several storm water treatment areas (STAs) are experiencing performance problems. Specifically, the STA-1W average discharge for the last 12 months was 98 parts per billion (ppb). STA-1W discharges directly into Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge, and this level of discharge, as confirmed by the Secretary of the Interior during the Committee's hearings, will cause an imbalance of the flora and fauna of the Everglades. Additionally, the State's report noted that STA-5, which discharges into the state-managed Everglades, achieved an average discharge of 81 ppb during the last 12 months. These excessive discharges, if continued, will not allow restoration to occur and are inconsistent with the requirements of the consent decree, which has as a primary goal the restoration and maintenance of water quality that is protective of the Everglades.

Most troubling to the Committee is the fact that U.S. District Court Judge Federico Moreno agrees that the State has violated the consent decree. His June 1, 2005 Order finds that the State is in violation of the interim levels for total phosphorus concentration at the refuge. Judge Moreno's Order requests that a list of specific acts by specific dates detailing what remedial measures will be undertaken to achieve the requirements of the decree be provided. The media have reported that the State and Federal governments are considering a proposal that would terminate the consent decree and substitute instead State law mechanisms as the primary enforcement tool to achieve water quality improvements. The Committee reminds the Department of its long-standing opposition to any changes that would weaken the consent decree, which was detailed in a July 2005 letter from the Committee to the President. After careful review of this matter, and based upon information supplied as part of the Committee's hearing process by the Department of the Interior and the Environmental Protection Agency, the Committee remains opposed to efforts to terminate the consent decree before its requirements have been met. Without clean water, the Everglades will be irretrievably altered and its unique habitat will be degraded. This will further frustrate Everglades restoration efforts now underway and potentially put at risk the federal taxpayer resources that are being expended for the Everglades restoration effort.

For all of these reasons, the Committee has included bill language this year that will make the funds to implement the Modified Water Deliveries Project unavailable for expenditure unless funds requested in the fiscal year 2007 budget for the Army Corps of Engineers for Everglades Restoration are fully appropriated and they will be unavailable should the consent decree be terminated before its requirements, including the 10 parts per billion numeric phosphorus criterion, have been achieved. The Committee recognizes that the water quality improvements may take more time to achieve than December 31, 2006 deadline; however the appropriate response to Judge Moreno's June 1, 2005 Order is not to terminate the decree, but rather to work harder to achieve the decree's requirements. In the interim, the Committee expects that the annual report, required by P.L. 108-108 and prepared jointly by the Departments of the Interior, Justice, and Army and the Environmental Protection Agency, summarizing the status of the water entering A.R.M. Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge and Everglades National Park will be submitted on-time this year. Additionally, the Committee expects that prior directives requiring the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to provide the Committee with the refuge's annual and quarterly reports summarizing the implementation of the additional monitoring and modeling at the refuge will continue for the next fiscal year.

The Committee also directs that the Department submit again a report by December 31, 2006 describing the scientific research projects to be funded in the National Park Service and the U.S. Geological Survey with the fiscal year 2007 appropriations. The report should provide details for each research project, including how each research project is consistent with the Department's Science Plan, as well as how the project is filling gaps in scientific information and supporting the decisions that need to be made.

*Other.*—The Committee continues to support the decision by Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) to retain the carpentry and maintenance positions at the park. The Committee recognizes the urgent needs at ONSR for these skilled personnel. The Committee expects that these positions will be retained.

The Committee recommends a revised approval process for National Park Service (NPS) fee projects. In response to concerns early in the program's implementation about the types of projects being funded, the Department of the Interior and the Committee agreed on a detailed review process for NPS recreation fee projects. However, since that time, the Service has instituted significant review and accountability measures to assure that fee dollars are spent on priority needs and are being used to address identified performance goals, such as reducing the average cost of collection and contributing towards improving the condition of park infrastructure assets. In addition, Congress passed new legislation extending the program and revising the allowable uses of fee dollars. As a result, the Committee agrees to a revised, streamlined process, as follows: (1) all parks will develop fee revenue comprehensive plans that are reviewed and approved at the regional and national levels; (2) once a park's comprehensive plan is approved by headquarters, the park has discretion to re-sequence projects within the approved plan after regional review; (3) fee projects for new construction or expanded infrastructure improvements costing more than \$500,000 will be identified annually in the budget justification, and will be considered approved if no response is provided by the Committee within 60 days; and (4) the budget justification will also contain summary information about the programmatic uses of fee dollars in the fiscal years covered by the justification.

*Law Enforcement.*—This Committee has expressed repeatedly its concerns regarding the direction and cost of extraordinary security measures taken at the designated Icon parks and elsewhere in the Service since 9/11. Many of the measures taken to date have provided at best a limited reduction in risk to both the resource and the visitor while coming at a very high cost in operating and construction funds. The Committee directs that all Icon security measures already established and those contemplated for the future be reviewed to ensure they strike a rational balance among reduction of a clearly defined risk, visitor access, and cost. A report on these findings is to be submitted to this Committee for review no later than April 15, 2007.

Furthermore, the Committee has not been convinced that there is a basis to hold law enforcement programs harmless above all other NPS operating programs, particularly during these times of limited budgets. The "no net loss" policy imposed on NPS and other bureaus by the Department is a policy that forces the Parks to hold harmless the number of law enforcement rangers while forcing all other visitor service, maintenance, and resources protection functions to deal with the absorption of fixed costs and other budgetary limitations. The Committee does not believe that a blanket policy leaving no room for management discretion is rational and the Committee has included bill language that will preclude it. Since 9/11, the Administration has imposed nearly \$30 million in additional costs for anti-terrorism measures without including any funds in the budget. In some cases the Committee has appropriated

funds to the base, but the balance was absorbed along with pay and other fixed costs. This situation will not be tolerated in the future.

*Bill Language.*—Language is included under the Operations account which provides that funds may be spent without regard to the “no net loss” of law enforcement personal policy.

*Valley Forge NHP.*—The public has been patient as the NPS has worked through its process in regard to management of the overabundance of white-tailed deer at the park. Within existing funds, NPS is directed to begin the environmental impact statement for deer management. The Committee expects that the plan will be funded fully so that it can be completed in fiscal year 2008. The Committee further expects that implementation of the selected action will begin immediately upon signing of the Record of Decision.

*Budget efficiency.*—The Committee is aware of steps taken at different levels across the Service to accomplish administrative streamlining and greater efficiency as budgetary resources decline. The Service is strongly encouraged to look for further opportunities, including more shared services from a common location (whether park or region), to assure continued provision of services needed by the parks but also to assure appropriate attention to oversight and accountability requirements. The traditional arrangement of every park being entirely self-sufficient may need to be rethought in light of the advances in technology and changes in business practice models that exist today, as well as the significant costs associated with supporting such a model.

The Service should work with the Boys and Girls Clubs of America to encourage participation in activities at National Parks. Coordination with the Boys and Girls Clubs and other youth organizations will be mutually beneficial to the youth who participate and the public support for Service programs.

The Committee urges the National Park Service to complete, in an efficient and timely manner, the rulemakings described in the final rule issued on March 21, 2000 (65 Fed. Reg. 15,077 (2000)), regarding personal watercraft use within certain units of the National Park System for all 21 of the park areas specifically identified in the rule.

The Committee supports public-private partnerships that protect the interests of the National Park Service while promoting opportunities for the beneficial use of public lands. The Committee is aware of a proposal by the First Tee of Washington, DC to partner with the National Park Service and to provide funding for the construction of an educational and recreational facility whose primary purpose will be the development of life skills and character-enhancing values in the District of Columbia children on approximately 57 acres of the National Park Service property at Kenilworth Park South. The Committee urges the National Park Service to act promptly on this partnership proposal.

The National Park Service shall consider the feasibility of extending a third lane on the southbound lane of the George Washington Memorial Parkway from its present terminus near Key Bridge to Roosevelt Memorial Bridge in Arlington, Virginia, and, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, shall submit to Congress a report on the feasibility of such extension.

## UNITED STATES PARK POLICE

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$80,213,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	84,775,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	84,775,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+4,562,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The Committee recommends \$84,775,000 for the U.S. Park Police, an increase of \$4,562,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level and the same as the budget request.

## NATIONAL RECREATION AND PRESERVATION

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

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$54,156,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	33,261,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	47,161,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	-6,995,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	+13,900,000

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimate by activity are shown in the following table:

(dollars in thousands)					
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended Request	Recommended Enacted	Recommended versus Request
National Recreation and Preservation					
Recreation programs.....	546	557	557	+11	---
Natural programs.....	9,700	9,437	9,437	-263	---
Cultural programs.....	19,733	19,694	19,694	-39	---
International park affairs.....	1,594	1,557	1,557	-37	---
Environmental and compliance review.....	393	403	403	+10	---
Grant administration.....	1,885	1,613	1,613	-272	---
Heritage Partnership Programs					
Commissions and grants.....	13,202	---	13,800	+598	+13,800
Administrative support.....	99	---	100	+1	+100
Subtotal, Heritage Partnership Programs.....	13,301	---	13,900	+599	+13,900
Statutory or Contractual Aid.....					
	7,004	---	---	-7,004	---
Total, National Recreation and Preservation.....	54,156	33,261	47,161	-6,995	+13,900

The Committee recommends \$47,161,000 for national recreation and preservation, an increase of \$13,900,000 above the request and a reduction of \$6,995,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

*Recreation Programs.*—The Committee recommends \$557,000 for recreation programs, the same as the budget request and an increase of \$11,000 above enacted. The increase is for uncontrollable expenses.

*Natural Programs.*—The Committee recommends \$9,437,000 for natural programs, the same as the budget request and a decrease of \$263,000 below the enacted level. The amount includes a programmatic decrease of \$500,000 for the Rivers and Trails program and an increase of \$237,000 for uncontrollable expenses. Within funds available for partnership wild and scenic rivers \$75,000 is provided for Westfield Wild and Scenic River.

*Cultural Programs.*—The Committee recommends \$19,694,000 for cultural programs, the same as the budget request and a decrease of \$39,000 below the enacted level. The amount includes a programmatic decrease of \$368,000 for the UGRR grants program and an increase of \$329,000 for uncontrollable expenses. The Committee strongly urges the Service to provide whatever additional funds are necessary to complete work on the American Revolution Commemoration Act. Within the funds provided, \$300,000 is provided for Heritage Preservation Inc.

*Chesapeake Bay Gateways Initiative.*—The Committee has not provided funds for the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Water Trail initiative. Since fiscal year 2000, this Committee has provided \$11,000,000 for this effort. A routine oversight program review conducted last year by the House Appropriations Committee's Surveys and Investigative staff uncovered serious problems. Despite efforts by the Service to deal with these issues, a recent Inspector General (IG) report finds continued problems, including Service reluctance to terminate relationships with grantees who have failed to complete the terms of the grant agreement. According to the IG report, of 23 grant projects reviewed, 18 had experienced significant delays which ranged from nine months to three years. Some of the reasons given for the delay in executing grant agreements were, according to the IG, unacceptable. The report goes on to document that Service personnel acknowledged that the lack of monitoring the grant agreements contributed to some project delays. In addition, of another 23 grants that were reviewed by the IG, 18 lacked adequate reviews of the actual costs incurred by grantees to produce the goods and services stipulated in the grant agreement; lacked evidence of meeting the match; and, in some cases, indicated improper use of grant funds.

Further, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) is about to release a report on the program in the summer of 2006. To date, GAO is documenting the same concerns about Service mismanagement and lack of oversight of the grant program and grantee compliance with regulations, lack of transparency of the process of becoming eligible for grants, and the questionable public benefit of multiple grants awarded to the same grant recipients and for the same purpose. There are also issues being raised about adequate grantee financial reporting and adequate documentation of progress.

It appears that the Service is having a difficult time properly managing the program. It is also apparent that many of the grantees have applied over and over for the same or similar projects. Given the very tight fiscal constraints on this bill and the fact that the parks have had to absorb \$61,000,000 over six years in pay and other fixed costs, the Committee feels that this program should not be funded.

*International Park Affairs.*—The Committee recommends \$1,557,000 for international affairs, the same as the budget request and a decrease of \$37,000 below the enacted level. The amount includes decreases of \$34,000 for the office of international affairs and \$34,000 for the international border program. There is an increase of \$31,000 for uncontrollable expenses.

*Environmental and Compliance Review.*—The Committee recommends \$403,000 for environmental and compliance review, the same as the budget request and an increase of \$10,000 above the enacted level. The increase is for uncontrollable expenses.

*Grant Administration.*—The Committee recommends \$1,613,000 for grant administration, the same as the budget request and a decrease of \$272,000 below the enacted level. The amount includes a programmatic decrease of \$306,000 for UPARR grant administration and a \$34,000 increase for uncontrollable expenses.

*Heritage Partnership Program.*—The Committee recommends \$13,900,000 for the heritage partnership program, an increase of \$13,900,000 over the budget request and \$599,000 above the enacted level. The Committee recommends the following distribution of funds:

America's Agricultural Heritage Partnership (Silos & Smokestacks) .....	\$700,000
Augusta Canal National Heritage Area .....	350,000
Automobile National Heritage Area .....	450,000
Blue Ridge National Heritage Area .....	800,000
Cane River National Heritage Area .....	800,000
Delaware and Lehigh National Heritage Corridor .....	750,000
Erie Canalway National Corridor .....	750,000
Essex National Heritage Area .....	800,000
Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area .....	450,000
John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor .....	800,000
Lackawanna Valley National Heritage Area .....	500,000
Mississippi Gulf National Heritage Area .....	200,000
National Aviation Heritage Area .....	250,000
National Coal Heritage Area .....	200,000
Ohio and Erie Canal National Heritage Corridor .....	800,000
Oil Region National Heritage Area .....	300,000
Quinnebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor .....	800,000
Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area .....	800,000
Schuylkill River Valley National Heritage Area .....	450,000
Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District .....	500,000
South Carolina National Heritage Corridor .....	800,000
Tennessee Civil War Heritage Area .....	400,000
Wheeling National Heritage Area .....	800,000
Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area .....	350,000
Subtotal, Projects .....	13,800,000
Administration .....	100,000
Total .....	\$13,900,000

## HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND

The Historic Preservation Fund supports the State historic preservation offices to perform a variety of functions, including State management and administration of existing grant obligations; review and advice on Federal projects and actions, determinations, and nominations to the National Register; Tax Act certifications; and technical preservation services. The States also review properties to develop data for planning use.

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$72,172,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	71,858,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	58,658,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	- 13,514,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	- 13,200,000

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following tables:

(dollars in thousands)					
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended Enacted	Recommended versus Request
-----					
Historic Preservation Fund					
State historic preservation offices.....	35,717	35,717	35,717	---	---
Tribal grants.....	3,941	3,941	3,941	---	---
HBCUs.....	2,956	---	1,000	-1,956	+1,000
Heritage Partnership Programs.....	---	7,400	---	---	-7,400
Save America's Treasures.....	29,558	14,800	15,000	-14,558	+200
Preserve America.....	---	10,000	3,000	+3,000	-7,000
-----					
Total, Historic Preservation Fund.....	72,172	71,858	58,658	-13,514	-13,200
=====					

The Committee recommends \$58,658,000 for historic preservation programs, a decrease of \$13,200,000 below the request and \$13,514,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

The Committee recommendation provides \$35,717,000 for the state historic preservation offices, \$3,941,000 for tribal grants, \$15,000,000 for Save America's Treasures grants, \$3,000,000 for Preserve America grants and \$1,000,000 for Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) grants. While the Committee has been strongly supportive of HBCU grants, there have been significant carryover balances over the last three years, despite the fact that the Committee reduced the private cost share to 30 percent.

The Committee has rejected the budget proposal to reduce by 50 percent the Heritage Partnership Program and include it along with Save America's Treasures and Preserve America under the Historic Preservation Fund. Heritage areas can be found, as in previous years, under National Recreation and Preservation.

The Committee recommends the following allocation for Save America's Treasures grants.

Alexandria Lyceum, VA .....	\$50,000
Alviso Adobe, CA .....	250,000
Anderson Hall, PA .....	50,000
Bellport/Brookhaven, NY .....	75,000
Benjamin Franklin Memorial, PA .....	200,000
Bennett College for Women, NC .....	75,000
Bixby House, Barn and Carriage House, PA .....	200,000
Boal Mansion, PA .....	150,000
Bremerton Public Library, WA .....	200,000
Brown Mansion, KS .....	100,000
Capitol Music Hall, WV .....	250,000
Carnegie Free Public Library, WI .....	200,000
Carnegie Public Library, SC .....	200,000
Clay County Courthouse, NC .....	200,000
Corinne Depot, UT .....	80,000
East Rock Soldiers & Sailors Monument, CT .....	200,000
Elias Church, PA .....	250,000
Eureka Main Stage, AR .....	250,000
Gold Bug/Meagher House, CA .....	100,000
Hay House, GA .....	100,000
Haywood County Courthouse, NC .....	100,000
Historic Huntley, VA .....	75,000
Immigration Station Hospital Building, CA .....	250,000
John Henry Historical Park, WV .....	150,000
Agriculture Reform Movement Building, TN .....	150,000
Lloyd House Gardens, VA .....	50,000
Lustron House, VA .....	75,000
Mason County Courthouse, WA .....	200,000
Maverick Concert Hall, NY .....	250,000
Moland House, PA .....	100,000
Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe Mission, NM .....	100,000
Olmsted Park (pergola), KY .....	150,000
Opera House Theater, TX .....	200,000
Oroville Historic State Theatre Renovations, CA .....	100,000
Poplar Hill on His Lordship's Kindness, MD .....	200,000
Quinn Chapel, IL .....	100,000
Revitalizing the Hamlet of Annandale, NY .....	250,000
Richard Howe House, OH .....	100,000
St. Joseph's College Theatre, IN .....	200,000
Salisbury House, IA .....	75,000
Scottish Rite Temple, Bloomington, IL .....	250,000
Seaboard Coastline RR Museum, FL .....	150,000
Spencer Ice Plant, WV .....	50,000
Spring Hill Home, OH .....	200,000
Stewart Family Home/Quail Hollow, OH .....	20,000

Tarrytown Lighthouse, NY .....	125,000
Thompson-Neely Grist Mill, PA .....	50,000
Tom Custer House, NC .....	75,000
W.A. Young & Son's Foundry, PA .....	200,000
Wesleyan College Building, GA .....	75,000
William Cullen Bryant Home, MA .....	150,000
Wyandot County, OH .....	100,000
Total .....	<u>\$7,500,000</u>

## CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$332,858,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	229,269,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	229,934,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	- 102,924,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	+665,000

The Committee recommends \$229,934,000 for construction, an increase of \$665,000 above the budget request and a decrease of \$102,924,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

The Committee recommends the following distribution of funds:

Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library & Museum, IL .....	\$300,000
Acadia National Park, ME (rehab sewage plant) .....	2,390,000
Big Bend National Park, TX (treat drinking water) .....	2,216,000
Boston National Historical Park, MA (replace barge) .....	1,527,000
Carlsbad Caverns National Park, NM (replace sewer system) .....	3,690,000
Cuyahoga Valley National Park, OH (rehabilitation) .....	2,500,000
Death Valley National Park, CA (water system) .....	8,754,000
Everglades National Park, FL (modified water) .....	13,330,000
Ford's Theatre, DC .....	1,500,000
Gateway National Recreation Area (Miller Field), NY (restrooms & plan) .....	620,000
Hamilton Grange National Memorial, NY (rehab & move) .....	8,493,000
Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, HI (replace cesspools) .....	4,319,000
Independence National Historical Park, PA (security fence) .....	843,000
Independence National Historical Park, PA (Deschler-Morris House) .....	2,272,000
Moccasin Bend NAD, TN (streambank erosion) .....	2,000,000
Mount Rainier National Park, WA (replace visitor center) .....	2,791,000
Mount Rainier National Park, WA (rehab Paradise Inn) .....	8,084,000
National Mall & Memorial Parks, DC (Ford's Theatre) .....	3,114,000
Olympic National Park, WA (Elwha Dam) .....	20,010,000
Point Reyes National Seashore, CA (watershed restoration) .....	2,444,000
Redwood National Park, CA (remove roads) .....	2,255,000
Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site, MA (replace dock) .....	3,202,000
Southwest Pennsylvania Heritage Commission, PA (rehabilita- tion) .....	2,500,000
Tuskegee Airmen National Historic Site, AL (Moton Airfield) .....	3,388,000
Tuskegee Airmen National Historic Site, AL (Hangar 2) .....	4,093,000
USS Arizona Memorial, HI (rehabilitation) .....	3,685,000
Valley Forge National Historical Park, PA (Washington head- quarters) .....	2,348,000
White House, DC (structural/utility rehab) .....	6,298,000
Wind Cave National Park, SD (replace lighting system) .....	2,965,000
Subtotal .....	<u>121,931,000</u>
Emergency/Unscheduled .....	2,956,000
Housing .....	6,897,000
Equipment replacement .....	23,617,000
Planning, construction .....	19,649,000
General management plans .....	13,601,000
Line item construction & maintenance .....	<u>121,931,000</u>

Construction program management .....	38,360,000
Dam safety .....	2,623,000
Managed partnership projects .....	300,000
	<hr/>
Total Construction .....	229,934,000

*Other.*—The Committee has included \$300,000 to continue work on the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library and Museum in Illinois, \$2,500,000 for rehabilitation work at Cuyahoga Valley National Park in Ohio, \$2,000,000 for streambank erosion work at Moccasin Bend NAD in Tennessee, and \$2,500,000 for the Southwest Pennsylvania Heritage Commission in Pennsylvania.

The Committee has also included \$620,000 for Gateway National Recreation Area for comfort stations and an updated development plan for Miller Field. In considering alternatives for improvements at Miller Field, the Service should focus on the most critical and high priority requirements to improve conditions at this high-use area. Total costs for improvements must be realistic and attainable in the current budget environment. The components of the plan will have to be implemented in phases, so small increments must necessarily be a part of any plan. The Service should also use this planning process to pursue partnerships with the leagues and users of these recreational areas.

The Committee is aware of delays in executing a line-item project funded in fiscal year 2004 for reconstruction of historic guard walls along the Blue Ridge Parkway and that these funds remain unobligated. In view of the need to complete other construction projects underway at the Blue Ridge Parkway, and given the higher costs now contemplated for the guard wall project, the Service is directed to reprogram these funds, as necessary, to complete the construction of the visitor center under construction near Asheville, North Carolina.

The Committee has included \$365,000 in the General Management Plans account to complete the Manhattan Project Plan.

*Bill language.*—Bill language on the South Florida Restoration project has been modified from current law to include a provision making funds contingent on the continuation of the consent decree in *United States v. South Florida Water Management District*.

#### LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

##### (RESCISSION)

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	– \$30,000,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	– 30,000,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	– 30,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	0
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The Committee recommends the rescission of \$30,000,000 in the annual contract authority provided by 16 U.S.C. 461–10a. This authority has not been used in years, and there are no plans to use it in fiscal year 2007.

## LAND ACQUISITION AND STATE ASSISTANCE

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$46,954,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	24,343,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	29,995,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	- 16,959,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	+5,652,000

The Committee recommends \$29,995,000 for land acquisition and State assistance, a decrease of \$16,959,000 below the enacted level and an increase of \$5,652,000 above the request.

The Committee recommends the following distribution of funds:

Chickamauga-Chattanooga NMP, TN .....	\$2,000,000
Cuyahoga Valley NP, OH .....	500,000
Flight 93, PA .....	5,000,000
Ice Age, WI .....	2,000,000
Indiana Dunes NL, IN .....	1,000,000
Mt. Rainier Carbon Creek River Gateway, WA .....	1,500,000
Shenandoah NB, VA .....	2,000,000
Subtotal .....	14,000,000
Emergencies & Hardships .....	3,349,000
Inholdings .....	2,000,000
Acquisition Management .....	9,021,000
Stateside Administration .....	1,625,000
Total .....	\$29,995,000

Funds provided for the Flight 93 Memorial are to be used to acquire authorized lands at fair market value established through the federal appraisal process.

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Bill language has been included to allow the transfer of \$66,000 to the Washington Tennis and Education Foundation for recreation and education programs for at-risk school children in the District of Columbia.

## UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

The United States Geological Survey (USGS) was established by an act of Congress on March 3, 1879 to provide a permanent Federal agency to conduct the systematic and scientific "classification of the public lands, and examination of the geological structure, mineral resources, and products of the National domain". The USGS is the Federal government's largest earth science research agency, the Nation's largest civilian mapmaking agency, and the primary source of data on the Nation's surface and ground water resources. Its activities include conducting detailed assessments of the energy and mineral potential of the Nation's land and offshore areas; investigating and issuing warnings of earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, landslides, and other geologic and hydrologic hazards; research on the geologic structure of the Nation; studies of the geologic features, structure, processes, and history of other planets of our solar system; topographic surveys of the Nation and preparation of topographic and thematic maps and related cartographic products; development and production of digital cartographic data

bases and products; collection on a routine basis of data on the quantity, quality, and use of surface and ground water; research in hydraulics and hydrology; the coordination of all Federal water data acquisition; the scientific understanding and technologies needed to support the sound management and conservation of our Nation's biological resources; and the application of remotely sensed data to the development of new cartographic, geologic, and hydrologic research techniques for natural resources planning and management, surveys, investigations, and research.

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$970,645,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	944,760,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	991,447,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+20,802,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	+46,687,000

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

	(dollars in thousands)			
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted Request
-----				
Surveys, Investigations, and Research				
Geographic Research, Investigations, & Remote Sensing				
Cooperative topographic mapping.....	68,855	---	---	-68,855
Land remote sensing.....	45,713	61,754	63,754	+18,041
Geographic analysis and monitoring.....	14,705	14,860	14,860	+155
				-----
Subtotal, Geographic Research & Remote Sensing..	129,273	76,614	78,614	-50,659
				-----
Geologic Hazards, Resource and Processes				
Geologic hazards assessments.....	81,000	82,396	82,396	+1,396
Geologic landscape and coastal assessments.....	77,752	78,106	79,606	+1,854
Geologic resource assessments.....	76,534	56,916	79,859	+3,325
				-----
Subtotal, Geologic Hazards, Resource & Processes	235,286	217,418	241,861	+6,575
				-----
Water Resources Investigations				
Hydrologic monitoring, assessments and research				
Ground water resources program.....	8,027	7,422	7,422	-605
National water quality assessment.....	62,203	62,571	63,511	+1,308
Toxic substances hydrology.....	14,386	13,215	13,215	-1,171
Hydrologic research and development.....	14,609	13,653	14,053	-556
National streamflow information program.....	13,944	16,764	16,764	+2,820
Hydrologic networks and analysis.....	29,358	28,251	28,251	-1,107
				-----
Subtotal, Hydrologic monitoring, assessments and research.....	142,527	141,876	143,216	+689
				-----
				+1,340

(dollars in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted	Request
Federal-State program.....	62,833	62,171	64,171	+1,338	+2,000
Water resources research institutes.....	6,404	---	6,404	---	+6,404
Subtotal, Water Resources Investigations.....	211,764	204,047	213,791	+2,027	+9,744
Biological Research					
Biological research and monitoring.....	136,416	135,692	137,692	+1,276	+2,000
Biological information management and delivery.....	23,794	21,967	22,967	-827	+1,000
Cooperative research units.....	14,664	14,938	14,938	+274	---
Subtotal, Biological Research.....	174,874	172,597	175,597	+723	+3,000
Enterprise Information					
Enterprise information security and technology.....	24,866	25,972	25,972	+1,106	---
Enterprise information resources.....	16,900	16,636	17,136	+236	+500
Federal geographic data coordination.....	4,628	68,622	70,622	+65,994	+2,000
Subtotal, Enterprise Information.....	46,394	111,230	113,730	+67,336	+2,500
Science support.....	69,302	67,382	72,382	+3,080	+5,000
Facilities.....	94,782	95,472	95,472	+690	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148).....	8,970	---	---	-8,970	---
TOTAL, UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.....	970,645	944,760	991,447	+20,802	+46,687

The Committee recommends \$991,447,000 for surveys, investigations, and research, an increase of \$46,687,000 above the budget request and \$20,802,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The discussion below references changes to the budget request.

*Geographic Research, Investigations, and Remote Sensing.*—The Committee recommends \$78,614,000 for geographic research and remote sensing, \$2,000,000 above the budget request and \$50,659,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The large reduction from the enacted is due to the transfer of funds for the former cooperative topographic mapping program to the Federal geographic data coordination subactivity within the enterprise information activity. The Committee agrees with Administration efforts to streamline geographic investigations and enhance national service; this is better accomplished by consolidating geographic funding in the enterprise activity as recommended in the request. The change to the request is an increase of \$2,000,000 for the AmericaView cooperative geographic program; this program provides service to many States and communities and leverages Federal funding with many partners.

The Committee has fully funded the requested funds, \$15,950,000, for the Landsat Data Continuity Mission, which will place the next generation Landsat sensor in orbit. Long-term remote sensing data is vital to many aspects of the government and private sector and is strongly supported by this Committee. This funding will complement the larger commitment required by the NASA.

*Geologic Hazards, Resources and Processes.*—The Committee recommends \$241,861,000 for geologic hazards, resources, and processes, \$24,443,000 above the budget request and \$6,575,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The recommendation includes the requested increase of \$2,000,000 for energy resources research activities. Changes from the request for the geologic landscape and coastal assessments program include an increase of \$500,000 to restore partially the Florida shelf research effort and \$1,000,000 for hurricane science to be established in the Survey's Florida lab. This latter effort should be included in the future as a part of the multi-hazards science initiative.

The Committee has restored fully the mineral resources program, including \$18,443,000 for research and assessments and \$4,500,000 for minerals information. The Committee strongly disagrees with the proposed reduction in the Survey's mineral resources program. Minerals and mineral products are important to the U.S. economy with processed minerals adding billions of dollars to the economy. Mineral commodities are essential to both national security and infrastructure development. Mineral resources research and assessments are a core responsibility of the Survey. The Committee does not agree that objective data on mineral commodities can be generated in the private sector and the Committee importunes the Administration to not propose this program elimination again.

The recommendation includes all requested funds for the new multi-hazards demonstration initiative. This includes funding in this activity as well as all the other activities within the Survey's budget.

*Water Resources Investigations.*—The Committee recommends \$213,791,000 for water resources investigations, \$9,744,000 above

the budget request and \$2,027,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The recommendation includes the requested increase of \$2,325,000 for the National streamflow information system. The recommendation also restores: (1) the technical support activities of the National water-quality assessment to the previous funding level (an increase of \$940,000 above the request); (2) the Hood Canal, WA, water study (\$100,000); (3) the Upper San Pedro River partnership, AZ (\$300,000); (4) cooperative water program interpretive studies (\$2,000,000); and (5) State water research institutes (\$6,404,000).

*Biological Research.*—The Committee recommends \$175,597,000 for biological research, \$3,000,000 above the budget request and \$723,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The recommendation includes the requested increase of \$1,000,000 for the NatureServe program. The recommendation also partially restores three requested program reductions; this includes \$350,000 above the request for the Pacific northwest forest program, \$300,000 for ivory-billed woodpecker research, and \$1,000,000 for the national biological information infrastructure. The recommendation also includes an increase of \$200,000 for the science excellence program in cooperation with the Fish and Wildlife Service, \$150,000 for the anadromous fish research lab Connecticut River watershed project, MA, and an increase of \$1,000,000 for the Great Lakes Science Center operations.

The Committee urges the Survey to try to implement the Chesapeake Bay science plan, including the assessment of nutrient and sediment reduction strategies in the watershed, identifying sediment sources to improve implementation of sediment reduction practices, and assessing the causes for fish health problems in the Potomac Basin.

*Enterprise Information.*—The Committee recommends \$113,730,000 for enterprise information, \$2,500,000 above the budget request, and \$67,336,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The change from the enacted is largely due to the transfer of funds from the former cooperative topographic mapping program within the mapping, remote sensing and geographic investigations activity to the Federal geographic data coordination subactivity. The change to the budget request includes \$500,000 above the request to offset half of the operational efficiencies claimed in the request and \$2,000,000 to improve the Nation's geospatial data program and the geospatial one-stop (GOS) program by expanding the operational architecture of the GOS and integrating additional bureau and Federal mapping enterprises in the GOS.

*Science Support.*—The Committee recommends \$72,382,000 for science support, \$5,000,000 above the budget request and \$3,080,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The increase above the request is to make up for past fixed costs which have had to be absorbed by the Survey.

*Facilities.*—The Committee recommends \$95,472,000 for facilities, as requested, a \$690,000 increase to the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

The Mid-Continent Mapping Center (MCMC) in Rolla, Missouri, was scheduled to be consolidated into a National Geospatial Technical Operations Center (NGTOC) on September 15, 2005. This action would close three regional centers in Rolla, Menlo Park, and

Reston and create the NGTOC in Denver, eliminating the jobs, operations, and functions of the MCMC. According to the Department of Interior Inspector General, the site selection was “supported by the whole of the record.” However, the Committee has recognized that the Inspector General’s finding that “the U.S. Geological Survey failed to effectively and transparently demonstrate the entirety of its criteria or communicate the magnitude of its rationale.”

The Committee is of the belief that the MCMC located in Rolla, Missouri, provides important data for mapping and responding to disasters and emergencies. The MCMC located in Rolla, Missouri, is critical to assessing threats and weaknesses prior to emergencies which can be forecast or anticipated. The MCMC in Rolla, Missouri, provides necessary overflow capability to keep USGS data available over the internet. The MCMC in Rolla, Missouri, provides critical support for the construction of the National Map.

Provided the important purposes the Mid-Century Mapping Center in Rolla, Missouri serves, and the subjective nature of the U.S. Geological Survey’s decision to close and consolidate the work being performed at MCMC, the Committee appropriates sufficient funds under to this Act to continue the function, activities, operations, and archives Mid-Century Mapping Center (MCMC), located in Rolla, Missouri and prohibits Federal funds from being used to carry out the closure and consolidation of the Rolla MCMC.

#### MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE

The Minerals Management Service (MMS) is responsible for collecting, distributing, accounting and auditing revenues from mineral leases on Federal and Indian lands. In fiscal year 2007, MMS expects to collect and distribute about \$14.0 billion from active Federal and Indian leases. The MMS also manages the offshore energy and mineral resources on the Nation’s outer continental shelf (OCS). To date, the OCS program has been focused primarily on oil and gas leasing. Over the past several years, MMS has been exploring the possible development of other marine mineral resources, especially sand and gravel. With the passage of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, MMS assumed increased responsibility for oil spill research, including the promotion of increased oil spill response capabilities, and for oil spill financial responsibility certifications of offshore platforms and pipelines. Under the Energy Policy Act of 2005, MMS has new responsibilities over Federal offshore renewable energy and related uses of America’s offshore public lands.

#### ROYALTY AND OFFSHORE MINERALS MANAGEMENT

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$167,391,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	156,651,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	157,496,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	– 9,895,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	+845,000

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

(dollars in thousands)					
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended Enacted	Recommended versus Request
<b>Royalty and Offshore Minerals Management</b>					
<b>OCS Lands</b>					
Leasing and environmental program.....	37,711	45,210	44,210	+6,499	-1,000
Resource evaluation.....	29,407	30,117	30,117	+710	---
Regulatory program.....	51,472	54,014	54,014	+2,542	---
Information management program.....	30,181	30,024	30,024	-157	---
Subtotal, OCS Lands.....	148,771	159,365	158,365	+9,594	-1,000
<b>Royalty Management</b>					
Compliance and asset management.....	42,723	43,134	43,134	+411	---
Revenue and operations.....	35,159	36,024	36,024	+865	---
Subtotal, Royalty Management.....	77,882	79,158	79,158	+1,276	---
<b>General Administration</b>					
Executive direction.....	2,100	2,533	2,533	+433	---
Policy and management improvement.....	4,199	4,090	4,320	+121	+230
Administrative operations.....	17,044	16,837	17,500	+456	+663
General support services.....	24,125	23,398	24,350	+225	+952
Subtotal, General Administration.....	47,468	46,858	48,703	+1,235	+1,845

	(dollars in thousands)			
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted Request
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148).....	16,000	---	---	-16,000
Subtotal (gross).....	290,121	285,381	286,226	-3,895
Use of receipts.....	-122,730	-128,730	-128,730	-6,000
Total, Royalty and Offshore Minerals Management.	167,391	156,651	157,496	-9,895

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$157,496,000 for royalty and offshore minerals management, an increase of \$845,000 above the budget request and \$9,895,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. In addition, the Committee recommends use of \$128,730,000 in receipts, which agrees with the Administration request to increase receipts by \$6,000,000.

The Committee recommendation provides \$7,387,000 for new Energy Policy Act of 2005 responsibilities, a reduction of \$1,000,000 from the request. The reduction is from the leasing and environmental program subactivity; it reduces the increased funding request for OCS alternate energy use to \$4,926,000. Other activities are funded at the request, except for the following small increases to offset partially fixed cost increases: \$230,000 for policy and management improvement; \$663,000 for administrative operations; and \$952,000 for general support services.

The Committee is aware that concerns have been raised about the MMS methods for collecting royalties for extraction of oil and gas from certain federal and Indian lands. The Committee believes it is imperative that the Interior Department's inspection, audit and enforcement activities result in proper revenue collections. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Department of the Interior to provide a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by January 31, 2007. The report should include a proposed timetable and estimated costs associated with analyzing options for changing regulations for federal and Native American natural gas leases, to institute more accurate measurement and reporting of natural gas production volumes on public lands. This report should also examine whether and how MMS can improve the accuracy of gas flow measurements including but not limited to: requiring the use of digital meters on all leases which are calibrated monthly, checking for pipeline bypasses, ensuring condensates are reported, and regular inspection of measurements taken at company master meters which can then be compared to well-specific meters for accuracy.

*Bill Language.*—The Committee has modified bill language requested by the Administration to allow three percent of the coastal impact assistance funds provided in section 31 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to be used for necessary administrative requirements of the service. The Committee notes that it is vital that this program be carefully administered to ensure maximum gain to the public and the energy producing States. The MMS should include information on activities and funding related to the coastal impact program in future budget justifications.

#### OIL SPILL RESEARCH

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$6,903,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	6,903,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	6,903,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	0
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The Committee recommends \$6,903,000 as requested to be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, to conduct oil spill research and financial responsibility and inspection activities associated with the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, Public Law 101-380. The

Committee recommendation is equal to the budget request and the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT

The Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSM), through its regulation and technology account, regulates surface coal mining operations to ensure that the environment is reclaimed once mining is completed. The OSM accomplishes this mission by providing grants to those states that maintain their own regulatory and reclamation programs and by conducting oversight of state programs. Further, the OSM administers the regulatory programs in the States that do not have their own programs, and are on Federal and Tribal lands. Through its Abandoned Mine Land (AML) reclamation account, the OSM provides environmental restoration at abandoned coal mines using tonnage-based fees collected from current coal production operations. In their unreclaimed condition these abandoned sites endanger public health and safety or prevent the beneficial use of land and water resources.

REGULATION AND TECHNOLOGY

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$108,810,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	112,109,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	112,109,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+3,299,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

(dollars in thousands)				
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Request
			Enacted	
-----				
Regulation and Technology				
Environmental restoration.....	156	157	157	+1
Environmental protection.....	78,395	80,965	80,965	+2,570
Technology development and transfer.....	14,903	15,101	15,101	+198
Financial management.....	481	485	485	+4
Executive direction.....	14,875	15,401	15,401	+526
	-----	-----	-----	-----
Subtotal, Regulation and Technology.....	108,810	112,109	112,109	+3,299
	-----	-----	-----	-----
Civil penalties.....	99	100	100	+1
	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total, Regulation and Technology.....	108,909	112,209	112,209	+3,300
	=====	=====	=====	=====

The Committee recommends \$112,109,000, the budget request, for regulation and technology. This is \$3,299,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

ABANDONED MINE RECLAMATION FUND

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$185,248,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	185,936,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	185,936,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+688,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

(dollars in thousands)					
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended Enacted	Recommended versus Request
<b>Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund</b>					
Environmental restoration.....	167,609	167,855	167,855	+246	---
Technology development and transfer.....	3,864	3,910	3,910	+46	---
Financial management.....	6,142	6,253	6,253	+111	---
Executive direction.....	7,633	7,918	7,918	+285	---
<b>Total, Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund.....</b>	<b>185,248</b>	<b>185,936</b>	<b>185,936</b>	<b>+688</b>	<b>---</b>

The Committee recommends \$185,936,000 for the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund, which is the same as the budget request and \$688,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. There is an additional \$100,000 that is estimated to be available in 2007 from performance board forfeiture receipts. The Committee has retained language, as in past years, which limits funding for minimum program states to \$1,500,000.

*Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (SMCRA).*—The Committee wholly supports the inclusion of an extension to the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (SMCRA) through December 31, 2007 in the recent Emergency Supplemental Appropriations. However, a need for a more permanent solution is necessary. The Committee encourages the authorizing Committees to reach consensus and act on a legislative proposal, that would increase the rate at which dangerous abandoned sites would be reclaimed and provide a fair and reasonable method of compensating the states and other governments, which have completed abandoned mine reclamation activities. Without new legislative direction this problem and associated reclamation costs will continue to grow.

*Abandoned Coal Mine Sites.*—The Committee is concerned that the known inventory of unfunded environmental (Priority 3) coal problems totals \$1.8 billion and that Priority 3 problems have never been systematically inventoried. Therefore, the Committee directs the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSM) to report to the Committee not later than December 31, 2006, on the methodology used to determine the current cost of the known inventory for unfunded environmental coal problems by State with an estimate of the scope and cost of doing a systematic inventory that includes the use of statistical samples from the various States.

*Bill Language.*—The Committee has included language which transfers the balance in the fund for the rural abandoned mine program (RAMP), which has not been used, to the Federal share fund, so the funds could be used in the future for emergencies and other Federal obligations.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

The Committee has retained the administrative provision proposed by the Administration's 2007 fiscal year budget request for the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement that allows the transfer of title for computer hardware, software and other technical equipment to State and Tribal regulatory and reclamation programs.

#### BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Bureau of Indian Affairs was created in 1824. Its mission is founded on a government-to-government relationship and trust responsibility that results from treaties with Native groups. The Bureau delivers services to over 1.6 million Native Americans through 12 regional offices and 88 agency offices. In addition, the Bureau provides education programs to Native Americans through the operation of 118 day schools, 52 boarding schools, and 14 dormitories. The Bureau administers more than 56 million acres of land held

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

OPERATION OF INDIAN PROGRAMS

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$1,962,190,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	1,966,594,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	1,973,403,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+11,213,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	+6,809,000

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted	Request
(dollars in thousands)					
-----					
Operation of Indian Programs					
Tribal Budget System					
Tribal Government					
Aid to tribal government.....	36,699	36,256	36,256	-443	---
Consolidated tribal government program.....	61,352	63,413	63,413	+2,061	---
Self governance compacts.....	138,079	142,761	142,761	+4,682	---
Contract support.....	132,628	151,628	151,628	+19,000	---
Indian self-determination fund.....	971	---	---	-971	---
New tribes.....	1,402	316	316	-1,086	---
Tribal government program oversight.....	3,558	7,364	7,364	+3,806	---
Subtotal, Tribal Government.....	374,689	401,738	401,738	+27,049	---
-----					
Human Services					
Social services.....	31,614	32,254	32,254	+640	---
Welfare assistance.....	85,190	74,179	74,179	-11,011	---
Indian child welfare act.....	10,909	10,167	10,167	-742	---
Housing improvement program.....	18,830	18,849	18,849	+19	---
Human services program oversight.....	3,873	3,936	3,936	+63	---
Subtotal, Human Services.....	150,416	139,385	139,385	-11,031	---
-----					
Trust - Natural Resources Management					
Natural resources, general.....	4,925	4,158	4,158	-767	---
Irrigation operations and maintenance.....	13,042	12,480	12,480	-562	---
Rights protection implementation.....	21,262	18,148	19,148	-2,114	+1,000
Tribal management/development program.....	10,146	4,315	4,315	-5,831	---
Endangered species.....	1,192	230	230	-962	---
Integrated resource information program.....	1,250	1,250	1,250	---	---

(dollars in thousands)					
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended Enacted	Recommended versus Request
Agriculture and range.....	24,272	23,554	23,554	-718	---
Forestry.....	42,137	43,094	43,094	+957	---
Water resources.....	11,502	9,713	9,713	-1,789	---
Fish, wildlife and parks.....	6,525	6,506	6,506	-19	---
Minerals and mining.....	8,179	11,464	9,464	+1,285	-2,000
Resource management program oversight.....	8,322	7,598	7,598	-724	---
Subtotal, Trust - Natural Resources Management..	152,754	142,510	141,510	-11,244	-1,000
Trust - Real Estate Services					
Trust services, general.....	11,069	10,492	10,492	-577	---
Navajo-Hopi settlement program.....	1,139	1,162	1,162	+23	---
Probate.....	15,708	19,075	18,019	+2,311	-1,056
Land title and records offices.....	13,436	13,835	13,835	+399	---
Real estate services.....	40,578	47,647	47,647	+7,069	---
Land records improvement.....	7,891	16,801	16,801	+8,910	---
Environmental quality.....	11,988	12,000	12,000	+12	---
Alaskan native programs.....	1,391	1,001	1,001	-390	---
Rights protection.....	14,274	14,345	14,345	+71	---
Real estate services oversight.....	24,368	16,291	16,291	-8,077	---
Subtotal, Trust - Real Estate Services.....	141,842	152,649	151,593	+9,751	-1,056
Education					
Elementary and secondary programs (forward funded).	457,750	457,352	457,352	-398	---
Elementary and secondary programs.....	77,223	60,800	73,859	-3,364	+13,059
Post secondary programs.....	102,674	103,161	103,161	+487	---
Education management.....	8,783	17,842	17,842	+9,059	---
Subtotal, Education.....	646,430	639,155	652,214	+5,784	+13,059

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended Recommended	Recommended versus Request
(dollars in thousands)				
Public Safety and Justice				
Law enforcement.....	193,377	201,620	197,426	+4,049
Tribal courts.....	17,621	12,109	12,109	-5,512
Fire protection.....	1,144	---	---	-1,144
Subtotal, Public Safety and Justice.....	212,142	213,729	209,535	-2,607
Community and Economic Development				
Job placement and training.....	8,396	8,467	8,467	+71
Economic development.....	4,407	4,401	4,401	-6
Road maintenance.....	27,386	25,336	25,336	-2,050
Community development.....	10,148	---	---	-10,148
Community development oversight.....	1,445	971	971	-474
Subtotal, Community and Economic Development.....	51,782	39,175	39,175	-12,607
Executive Direction and Administrative Services.....	232,135	238,253	238,253	+6,118
Total, Operation of Indian Programs.....	1,962,190	1,966,594	1,973,403	+11,213
				+6,809

The Committee recommends \$1,973,403,000 for the operation of Indian programs, \$6,809,000 above the budget request and \$11,213,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

The Committee commends the Bureau of Indian Affairs for presenting the President's 2007 budget submission in the new budget structure. The old budget structure was confusing and complex and offered little opportunity to review funding levels and assess performance on a programmatic level, the Committee is hopeful that the new structure will enable a better working relationship between the Bureau and Tribal leaders and governments.

The Committee however, remains concerned about the amount of carryover monies in many of the accounts and about complaints from Tribes that there was inadequate consultation with Tribes and Tribal leaders during preparation of this year's budget. The Committee is also concerned that the process of making budgetary data available to Tribes is inadequate.

Therefore, the Committee directs the Bureau to update the Committee on how the budget structure is: (1) being received by the tribes; (2) aligned programmatically to provide full transparency for Tribal priority allocation funding, (3) increases accountability for Bureau programs and program managers, and (4) clearly delineates funding levels of the central and regional offices. The Committee direct that this report be received not later than December 31, 2006.

*Tribal Government.*—The Committee recommends \$401,738,000 for Tribal Government activities and operations, the same as the budget request and \$27,049,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

*Human Services.*—The Committee recommends \$139,385,000 for human services, to include social services and welfare assistance, the same as the budget request and \$11,031,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

The Committee included bill language as proposed by the Administration to allow the Secretary to exceed the welfare budget cap in cases of designated Federal disasters.

*Trust—Natural Resources Management.*—The Committee recommends \$141,510,000 for natural resources management and oversight, \$1,000,000 below the budget request and \$11,244,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. An increase of \$1,000,000 is provided for the Washington timber-fish-wildlife program, and should be used for the mass marking of salmon. A decrease of \$2,000,000 is for Energy Policy Act of 2005 program implementation.

*Trust—Real Estate Services.*—The Committee recommends \$151,593,000 for real estate services and oversight, \$1,056,000 below the budget request and \$9,751,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The Committee agrees with the requested increase for trust services to implement reforms to address the probate backlog; however, a reduction of \$1,056,000 within the requested increase for probate backlog is necessary to restore decreases elsewhere in the 2007 budget request.

*Education.*—The Committee recommends \$652,214,000 for education, \$13,059,000 above the budget request and \$5,784,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The Committee has fully restored the proposed reduction of \$16,371,000 to the Johnson-

O'Malley assistance grants. The Committee feels that the justification for the reduction, that there are other programs in the government that could provide these funds, is unfounded because there is no guarantee of a one-for-one correlation between the Department of Education grant opportunities and what Johnson-O'Malley provides to the Tribes. The Committee has also reduced Education—Elementary and Secondary Programs by \$3,311,000 because this is the amount of unused prior year funds available for fiscal year 2007.

The Committee believes that the United Tribes Technical College and Crownpoint Institute are institutions of higher learning that provide an educational benefit to Indian country. The continued reduction of funding for these institutions is of great concern. The Committee urges the Department and the Office of Management and Budget to give these colleges full consideration in future budget requests and to work with these institutions to resolve concerns and disparities over funding formulas prior to submission of the fiscal year 2008 budget request.

*Public Safety and Justice.*—The Committee recommends \$209,535,000 for public safety and justice, \$4,194,000 below the budget request and \$2,607,000 below the 2006 enacted level.

The funding provided for law enforcement should be used for high priority law enforcement needs in Indian country developed in consultation with the Tribes and Tribal leaders including, but not limited to, community policing programs and drug enforcement. The Bureau should provide the Committee a report detailing the use of law enforcement funds not later than December 31, 2006.

*Community and Economic Development.*—The Committee recommends \$39,175,000 for community and economic development, the same as the budget request and \$12,607,000 below the 2006 enacted level.

*Executive Direction and Administration Services.*—The Committee recommends \$238,253,000, the same as the budget request and \$6,118,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

#### CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$271,582,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	\$215,049,000
Recommended 2007 .....	215,799,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	– 55,783,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	+750,000

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:



The Committee recommends \$215,799,000 for construction, \$750,000 above the budget request and \$55,783,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

*Education.*—The Committee recommends \$157,441,000 for education construction, the same as the budget request and \$49,346,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

The Committee continues to support Indian school construction and repair funding. The Committee understands the need to slow-down new construction to allow planning and design to catch up with previously appropriated construction funding. The Committee does not, however, agree that the Bureau needs to reduce funding for new schools to finish ongoing projects. The Bureau has experienced large, unobligated carryover balances from prior years in the construction account.

The Committee directs the Bureau to report not later than March 1, 2007 on the projected obligation, by project, of the existing balance of carryover dollars as discussed during the fiscal year 2007 budget review; the time frame for obligation; the implementation of new policies and processes on enrollment projections and updated education space standards; and the modifications that have been made to strengthen existing planning and design policies.

*Public Safety and Justice.*—The Committee recommends \$11,611,000 for public safety and justice construction, the same as the budget request and \$8,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

*Resources Management.*—The Committee recommends \$38,560,000 for resources management construction, \$750,000 above the budget request and \$6,539,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The funding increase of \$750,000 is for upgrades and repairs for the Navajo Agriculture Products Industry irrigation project. This funding is in addition to the base funding provided in the budget for the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project.

*Navajo Indian Irrigation Project.*—The Committee remains concerned about the management of the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project (NIIP). Overhead costs of the project have been excessive and Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) management and oversight of the project has been confused and convoluted, with no one clearly in charge. As recently as 2004, nearly \$2.3 of a \$12.9 million appropriation was devoted to BIA staff and consultants, although the project is actually being constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation. Only \$9.98 million was transferred to Reclamation construction activities. To address this unacceptable situation, the Committee directs the Secretary to take the following actions:

1. Limit BIA staffing and other overhead costs from the construction appropriation for NIIP to not more than \$700,000.
2. Ensure that the balance of the amount provided for the project is made available to the Bureau of Reclamation immediately.
3. Develop a streamlined management structure assigning clear responsibility within BIA for NIIP and providing for seamless coordination between BIA and the Bureau of Reclamation.
4. Ensure that non-contract and indirect cost surcharges by the Bureau of Reclamation to the funds transferred from BIA are limited to the minimum amount necessary to support on-going construction and rehabilitation of NIIP.

The Committee further expects that the Secretary will give first priority within construction funding, including carryover, to correcting construction deficiencies and completing rehabilitation of the older blocks of NIIP.

*General Administration.*—The Committee recommends \$2,111,000 for general administration, the same as the budget request and \$6,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

*Construction Management.*—The Committee recommends \$6,076,000 for construction management, the same as the budget request and \$88,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

INDIAN LAND AND WATER CLAIM SETTLEMENTS AND MISCELLANEOUS  
PAYMENTS TO INDIANS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$34,243,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	33,946,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	39,213,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+4,970,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	+5,267,000

The Committee recommends \$39,213,000 for Indian land and water claim settlements and miscellaneous payments to Indians, \$5,267,000 above the budget request and \$4,970,000 below the 2006 enacted level. Funding includes \$625,000 for the White Earth land settlement, \$250,000 for Hoopa-Yurok, \$142,000 for Pyramid Lake, \$7,500,000 for Rocky Boy's, \$10,339,000 for the Cherokee, Choctaw and Chickasaw settlement, \$316,000 for Quinault, and \$20,041,000 for Nez Perce/Snake River. The changes to the budget request reflect the addition of \$5,067,000 which was requested in the Fish and Wildlife Service budget for the Idaho Salmon and Clearwater River Basins Habitat Account and \$200,000 which was requested in the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) budget for mitigation of BLM land transfers for the Nez Perce/Snake settlement.

INDIAN GUARANTEED LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$6,255,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	6,262,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	6,262,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+7,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The Committee recommends \$6,262,000 for the Indian guaranteed loan program account, the same as the budget request and \$7,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The Committee has retained all administrative provisions proposed by the Administration's 2007 fiscal year budget request for the Bureau of Indian Affairs including changes to a prior administrative provision, limiting the use of funds in the executive direction and administrative service account and the provision proposed by the Administration that allows the use of funds from Indian Student Equalization Program (ISEP) for costs associated with student enrollment increases at Bureau-funded schools.

## DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES

## INSULAR AFFAIRS

The Office of Insular Affairs (OIA) was established on August 4, 1995, through Secretarial Order No. 3191, which also abolished the former Office of Territorial and International Affairs. The OIA has important responsibilities to help the United States government fulfill its responsibilities to the four U.S. territories of Guam, American Samoa (AS), U.S. Virgin Islands and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) and also the three freely associated States: the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) and the Republic of Palau. The permanent and trust fund payments to the territories and the compact nations provide substantial financial resources to these governments. During fiscal year 2004 new financial arrangements for the Compacts of Free Association with the FSM and the RMI were implemented; this also included mandatory payments for certain activities previously provided in discretionary appropriations as well as Compact impact payments of \$30,000,000 per year split among Guam, CNMI, AS, and Hawaii.

## ASSISTANCE TO TERRITORIES

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$76,160,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	74,361,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	77,561,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+1,401,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	+3,200,000

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

(dollars in thousands)				
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended Enacted	Recommended versus Request
<b>Assistance to Territories</b>				
<b>Territorial Assistance</b>				
Office of Insular Affairs.....	7,273	7,624	8,024	+751
Technical assistance.....	10,524	8,226	11,026	+502
Maintenance assistance fund.....	2,266	2,277	2,277	+11
Brown tree snake.....	2,660	2,673	2,673	+13
Insular management controls.....	1,469	1,476	1,476	+7
Coral reef initiative.....	493	495	495	+2
Water and wastewater projects.....	985	990	990	+5
Subtotal, Territorial Assistance.....	25,670	23,761	26,961	+1,291
American Samoa Operations grants.....	22,770	22,880	22,880	+110
Northern Marianas Covenant grants.....	27,720	27,720	27,720	---
<b>Total, Assistance to Territories.....</b>	<b>76,160</b>	<b>74,361</b>	<b>77,561</b>	<b>+1,401</b>

The Committee recommends \$77,561,000 for assistance to territories, \$3,200,000 above the budget request and an increase of \$1,401,000 above the fiscal year 2006 level.

*Territorial Assistance.*—The Committee recommends \$26,961,000 for territorial assistance, \$3,200,000 above the budget request and \$1,291,000 above the fiscal year 2006 level. Increases to the budget request include: \$400,000 within the Office of Insular Affairs (OIA) for additional oversight of the implementation of the Compacts of Free Association and other increased territorial workload; \$800,000 within technical assistance for payments to replace the Prior Service Trust Fund, \$1,000,000 for specific insular measures and assessments, and \$1,000,000 in technical assistance to continue health care programs in the Marshall Islands. The funding for the Office of Insular Affairs has been changed to two-year availability to enhance office efficiencies.

The Committee notes that the cost of infrastructure needs of the insular areas greatly exceeds Federal and Insular Government resources available to address those needs. Therefore, the Committee encourages the OIA to explore ways in which its grant funds for infrastructure can be leveraged through bond financings and other types of financing. Any such leveraging should not entail any express or implied guarantee by the Federal Government or otherwise provide any express or implied additional direct or contingent commitment of funds from the Federal Government.

The Committee is encouraged by recent progress with the Prior Service Trust Fund and reiterates its support for the agreement among the pension systems of the Republic of Palau, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI), the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Federated States of Micronesia to assume responsibilities for the enrollees of the Prior Service Benefits Trust Fund. The Committee recommendation includes \$800,000 for distribution among the pension systems for payments to the enrollees, provided the agreement is fully implemented by each jurisdiction. The Committee expects that this funding be reprogrammed for general technical assistance uses if there is a failure to implement fully the transfer of Prior Service Trust fund management to the insular nation and territorial governments.

The Committee has also included \$1,000,000 for continuation of health care programs in the Marshall Islands. The funds shall be used first to provide primary health care to members of the Enewetak, Bikini, Rongelap, and Utrik communities residing on Enewetak Atoll, Kili Island, Mejetto Island, Rongelap Atoll following resettlement, and Utrik Atoll. Such primary medical care shall consist of a clinic with at least one doctor and an assistant, necessary supplies, and logistical support.

*American Samoa.*—The Committee recommends \$22,880,000 for American Samoa operations as requested, an increase of \$110,000 above the fiscal year 2006 level. The Committee expects the government of American Samoa will use no less than \$500,000 of this funding for physical education activities at schools.

The Committee continues to be concerned about accountability for key Federal grants to American Samoa. The Secretary should enhance the inter-departmental, coordinated approach to oversight of all Federal grants awarded to American Samoa. The Committee is encouraged by recent developments by the American Samoa Gov-

ernment (ASG) to control and limit Federal grants. The Committee also encourages the OIA to ensure that single audits are completed in a timely fashion and that the information contained therein is widely available to all branches of the territorial government. The OIA should consider requiring the American Samoan government to complete its capital investment plan for a 5-year duration, and include specific targets for the three main sectors of health, education and other government needs. The OIA should require a prioritized list of items needed by the ASG next year, and this list should be developed in an open fashion with the territorial government.

The Committee encourages the American Samoan government to not allow commercial development of waterfront areas of Utulei Beach Park because this site has such high recreational and natural values, and it has enjoyed funding from the Land and Water Conservation Fund Program which indicates that this park land should be dedicated to public outdoor recreational use in perpetuity.

*Northern Mariana Islands/Covenant Grants.*—The Committee recommends \$27,720,000 for CNMI covenant grants, the same as the budget request and the fiscal year 2006 level. The Committee directs the Office of Insular Affairs to implement the allocations presented in the budget request, however, the Secretary may use discretion to modify the Covenant funding formula to address appropriately court-ordered infrastructure projects in the respective territories.

#### COMPACT OF FREE ASSOCIATION

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$5,313,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	4,862,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	5,362,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+49,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	+500,000

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

(dollars in thousands)					
	FY 2006	FY 2007	Recommended	Recommended	Recommended versus
	Enacted	Request	Enacted	Request	Request
-----					
Compact of Free Association					
Compact of Free Association - Federal services.....	2,820	2,862	2,862	2,862	+42
Mandatory payments - program grant assistance.....	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	---
Enewetak support.....	493	---	500	500	+7
					+500
Total, Compact of Free Association.....	5,313	4,862	5,362	5,362	+49
					+500
					=====

The Committee recommends \$5,362,000 for the compact of free association, \$500,000 above the budget request and \$49,000 above the fiscal year 2006 level. The Committee recommendation continues Enewetak support.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$130,238,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	118,845,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	118,303,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	- 11,935,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	- 542,000

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

(dollars in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended Enacted	Recommended versus Request
<b>Departmental Management</b>					
Departmental direction.....	13,391	13,514	13,514	+123	---
Management and coordination.....	28,916	30,399	30,257	+1,341	-142
Hearings and appeals.....	7,950	7,895	7,495	-455	-400
Central services.....	33,367	35,095	35,095	+1,728	---
Bureau of Mines workers compensation/unemployment.....	643	627	627	-16	---
Take Pride in America.....	493	499	499	+6	---
Financial and business management system.....	22,224	22,240	22,240	+16	---
Indian Arts and Crafts Board.....	1,144	1,160	1,160	+16	---
Grant to Kendall County, Illinois.....	4,926	---	---	-4,926	---
Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial.....	9,852	---	---	-9,852	---
Appraisal services.....	7,332	7,416	7,416	+84	---
<b>Total, Departmental Management.....</b>	<b>130,238</b>	<b>118,845</b>	<b>118,303</b>	<b>-11,935</b>	<b>-542</b>

The Committee recommends \$118,303,000 for salaries and expenses for departmental management, a decrease of \$11,935,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted and \$542,000 below the budget request. Changes to the request include decreases of \$128,000 for environmental policy and compliance, \$14,000 for indirect cost negotiations and \$400,000 for hearings and appeals. The Committee was unable to provide programmatic increases due to the bill's restrictive budget allocation.

Departmental programs that have been denied requested programmatic increases in this appropriation should not be augmented with staffing and funds from individual bureaus or any other source to achieve the requested level of activity.

The Committee does not support the Department's continued efforts to turn over responsibility for the three Indian museums, operated by the Department, to non-federal interests. The Committee strongly urges the Department to stop pursuing this course of action.

*Financial Management System.*—The Committee continues to be concerned about the development of the new financial management system at a time when budget allocations are in serious decline. Staffing at the bureaus is being reduced at an alarming rate due in part to the absorption of pay and other fixed costs and insufficient budget requests. The Committee is aware that not only did the Interior system encounter problems, which delayed the project a year, but other major departments such as NASA and the Veterans Administration have also experienced delays and cost overruns. The current system must be replaced over time. The Committee cautions the Department to ensure that these funds are used wisely and that unnecessary costs and delays are avoided. These funds are coming at the expense of critical ongoing agency programs.

*Land Appraisal Office.*—Several years ago, at the request of the Department, the Committee reluctantly agreed to consolidate the Interior Department's land appraisal services into a central office in the Department. It has been the experience of the Committee that centralization of services often does not yield either the cost savings or efficiencies that are promised. This is certainly the case to date with the appraisal function consolidation.

The Committee waited two years before asking the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to review the new alignment for appraisal services. The report will be finalized in August, but the Committee is seriously concerned about the preliminary findings as of April 2006. There are issues of serious implementation challenges and a lack of leadership, guidance and procedures from the Appraisal Services Directorate. There are also serious compliance issues, problems with the quality of appraisals, and significant delays in processing.

The Committee will not make a final determination until the release of the final report, but cautions the Department to take a serious look at the performance of its top managers before it attempts to attribute these problems to the individual bureaus. The evidence to date does not support the latter.

The Committee is concerned by continuing reports from employees of the Department of the Interior about potential environmental health problems created as a result of the ten-year con-

struction and modernization project for the Department's main building in Washington, D.C. The Committee requests that the Secretary conduct a review of these concerns on an expedited basis and submit a report of the results of this review to the Committee not later than September 1, 2006. This report is expected to reflect a formal evaluation of the existence of any worker safety problems, a corrective action plan for any problems which are documented, and specific responses to each of the recommendation of the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health promulgated in their letter in their letter to the Department on February 3, 2006. In addition the Committee encourages the Secretary to establish as soon as possible a formal process through which these issues can be discussed with employees.

#### PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) provide for payments to local units of government containing certain federally owned lands. These payments are designed to supplement other Federal land receipt sharing payments that local governments may be receiving. The recipients may use payments received for any governmental purpose.

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$232,528,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	198,000,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	228,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	- 4,528,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	+30,000,000

The Committee recommends \$228,000,000 for PILT, \$30,000,000 above the budget request and \$4,528,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

#### CENTRAL HAZARDOUS MATERIALS FUND

The Central Hazardous Materials Fund was established to include funding for remedial investigations/feasibility studies and cleanup of hazardous waste sites for which the Department of the Interior is liable pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act and includes sums recovered from or paid by a party as reimbursement for remedial action or response activities.

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$9,710,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	9,923,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	9,923,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+213,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The Committee recommends \$9,923,000 for the central hazardous materials fund, as requested, an increase of \$213,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. Prior to fiscal year 2006 this account was located in the Bureau of Land Management.

## OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$54,624,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	56,755,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	56,755,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+2,131,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The Committee recommends \$56,755,000 for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Solicitor, the same as the budget request and an increase of \$2,131,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

## OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$38,541,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	40,699,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	39,688,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+1,147,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	-1,011,000

The Committee recommends \$39,688,000 for salaries and expenses of the Office of Inspector General, a decrease of \$1,011,000 from the budget request and an increase of \$1,147,000 above the enacted level. The Committee could not provide funds for programmatic increases due to the bill's restrictive budget allocation. The Committee greatly values this office and the important contributions it makes to the performance of the Department and its bureaus.

## OFFICE OF SPECIAL TRUSTEE FOR AMERICAN INDIANS

The Office of Special Trustee for American Indians (OST) was established by the American Indian Trust Fund Management Reform Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-412). The Special Trustee is charged with general oversight of Indian trust asset reform efforts Department-wide to ensure proper and efficient discharge of the Secretary's trust responsibilities to Indian Tribes and individual Indians. The Office of the Special Trustee was created to ensure that the Department of the Interior establishes appropriate policies and procedures, develops necessary systems, and takes affirmative actions to reform the management of Indian trust funds. In carrying out the management and oversight of the Indian trust funds, the Secretary has a responsibility to ensure that trust accounts are properly maintained, invested and reported in accordance with the American Indian Trust Fund Management Reform Act of 1994, Congressional action, and other applicable laws.

The Special Trustee for American Indians also has responsibility for the related financial trust functions including deposit, investment, and disbursement of trust funds. The Department has responsibility for what may be the largest land trust in the world. Indian trust lands today encompass approximately 56 million acres of land—over 10 million acres belonging to individual Indians and nearly 46 million acres owned by Indian Tribes. On these lands, Interior manages over 100,000 leases for individual Indians and

Tribes. Leasing, use permits, sale revenues, and interest of approximately \$300 million per year are collected for approximately 277,000 individual Indian money accounts, and about \$518 million per year is collected for about 1,450 tribal accounts per year. In addition, the trust manages approximately \$2.9 billion in tribal funds and \$420 million in individual Indian funds.

#### FEDERAL TRUST PROGRAMS

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$188,774,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	185,036,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	150,036,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	- 38,738,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	- 35,000,000

The Committee recommends \$150,036,000 for Federal Trust programs, \$35,000,000 below the budget request and \$38,738,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

*Program Operations, Support, and Improvements.*—The Committee recommends \$162,886,000 for program operations, support and improvements, \$20,000,000 below the budget request and \$23,689,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The total change from the request is a reduction of \$35,000,000 for historical accounting which includes the use of \$15,000,000 of prior year unobligated funds to offset 2007 requirements.

*Executive Direction.*—The Committee recommends \$2,150,000 for executive direction the same as the budget request, and \$49,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

Since 1996, the Committee has appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars for activities related to the Cobell litigation. The Committee believes that these funds would have been better used to fund greatly needed health, law enforcement and education programs in Indian country. The Committee believes that this case must be resolved without further negatively impacting funding levels for Indian programs. The budget documents indicate continuing talks regarding a possible settlement of the Cobell. The Committee recognizes that, in addition to the mediation talks that have taken place, the House and Senate authorizing Committees have made commitments to develop a comprehensive legislative solution to this ongoing problem. However, the Committee remains concerned that there has been a continued use of Bureau of Indian Affairs, Operation of Indian Programs appropriated funds to pay for ongoing litigation support costs. Without a solution, this practice will continue to erode programmatic funding in Indian country. Therefore, the Committee directs the Department to report quarterly on the use of Bureau of Indian Affairs, Operation of Indian Programs funds for ongoing litigation support costs associated with the Cobell case.

*Bill Language.*—As in previous years, the Committee has included bill language under the Office of Special Trustee that limits the amount of funding available for historical accounting to \$45,000,000. The clear intent of the Committee is to definitively limit the amount of funding available to conduct historical accounting activities.

INDIAN LAND CONSOLIDATION

Appropriation enacted, 20006 .....	34,006,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	\$59,449,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	34,006,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	0
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	- 25,443,000

The Committee recommends \$34,006,000 for Indian Land Consolidation, \$25,443,000 below the budget request and the same as the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

NATURAL RESOURCE DAMAGE ASSESSMENT AND RESTORATION

NATURAL RESOURCE DAMAGE ASSESSMENT FUND

The purpose of the Natural Resource Damage Assessment Fund is to provide the basis for claims against responsible parties for the restoration of injured natural resources. Assessments ultimately will lead to the restoration of injured resources and reimbursement for reasonable assessment costs from responsible parties through negotiated settlements or other legal actions. Operating on a “polluter pays” principle, the program anticipates recovering over \$32 million in receipts in fiscal year 2006, with the vast majority to be used for the restoration of injured resources. The program works to restore sites ranging in size from small town landfills to the Exxon Valdez oil spill of 1989 in Alaska.

Prior to fiscal year 1999, this account was included under the United States Fish and Wildlife Service appropriation. The account was moved to the Departmental Offices appropriation because its functions relate to several different bureaus within the Department of the Interior.

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$6,016,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	6,109,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	6,109,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+93,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The Committee recommends \$6,109,000, the budget request, for the natural resource damage assessment fund, an increase of \$93,000 above the fiscal year 2006 level.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Sections 101 and 102 provide for emergency transfer authority with the approval of the Secretary.

Section 103 provides for the use of appropriations for certain services.

Sections 104 through 106 prohibit the expenditure of funds for Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) oil leasing activities in certain areas. These OCS provisions are addressed under the Minerals Management Service.

Section 107 permits the transfer of funds between the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Office of Special Trustee for American Indians.

Section 108 continues a provision permitting the redistribution of tribal priority allocation and tribal base funds to alleviate funding inequities.

Section 109 continues a provision permitting the conveyance of the Twin Cities Research Center of the former Bureau of Mines for the benefit of the National Wildlife Refuge System.

Section 110 continues a provision authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to use helicopter or motor vehicles to capture and transport horses and burros at the Sheldon and Hart National Wildlife Refuges.

Section 111 authorizes federal funds for Shenandoah Valley Battlefield NHD and Ice Age NST to be transferred to a State, local government, or other governmental land management entity for acquisition of lands.

Section 112 continues a provision prohibiting the closure of the underground lunchroom at Carlsbad Caverns NP, NM.

Section 113 continues a provision preventing the demolition of a bridge between New Jersey and Ellis Island.

Section 114 continues a provision limiting compensation for the Special Master and Court Monitor appointed by the Court in *Cobell v. Norton* to 200 percent of the highest Senior Executive Service rate of pay.

Section 115 continues a provision allowing the Secretary to pay private attorney fees for employees and former employees in connection with *Cobell v. Norton*.

Section 116 continues a provision dealing with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's responsibilities for mass marking of salmonid stocks.

Section 117 prohibits the conduct of gaming under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) on lands described in section 123 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001, or land that is contiguous to that land.

Section 118 continues a provision prohibiting the use of funds to study or implement a plan to drain or reduce water levels in Lake Powell.

Section 119 allows the National Indian Gaming Commission to collect \$13,000,000 in fees for fiscal year 2008.

Section 120 makes funds appropriated for fiscal year 2006 available to the tribes within the California Tribal Trust Reform Consortium and others on the same basis as funds were distributed in fiscal year 2005, and separates this demonstration project from the Department of the Interior's trust reform reorganization.

Section 121 provides for the renewal of certain grazing permits in the Jarbidge Field office of the Bureau of Land Management.

Section 122 authorizes the acquisition of lands and leases for Ellis Island.

Section 123 permits the Secretary of the Interior to issue grazing permits within the Mojave National Preserve.

Section 124 implements rules concerning winter snowmobile use on Yellowstone National Park.

Section 125 prohibits the use of funds for Center of Excellence and partnership "Skills Bank Training without Committee approval.

## TITLE II—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

The Environmental Protection Agency was created by Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1970, which consolidated nine programs

from five different agencies and departments. Major EPA programs include air and water quality, drinking water, hazardous waste, research, pesticides, radiation, toxic substances, enforcement and compliance assurance, pollution prevention, oil spills, Superfund, Brownfields, and the Leaking Underground Storage Tank program. In addition, EPA provides Federal assistance for wastewater treatment, sewer overflow control, drinking water facilities, and other water infrastructure projects. The agency is responsible for conducting research and development, establishing environmental standards through the use of risk assessment and cost-benefit analysis, monitoring pollution conditions, seeking compliance through a variety of means, managing audits and investigations, and providing technical assistance and grant support to States and tribes, which are delegated authority for actual program implementation. Under existing statutory authority, the Agency may contribute to specific homeland security efforts and may participate in some international environmental activities.

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

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended.

Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended.

Toxic Substances Control Act, as amended.

Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended.

Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, as amended.

Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, as amended.

Oil Pollution Act of 1990.

Public Health Service Act (Title XIV), as amended.

Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended.

Clean Air Act, as amended.

Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended.

Great Lakes Legacy Act of 2002.

Bioterrorism Act of 2002.

Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended.

Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act of 2002 (amending CERCLA).

Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act of 1986.

Pollution Prevention Act of 1990.

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended.

Pollution Prosecution Act of 1990.

Pesticide Registration Improvement Act of 2003.

For fiscal year 2007, the Committee recommends \$7,566,870,000 for the Environmental Protection Agency, a decrease of \$58,546,000 below the fiscal year 2006 level and \$251,395,000 above the budget request. Changes to the budget request are detailed in each of the appropriation accounts below.

The Committee agrees to the following:

1. The Committee expects the EPA to continue to prepare its budget justification in the order specified in the table accompanying this report. There should be an explanation of every program/project, including those proposed for elimination. Each program/project should provide details and funding for each program

and project element funded in the current year and the proposed funding for each element in the budget year along with an explanation of any increase or decrease in funding and any change in emphasis.

2. The Committee was extremely disappointed with some of the EPA responses to Committee hearing questions for the record. EPA, in several instances, reported that it could not explain the impact on programs and projects of proposed reductions because the allocation of funds was yet to be determined. EPA should not propose program reductions if it cannot clearly identify the impact of those reductions on programs and projects. These details should be included in the Congressional budget justification.

3. The Committee has included the fixed cost increases proposed in the budget request for EPA. Any additional fixed cost increases not included in the appropriation for fiscal year 2007 should be absorbed through FTE reductions, which should be achieved through attrition.

4. The Committee continues to believe that the EPA needs to do a better job of using limited staff resources and commends the EPA for initiating a workforce assessment. A thorough analysis of staffing in the Regional Offices should be conducted and staffing and funding should be realigned as indicated by that analysis. In addition, those States that are doing a good job of running their programs do not need as much oversight as States that have problems with program implementation. EPA should consider differential oversight and focus its limited resources on States that have problems while providing somewhat less oversight to States with adequate programs and minimal oversight to States with excellent programs. The State oversight analysis should be done on a program by program basis.

5. EPA and the States focus on the number of environmental pollution permits issued, the number of environmental standards established, the number of facilities inspected, and other such outputs of performance. These measures can provide important information for EPA and State managers but they do not measure the actual environmental outcomes that must be known to ensure that resources are being allocated in the most cost effective ways to improve environmental conditions and public health. Further, the Government Accountability Office, EPA's Office of Inspector General, and the National Academy of Public Administration have identified ways that EPA can achieve its goals more efficiently and effectively by moving from traditional and intensive enforcement and compliance activities to more cost effective, efficient, and results oriented approaches. The Committee expects EPA to make substantive changes in these areas in 2007 and to include a description of those changes in the 2008 budget justification.

6. The Committee has included modest increases for certain programs authorized by the Energy Policy Act of 2005 and for Homeland Security initiatives. Given the limited funding available for this bill and the need to restore funding for mission essential programs and high priority projects that were reduced or eliminated in the budget request, the Committee was unable to provide a sizable portion of the \$80 million increase requested for programs associated with the Energy Policy Act of 2005 or the \$55 million increase requested for Homeland Security programs. The Committee

also did not provide funding for the Asia-Pacific Partnership initiative.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

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

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$730,810,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	788,274,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	808,044,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+77,234,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	+19,700,000

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted	Request
(dollars in thousands)					
-----					
Science and Technology					
Air toxics and quality					
Clean air allowance trading programs (also EPM).....	8,527	9,259	9,259	+732	---
Federal support for air quality mgmt (also EPM).....	10,012	10,273	10,273	+261	---
Federal support for air toxics program (also EPM)....	2,225	2,265	2,265	+40	---
Federal vehicle and fuels standards/certification....	58,613	---	---	-58,613	---
Energy Policy Act (Fed vehicle & fuel standards).....	---	11,400	2,400	+2,400	-9,000
Federal vehicles and fuel standards (other).....	---	56,925	56,925	+56,925	---
Radiation: Protection (also EPM; HSS).....	2,086	2,054	2,054	-32	---
Radiation: Response preparedness (also EPM).....	3,468	3,586	3,586	+118	---
Subtotal, Air toxics and quality.....	84,931	95,762	86,762	+1,831	-9,000
Climate protection					
Climate protection program (also EPM).....	18,648	12,550	18,550	-98	+6,000
Enforcement					
Forensics support (also HSS).....	13,129	13,185	13,185	+56	---
Homeland security					
Homeland security: Critical infrastructure					
protection					
Water sentinel and related training.....	8,131	41,735	16,735	+8,604	-25,000
Critical infrastructure protection (except					
water sentinel) (also EPM; HSS).....	4,262	3,516	3,516	-746	---
Subtotal, Homeland security: Critical					
infrastructure protection.....	12,393	45,251	20,251	+7,858	-25,000

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended Request	Recommended Enacted	Recommended versus Request
(dollars in thousands)					
-----					
Homeland security: Preparedness, response, and recovery					
Decontamination (also EPM; HSS).....	16,868	24,667	19,667	+2,799	-5,000
Laboratory preparedness & response (also EPM; HSS)	591	600	600	+9	---
Safe buildings.....	3,722	4,000	4,000	+278	---
Preparedness, response, and recovery (other activities) (also HSS).....	14,571	15,231	15,231	+660	---
(Transfer from Hazardous substance superfund).....	(1,976)	(2,000)	(2,000)	(+24)	---
Subtotal, Homeland security: Preparedness, response, and recovery.....	35,752	44,498	39,498	+3,746	-5,000
Homeland security: Protection of EPA personnel and infrastructure (also EPM; B&F; HSS).....	2,050	2,079	2,079	+29	---
Subtotal, Homeland security.....	50,195	91,828	61,828	+11,633	-30,000
Indoor air					
Indoor air: Radon program (also EPM).....	429	442	442	+13	---
Indoor air: Schools and workplace program (moved from indoor air (also EPM).....	810	829	829	+19	---
Subtotal, Indoor air.....	1,239	1,271	1,271	+32	---

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted	Request
(dollars in thousands)					
IT / Data management / Security					
IT / Data management (also EPM; LUST; OSR; HSS).....	4,173	4,268	4,268	+95	---
Operations and administration					
Facilities infrastructure and operations (also EPM; B&F; LUST; OSR; HSS).....	8,511	70,240	70,240	+61,729	---
Pesticide licensing					
Pesticides: Registration of new pesticides (also EPM).....	2,463	2,766	2,766	+303	---
Pesticides: Review/Reregistration of existing pesticides (also EPM).....	2,480	2,820	2,820	+340	---
Subtotal, Pesticide licensing.....	4,943	5,586	5,586	+643	---
Research / Congressional priorities.....	32,919	---	30,000	-2,919	+30,000
Research: Clean air					
Research: Air toxics.....	16,226	12,274	16,224	-2	+3,950
Research: Global change.....	18,619	17,456	19,056	+437	+1,600
Research: National ambient air quality standards (NAAQS).....	66,777	65,456	66,356	-421	+900
Subtotal, Research: Clean air.....	101,622	95,186	101,636	+14	+6,450
Research: Clean water					
Research: Drinking water.....	45,170	49,243	49,243	+4,073	---
Research: Water quality.....	51,269	56,988	56,988	+5,719	---
Subtotal, Research: Clean water.....	96,439	106,231	106,231	+9,792	---

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended Enacted	Recommended versus Request
(dollars in thousands)					
Research: Human health and ecosystems					
Human health risk assessment.....	35,637	34,488	34,488	-1,149	---
(By transfer from Hazardous substance superfund)...	(3,755)	(3,847)	(3,847)	(+92)	---
Research: Computational toxicology.....	12,327	14,983	14,983	+2,656	---
Research: Endocrine disruptor.....	10,494	9,081	10,481	-13	+1,400
Research: Fellowships.....	11,691	8,383	11,738	+47	+3,355
Research: Human health and ecosystems.....	167,703	161,313	166,313	-1,390	+5,000
Subtotal, Research: Human health and ecosystems	237,852	228,248	238,003	+151	+9,755
Research: Land protection					
Research: Land protection & restoration (also HSS)...	11,606	10,553	10,553	-1,053	---
(By transfer from Hazardous substance superfund)...	(22,927)	(21,964)	(22,964)	(+37)	(+1,000)
Subtotal, Research: Land protection.....	11,606	10,553	10,553	-1,053	---
Research: Sustainability					
Research: Economics and decision science (EDS).....	2,361	2,495	2,495	+134	---
Research: Environmental technology verification (ETV).....	2,990	---	2,405	-585	+2,405
Research: Sustainability (other activities).....	25,803	21,404	21,404	-4,399	---
(By transfer from Hazardous substance superfund)...	(292)	---	---	(-292)	---
Subtotal, Research: Sustainability.....	31,154	23,899	26,304	-4,850	+2,405

(dollars in thousands)				
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted Request
-----				-----
Toxic research and prevention				
Research: Pesticides and toxics.....	30,357	26,224	30,384	+27      +4,160
Water: Human health protection				
Drinking water programs (also EPM).....	3,092	3,243	3,243	+151      ---
-----				-----
Total, Science and Technology.....	730,810	788,274	808,044	+77,234      +19,770
(By transfer from Hazardous substance superfund)	(30,156)	(27,811)	(30,011)	(-145)      (+2,200)
=====				=====

The Committee recommends \$808,044,000 for science and technology, an increase of \$77,234,000 above the fiscal year 2006 level and \$19,700,000 above the budget request. The Committee notes that the increase above the 2006 funding level is largely attributable to the realignment of administrative costs from the environmental programs and management account. In addition, the Committee recommends that \$30,011,000 be transferred to this account from the Hazardous Substance Superfund account for ongoing research activities consistent with the intent of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended. Changes to the budget request are detailed below.

*Air Toxics and Quality.*—The Committee recommends a decrease of \$9,000,000 for Federal vehicle and fuels standards certification associated with implementation of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 renewable fuels standard.

*Climate Protection Program.*—The Committee recommends an increase of \$6,000,000 for the climate protection program to restore base program research funding.

*Homeland Security.*—The Committee recommends a decrease of \$25,000,000 in critical infrastructure protection for WaterSentinel and related training and a decrease of \$5,000,000 in preparedness, response, and recovery for the decontamination program.

*Research: Congressional Priorities.*—The Committee recommends an increase of \$30,000,000 for programs of national and regional significance including:

State	Project name	Amount
CA .....	Central California Ozone Study, San Joaquin Valleywide Air Pollution Study Agency .....	\$375,000
CA .....	Irrigation Training and Research Center—Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo Flow Rate Measurement	250,000
FL .....	Florida Department of Citrus Abscission Chemical Studies .....	1,000,000
NY .....	Environmental Systems Ctr of Excellence at Syracuse Univ., Indoor environmental quality & urban ecosystems sustainability.	2,000,000
OH .....	Ohio State University Oleantangy River Wetlands Park teaching, research, and outreach initiative.	500,000
OK .....	Tulsa Air Quality Study (ozone compliance) .....	300,000
TX .....	Mickey Leland National Urban Air Toxics Research Center .....	1,500,000
	American Water Works Association Research Foundation .....	1,000,000
	Consortium for Plant Biotechnology Research .....	750,000
	New England Green Chemistry Consortium .....	750,000
	Southwest Center for Environmental Research and Policy .....	1,500,000
	Water Environment Research Foundation .....	3,000,000
	Water Systems Council Wellcare Program .....	1,000,000

*Research: Clean Air.*—The Committee recommends an increase of \$6,450,000 to restore funding for clean air research including increases of \$3,950,000 for air toxics, \$1,600,000 for global change, and \$900,000 for particulate monitoring methods and tropospheric ozone research in the National Ambient Air Quality Standards program.

*Human Health and Ecosystems.*—The Committee recommends an increase of \$9,755,000 to restore funding for human health and ecosystems research including increases of \$1,400,000 for endocrine disruptor research, \$3,355,000 for fellowships through the Science to Achieve Results program, and \$5,000,000 for the environmental monitoring and assessment program.

*Research: Sustainability.*—The Committee recommends an increase of \$2,405,000 to restore partially the environmental technology verification program.

*Toxics Research and Prevention.*—The Committee recommends an increase of \$4,160,000 to restore funding for pesticides and toxics research.

The Committee agrees to the following:

1. Competitively awarded contract research and engineering services and activities for clean automotive technologies under the climate protection program should be funded at least at the 2006 level.

2. The funding recommended for the WaterSentinel program includes sufficient monies for one additional pilot project. EPA should ensure that this additional pilot project is located in a metropolitan area which is highly vulnerable from a homeland security threat perspective and which has funding support from the local council of governments.

3. Any future WaterSentinel funding should be requested through the Department of Homeland Security and EPA should coordinate with the Office of Management and Budget to ensure this happens beginning in fiscal year 2008. While the Committee agrees that EPA's expertise is important for program success and that it had a critical role to play in establishing the program, the Committee also believes strongly that continuing program funding must be provided through the Department of Homeland Security.

4. The Committee continues to stress the importance of the Science to Achieve Results program. Funding reductions in this program are not acceptable because such reductions would ultimately result in long term problems, with and gaps in, critical environmental research.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

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

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

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

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$2,346,711,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	2,306,617,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	2,336,442,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	- 10,269,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	+29,825,000

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted	Request
(dollars in thousands)					
-----					
Environmental Programs and Management					
Air toxics and quality					
Clean air allowance trading programs (also S&T).....	17,708	19,126	19,126	+1,418	---
Federal stationary source regulations.....	23,215	25,678	25,678	+2,463	---
Federal support for air quality management					
Clean diesel initiative.....	5,867	---	---	-5,867	---
Energy Policy Act implementation.....	---	2,800	---	---	-2,800
Federal support for air quality management (other activities) (also S&T).....	90,082	85,266	85,266	-4,816	---
-----					
Subtotal, Federal support for air quality management.....	95,949	88,066	85,266	-10,683	-2,800
Federal support for air toxics program (also S&T)...					
Radiation: Protection (also S&T; HSS).....	25,405	25,514	25,514	+109	---
Radiation: Response preparedness (also S&T).....	11,178	10,649	10,649	-529	---
Stratospheric ozone: Domestic programs.....	2,632	2,689	2,689	+57	---
Stratospheric ozone: Multilateral fund.....	4,938	5,221	5,221	+283	---
	8,600	13,365	9,600	+1,000	-3,765
-----					
Subtotal, Air toxics and quality.....	189,625	190,308	183,743	-5,882	-6,565
Brownfields.....					
	24,534	24,637	24,637	+103	---
Climate protection program					
Energy star.....	49,536	45,723	47,723	-1,813	+2,000
Methane to markets.....	1,971	4,421	2,421	+450	-2,000

(dollars in thousands)					
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted	Request
Climate protection program (other activities) (also S&T).....	39,327	41,700	40,700	+1,373	-1,000
Subtotal, Climate protection.....	90,834	91,844	90,844	+10	-1,000
Compliance					
Compliance assistance and centers					
Energy policy act implementation.....	---	111	111	+111	---
Other activities.....	27,935	28,780	28,780	+845	---
Subtotal, Compliance assistance and centers....	27,935	28,891	28,891	+956	---
Compliance incentives (also HSS).....	9,412	9,702	9,702	+290	---
Compliance monitoring					
Energy policy act implementation.....	---	987	---	---	-987
Other activities.....	85,463	92,032	92,032	+6,569	---
Subtotal, Compliance monitoring.....	85,463	93,019	92,032	+6,569	-987
Subtotal, Compliance.....	122,810	131,612	130,625	+7,815	-987
Enforcement					
Energy policy act.....	---	753	---	---	-753
Civil enforcement (also OSR; HSS) (other).....	117,807	120,025	120,025	+2,218	---
Subtotal, Civil enforcement.....	117,807	120,778	120,025	+2,218	-753

	(dollars in thousands)				
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended Enacted	Recommended versus Request
Criminal enforcement (also HSS).....	37,565	37,794	37,794	+229	---
Enforcement training (also HSS).....	2,945	2,504	2,504	-441	---
Environmental justice (also HSS).....	5,569	3,859	5,569	---	+1,710
NEPA implementation.....	12,640	13,787	13,787	+1,147	---
Subtotal, Enforcement.....	176,526	178,722	179,679	+3,153	+957
Environmental protection / Congressional priorities....	49,799	---	40,000	-9,799	+40,000
Geographic programs					
Geographic program: Chesapeake Bay.....	22,118	26,398	22,398	+280	-4,000
Geographic program: Great Lakes.....	21,164	20,577	20,577	-587	---
Geographic program: Gulf of Mexico.....	4,809	4,311	4,311	-498	---
Geographic program: Lake Champlain.....	1,926	934	934	-992	---
Geographic program: Long Island Sound.....	470	467	467	-3	---
Geographic program: Other					
Community action for a renewed environment (CARE).	2,862	4,448	4,448	+1,586	---
Geographic program: Puget Sound.....	1,971	---	6,000	+4,029	+6,000
Other activities.....	5,124	4,602	4,602	-522	---
Subtotal, Geographic program: Other.....	9,957	9,050	15,050	+5,093	+6,000
Regional geographic initiatives.....	8,060	9,137	8,137	+77	-1,000
Subtotal, Geographic programs.....	68,504	70,874	71,874	+3,370	+1,000

(dollars in thousands)				
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted Request
Homeland security				
Homeland security: Communication and information (also HSS)				
Laboratory preparedness and response (also S&T)...	1,212	1,200	1,200	-12
Communication and information (other activities)...	5,263	5,600	5,600	+337
Subtotal, Homeland security: Communication and information.....	6,475	6,800	6,800	+325
Homeland security: Critical infrastructure protection				
Decontamination (also S&T; EPM; HSS).....	98	99	99	+1
Critical infrastructure protection (except decontamination) (also S&T; HSS).....	6,689	7,144	7,144	+455
Subtotal, Homeland security: critical infrastructure protection.....	6,787	7,243	7,243	+456
Homeland security: Preparedness, response, and recovery (also S&T; HSS)				
Decontamination (also S&T; EPM; HSS).....	3,252	3,329	3,329	+77
Homeland security: Protection of EPA personnel and infrastructure (also S&T; B&F; HSS).....	6,199	6,269	6,269	+70
Subtotal, Homeland security.....	22,713	23,641	23,641	+928

(dollars in thousands)					
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted	Request
<b>Indoor air</b>					
Indoor air: Radon program (also S&T).....	5,159	5,519	5,519	+360	---
Reduce risks from indoor air (also S&T).....	23,137	23,464	23,464	+327	---
Subtotal, Indoor air.....	28,296	28,983	28,983	+687	---
<b>Information exchange / Outreach</b>					
Children and other sensitive populations: Agency coordination.....	5,633	6,064	6,064	+431	---
Congressional, intergovernmental, external relations (also HSS).....	50,291	52,143	52,143	+1,852	---
Environmental education.....	8,889	---	9,000	+111	+9,000
Exchange network (also HSS).....	17,700	16,049	16,689	-1,001	+650
Small business ombudsman.....	3,343	3,502	3,502	+159	---
Small minority business assistance.....	2,503	2,646	2,646	+143	---
State and local prevention and preparedness.....	11,377	12,508	12,508	+1,131	---
Toxics release inventory (TRI) / Right to know.....	14,289	15,243	15,243	+954	---
Tribal - Capacity building.....	11,049	11,436	11,436	+387	---
Subtotal, Information exchange / Outreach.....	125,074	119,591	129,241	+4,167	+9,650
<b>International programs</b>					
Commission for environmental cooperation.....	4,116	4,137	4,137	+21	---
Environment and trade.....	1,766	1,861	1,861	+95	---
International capacity building.....	6,138	6,390	6,390	+252	---
Persistent organic pollutants (POPs) implementation. U.S. / Mexico border.....	1,697	1,809	1,809	+112	---
	5,749	6,061	6,061	+312	---
Subtotal, International programs.....	19,466	20,258	20,258	+792	---

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended Enacted	Recommended versus Request
(dollars in thousands)					
IT / Data management / Security					
Information security (also HSS).....	3,751	5,562	5,562	+1,811	---
IT / Data management (also S&T; LUST; OSR; HSS) (\$22.59 million moved to EPM Compliance in FY06)...	94,567	96,807	96,807	+2,240	---
Subtotal, IT / Data management / Security.....	98,318	102,369	102,369	+4,051	---
Legal/Science/Regulatory/Economic review					
Administrative law.....	4,607	4,861	4,861	+254	---
Alternative dispute resolution (also HSS).....	1,048	1,230	1,230	+182	---
Civil rights / Title VI compliance.....	10,575	11,054	11,054	+479	---
Legal advice: Environmental program (also HSS).....	35,931	37,525	37,525	+1,594	---
Legal advice: Support program.....	13,206	13,466	13,466	+260	---
Regional science and technology.....	3,522	3,521	3,521	-1	---
Regulatory innovation.....	21,511	25,853	23,853	+2,342	-2,000
Regulatory/Economic-management and analysts.....	16,551	17,555	17,555	+1,004	---
Science advisory board.....	4,402	4,616	4,616	+214	---
Subtotal, Legal/Science/Regulatory/Economic review.....	111,353	119,681	117,681	+6,328	-2,000
Operations and administration					
Acquisition management (also LUST; HSS).....	23,265	25,418	25,418	+2,153	---
Central planning, budgeting, and finance (also LUST; HSS).....	73,680	83,548	83,548	+9,868	---
Facilities infrastructure and operations (also S&T; B&F; LUST; OSR; HSS).....	343,908	294,760	293,760	-50,148	-1,000
Financial assistance grants / Interagency agreements (IAG) management (also HSS).....	23,168	21,847	21,847	-1,321	---



	(dollars in thousands)			
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted Request
Underground storage tanks (LUST / UST) (also LUST).....	7,763	11,714	10,214	+2,451 -1,500
Water: Ecosystems				
Great Lakes Legacy Act.....	28,989	49,600	29,600	+611 -20,000
National estuary program / Coastal waterways.....	23,773	18,417	24,417	+644 +6,000
Wetlands.....	19,416	20,992	20,992	+1,576 ---
Subtotal, Water: Ecosystems.....	72,178	89,009	75,009	+2,831 -14,000
Water: Human health protection				
Beach/Fish programs.....	3,156	2,654	2,654	-502 ---
Drinking water programs (also S&T).....	95,656	99,121	99,121	+3,465 ---
Subtotal, Water: Human health protection.....	98,812	101,775	101,775	+2,963 ---
Water quality protection				
Marine pollution.....	12,212	12,462	12,462	+250 ---
Surface water protection				
Water quality monitoring.....	7,193	7,121	7,121	-72 ---
Surface water protection (other activities).....	182,019	184,467	186,467	+4,448 +2,000
Subtotal, Surface water protection.....	189,212	191,588	193,588	+4,376 +2,000
Subtotal, Water quality protection.....	201,424	204,050	206,050	+4,626 +2,000
Total, Environmental Programs and Management.....	2,346,711	2,306,617	2,336,442	-10,269 +29,825

The Committee recommends \$2,336,442,000 for environmental programs and management, a decrease of \$10,269,000 below the fiscal year 2006 level and \$29,825,000 above the budget request. Changes to the budget request are detailed below.

*Air Toxics and Quality.*—The Committee recommends a decrease of \$6,565,000 for air toxics and quality including a decrease of \$2,800,000 in the Federal support for air quality management program for implementation of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 and \$3,765,000 in the stratospheric ozone program for the multilateral fund.

*Climate Protection.*—The Committee recommends a net decrease of \$1,000,000 for climate protection programs, including an increase of \$2,000,000 for Energy Star, a decrease of \$2,000,000 for the methane to markets initiative, and, in other climate change programs, a decrease of \$5,000,000 for the Asia-Pacific Partnership and an increase of \$4,000,000 to restore ongoing climate change programs.

*Compliance.*—The Committee recommends a decrease of \$987,000 in the compliance monitoring program for implementation of the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

*Enforcement.*—The Committee recommends an increase of \$957,000 for enforcement, including a decrease of \$753,000 in the civil enforcement program for implementation of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 and an increase of \$1,710,000 to restore the environmental justice program. The Committee notes that there is also an increase, as requested, in the Superfund account for environmental justice activities.

*Environmental Protection: Congressional Priorities.*—The Committee recommends \$40,000,000 for programs of national and regional significance including:

State	Project name	Amount
CO .....	NE Colorado Surface Water/Groundwater Conservation Program (Central Colorado Water Conservation District)	\$250,000
IA .....	Iowa State University project on mitigating emissions from egg farms .....	1,000,000
NY .....	Central New York Watersheds in Onondaga, Wayne, & Cayuga Counties water quality management.	2,000,000
NY/CT .....	Long Island Sound restoration .....	1,800,000
	America's Clean Water Foundation on Farm Assessment & Environmental Review Program ....	3,000,000
	Groundwater Protection Council .....	650,000
	National Biosolids Partnership (Water Environment Federation) .....	1,000,000
	National Hispanic Healthy Farm Workers Initiative (Self Reliance Foundation) .....	1,000,000
	National Rural Water Association .....	11,000,000
	Rural Community Assistance Program .....	3,500,000

*Geographic Programs.*—The Committee recommends a net increase of \$1,000,000 for geographic programs, including a decrease of \$6,397,000 for the Corsica River watershed pilot project in the Chesapeake Bay program, an increase of \$2,397,000 for competitive grants for community based efforts in the Chesapeake Bay program, an increase of \$6,000,000 for the Puget Sound program, and a decrease of \$1,000,000 for regional geographic initiatives.

*Information Exchange/Outreach.*—The Committee recommends an increase of \$9,650,000 for information exchange/outreach, including increases of \$9,000,000 for environmental education and \$650,000 for the exchange network.

*Legal/Science/Regulatory/Economic Review.*—The Committee recommends a decrease of \$2,000,000 for regulatory innovation.

*Operations and Administration.*—The Committee recommends a decrease of \$1,000,000 for facilities infrastructure and operations.

*Pesticide Licensing.*—The Committee recommends an increase of \$4,500,000 for pesticide licensing including increases of \$2,000,000 for registration of new pesticides and \$2,500,000 for review/reregistration of existing pesticides.

*Toxics Risk Review and Prevention.*—The Committee recommends a net decrease of \$1,230,000 for toxics review and prevention, including an increase of \$770,000 for endocrine disruptors and a decrease of \$2,000,000 for the pollution prevention program.

*Underground Storage Tanks.*—The Committee recommends a decrease of \$1,500,000 in the underground storage tank program for implementation of the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

*Water: Ecosystems.*—The Committee recommends a net decrease of \$14,000,000 for water/ecosystems, including a decrease of \$20,000,000 for Great Lakes Legacy Act programs and an increase of \$6,000,000 for the National Estuary Program. Direction on distribution of National Estuary Program funding is provided below.

*Water Quality Protection.*—The Committee recommends an increase of \$2,000,000 for surface water protection to restore and improve the quality of rivers, lakes, and streams.

The Committee agrees to the following:

1. The Committee recommendation includes the \$2,000,000 in the budget request to continue the Water Information Sharing and Analysis Center and the Water Security Channel efforts to provide up to date security information for drinking water and wastewater utilities.

2. No funds are provided in the Chesapeake Bay program for a pilot project in the Corsica River. The Committee encourages EPA to use the increase recommended by the Committee for competitive grants for community-based efforts and to award grants based upon their contribution to pounds of nitrogen, phosphorous, and sediment removed. The Committee also expects the Chesapeake Bay program to provide facilitator training to its staff and to use a facilitator at each of its committee, subcommittee, and task group meetings to ensure that those meetings and the subsequent actions taken achieve results. This also could be achieved through the use of trained facilitators associated with State and other partner organizations.

3. A total of \$6,000,000 is provided for the Puget Sound geographic program under section 320 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended. This program is to be administered by the Washington State Department of Ecology.

4. A total of \$24,417,000 is included for the National Estuary Program (NEP), which includes \$500,000 for each of the 28 NEP estuaries and \$10,417,000 for other activities in support of the program.

5. EPA should encourage local governments and communities to pursue innovative public-private partnerships, such as the Adopt-A-Waterway program, which, at no additional cost to taxpayers, help to implement storm water pollution prevention activities, curb urban runoff, and improve water quality. Further, EPA should work with the States to enter into public-private partnerships, such

as Adopt-A-Waterway, to fulfill their public education and outreach responsibilities.

6. The Pesticide Safety Education Program should continue to be funded at \$1,200,000 in fiscal year 2007 using the services of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service.

7. The Committee commends the Agriculture Container Recycling Council for its development of a voluntary program for recycling agricultural and professional specialty pesticides containers. This program has facilitated the proper disposal of millions of plastic pesticide containers at no cost to farmers. The EPA has been developing regulations on this recycling and, to ensure the program remains a viable, free service that is available to agricultural producers, the Committee expects EPA to issue a final rulemaking on the recycling of high density polyethylene pesticide containers within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

8. There are a number of environmental changes associated with global climate change that may have a direct impact on human health. Much of the country may experience more serious air pollution, increased number of heat waves, and the emergence of more pest borne diseases. Certain vulnerable populations will suffer the most, in particular the very young and the very old. In order to better understand and plan for these problems, the EPA should contract with the National Academies of Science to conduct a study of the potential health impacts of global climate change on the U.S. population at large, and especially on the young, the elderly, those with respiratory diseases, and those in communities situated in areas particularly vulnerable to pollution and other environmental problems including minority communities. The study should also review and make recommendations on areas that the United States needs to improve medical preparedness and response capabilities and public health systems to deal with the health impacts associated with increased pollution and other environmental changes. The Committee expects the EPA to provide \$1 million with available funds to support this study in fiscal year 2007.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

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

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$36,904,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	35,100,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	35,100,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	-1,804,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

(dollars in thousands)				
	FY 2006	FY 2007	Recommended	Recommended versus
	Enacted	Request	Enacted	Request
-----				
Office of Inspector General				
Audits, evaluations, and investigations.....	36,904	35,100	35,100	-1,804
(By transfer from Hazardous substance superfund)....	(13,337)	(13,316)	(13,316)	(-21)
				---
				---

The Committee recommends \$35,100,000, the budget request, for the Office of Inspector General, a decrease of \$1,804,000 below the fiscal year 2006 level. In addition, the Committee recommends that \$13,316,000, as requested, be transferred to this account from the Hazardous Substance Superfund account.

*Bill Language.*—Bill Language is recommended providing that, notwithstanding any other provision of law, in fiscal year 2007 and thereafter, the EPA Inspector General shall not serve as the IG for the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

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

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$39,626,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	39,816,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	39,816,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+190,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

(dollars in thousands)			
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended versus Enacted Request
<b>Buildings and Facilities</b>			
Homeland security			
Homeland security: Protection of EPA personnel and infrastructure (also S&T; EPM; HSS).....	11,331	11,385	+54
Operations and administration			
Facilities infrastructure and operations (also S&T; EPM; HSS; LUST; OSR).....	28,295	28,431	+136
<b>Total, Buildings and Facilities.....</b>	<b>39,626</b>	<b>39,816</b>	<b>+190</b>

The Committee recommends \$39,816,000, the budget request, for buildings and facilities, an increase of \$190,000 above the fiscal year 2006 level.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND  
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

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

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

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$1,242,074,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	1,258,955,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	1,256,855,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+14,781,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	-2,100,000

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:



(dollars in thousands)				
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted Request
-----				
Homeland security				
Homeland security: Communication and information (also EPM)				
Laboratory preparedness and response (also S&T; EPM; HSS)	296	300	300	+4
-----				
Homeland security: Critical infrastructure protection				
Decontamination (also S&T; EPM; HSS)	197	198	198	+1
Critical infrastructure protection (other activities) (also S&T; EPM)	1,245	1,374	1,374	+129
-----				
Subtotal, Homeland security: Critical infrastructure protection	1,442	1,572	1,572	+130
-----				
Homeland security: Preparedness, response, and recovery				
Decontamination (also S&T; EPM; HSS)	10,395	12,271	10,471	+76
Laboratory preparedness and response (also S&T; EPM; HSS)	---	9,500	1,000	+1,000
Preparedness, response, and recovery (other activities) (also S&T)	27,184	28,004	28,004	+820
(Transfer to Science and Technology)	(-1,976)	(-2,000)	(-2,000)	(-24)
-----				
Subtotal, Homeland security: Preparedness, response, and recovery	37,579	49,775	39,475	+1,896
-----				
			39,475	-10,300

(dollars in thousands)					
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted	Request
Homeland security: Protection of EPA personnel and infrastructure (also S&T; EPM; B&F).....	588	594	594	+6	---
Subtotal, Homeland security.....	39,905	52,241	41,941	+2,036	-10,300
Information exchange / Outreach					
Congressional, intergovernmental, external relations (also EPM).....	48	130	130	+82	---
Exchange network (also EPM).....	1,650	1,432	1,432	-218	---
Subtotal, Information exchange / Outreach.....	1,698	1,562	1,562	-136	---
IT / Data management / Security					
Information security (also EPM).....	341	789	789	+448	---
IT / Data management (also S&T; EPM; LUST; OSR).....	17,053	17,120	17,120	+67	---
Subtotal, IT / Data management / Security.....	17,394	17,909	17,909	+515	---
Legal/Science/Regulatory/Economic review					
Alternative dispute resolution (also EPM).....	975	887	887	-88	---
Legal advice: Environmental program (also EPM).....	755	691	691	-64	---
Subtotal, Legal/Science/Regulatory/Economic review.....	1,730	1,578	1,578	-152	---
Operations and administration					
Financial assistance grants / Interagency agreements (IAG) management (also EPM).....	3,060	2,921	2,921	-139	---
Facilities infrastructure and operations (also S&T; EPM; B&F; LUST; OSR).....	69,667	73,945	73,945	+4,278	---
Acquisition management (also EPM; LUST).....	19,727	23,514	22,514	+2,787	-1,000

(dollars in thousands)				
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended Enacted	Recommended versus Request
Human resources management (also EPM; LUST).....	5,665	5,270	5,270	-395
Central planning, budgeting, and finance (also EPM; LUST).....	24,349	25,541	25,541	+1,192
Subtotal, Operations and administration.....	122,468	131,191	130,191	+7,723
Research: Human health and ecosystems				
Human health risk assessment.....	3,755	3,847	3,847	+92
(Transfer to Science and Technology).....	(-3,755)	(-3,847)	(-3,847)	(-92)
Research: Land protection				
Research: Land protection and restoration.....	22,927	21,964	22,964	+37
(Transfer to Science and Technology).....	(-22,927)	(-21,964)	(-22,964)	(-37)
Research: Superfund innovative technology (SITE) program.....	1,206	---	1,200	-6
(Transfer to Science and Technology).....	(-1,206)	---	(-1,200)	(+6)
Subtotal, Research: Land protection.....	24,133	21,964	24,164	+31
Research: Sustainability				
Pollution prevention (also S&T).....	292	---	---	-292
(Transfer to Science and Technology).....	(-292)	---	---	(+292)

(dollars in thousands)					
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended Enacted	Recommended versus Request
-----					
Superfund cleanup					
Superfund: Emergency response and removal.....	193,584	192,399	193,399	-185	+1,000
Superfund: EPA emergency preparedness.....	10,540	8,863	9,863	-677	+1,000
Superfund: Federal facilities.....	31,336	31,487	31,487	+151	---
Superfund: Remedial.....	588,905	581,595	588,595	-310	+7,000
Superfund: Support to other Federal agencies.....	9,540	8,575	9,575	+35	+1,000
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Subtotal, Superfund cleanup.....	833,905	822,919	832,919	-986	+10,000
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total, Hazardous Substance Superfund.....	1,242,074	1,258,955	1,256,855	+14,781	-2,100
(Transfer to Office of Inspector General).....	(-13,337)	(-13,316)	(-13,316)	(+21)	---
(Transfer to Science and Technology).....	(-30,156)	(-27,811)	(-30,011)	(+145)	(-2,200)
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

The Committee recommends \$1,256,855,000 for hazardous substance Superfund, an increase of \$14,781,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level and \$2,100,000 below the budget request. Changes to the budget request are detailed below.

*Enforcement.*—The Committee recommends a decrease of \$3,000,000 for Superfund enforcement, which leaves an increase of almost \$4 million above the 2006 level.

*Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery.*—The Committee recommends a decrease of \$10,300,000 for homeland security: preparedness, response, and recovery, including decreases of \$1,800,000 for decontamination and \$8,500,000 for laboratory preparedness and response.

*Operations and Administration.*—The Committee recommends a decrease of \$1,000,000 in the acquisition management program for contract workforce education.

*Research: Land Protection.*—The Committee recommends an increase of \$2,200,000 research, including increases of \$1,000,000 for land protection and restoration and \$1,200,000 to continue the Superfund innovative technology evaluation program.

*Superfund Cleanup.*—The Committee recommends an increase of \$10,000,000 to restore base funding for Superfund cleanup including increases of \$1,000,000 for emergency response and removal, \$1,000,000 for EPA emergency preparedness, \$7,000,000 for the remedial program, and \$1,000,000 for support to other Federal agencies.

*Bill Language.*—Bill language is included transferring funds to the Office of Inspector General and to the Science and Technology account. The funding transfer to the Science and Technology account is increased above the budget request by \$2,200,000, which includes increases of \$1,000,000 for land protection and restoration research and \$1,200,000 for the Superfund Innovative Technology Evaluation program (SITE).

*Report Language:*

1. The Committee believes that the Superfund Innovative Technology Evaluation program is an important element of the Superfund program and does not agree with eliminating SITE funding as proposed in the budget request.

2. Within the funds provided for support to other Federal agencies, the U.S. Coast Guard should receive at least \$5,200,000.

#### LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK PROGRAM

Subtitle I of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act, authorized the establishment of a response program for clean-up of releases from leaking underground storage tanks. Owners and operators of facilities with underground tanks must demonstrate financial responsibility and bear initial responsibility for clean-up. The Federal trust fund is funded through the imposition of a motor fuel tax of one-tenth of a cent per gallon, which generates approximately \$170,000,000 per year.

Most States also have their own leaking underground storage tank programs, including a separate trust fund or other funding mechanism, in place. The Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund provides additional clean-up resources and may also be used to enforce necessary corrective actions and to recover costs ex-

pended from the Fund for clean-up activities. The underground storage tank response program is designed to operate primarily through cooperative agreements with States. However, funds are also used for grants to non-State entities, including Indian tribes, under Section 8001 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act.

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$79,953,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	72,759,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	72,759,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	- 7,194,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended Enacted	Recommended Request	Recommended versus Request
(dollars in thousands)					
-----					
Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUST)					
Compliance					
Compliance assistance and centers (also EPM; OSR; HSS).....	711	839	839	+128	---
IT / Data management / Security					
IT / Data management (also S&T; EPM; HSS; OSR).....	182	176	176	-6	---
Operations and administration					
Acquisition management (also EPM; HSS).....	358	361	361	+3	---
Central planning, budgeting, and finance (also EPM; HSS).....	1,010	1,015	1,015	+5	---
Facilities infrastructure and operations (also S&T; EPM; B&F; HSS; OSR).....	894	917	917	+23	---
Human resources management (also EPM; HSS).....	3	3	3	---	---
Subtotal, Operations and administration.....	2,265	2,296	2,296	+31	---

(dollars in thousands)					
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted	Request
Research: Land protection					
Research: Land protection and restoration (also					
S&T; HSS; OSR).....	634	651	651	+17	---
Underground storage tanks (LUST / UST)					
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148).....	8,000	---	---	-8,000	---
Underground storage tanks (LUST / UST) (also EPM)....	10,514	10,590	10,590	+76	---
LUST Cooperative agreements.....	57,647	58,207	58,207	+560	---
Subtotal, Underground storage tanks (LUST / UST)	76,161	68,797	68,797	-7,364	---
Total, Leaking Underground Storage Tank Program.	79,953	72,759	72,759	-7,194	---

The Committee recommends \$72,759,000, the budget request, for the leaking underground storage tank program, a decrease of \$7,194,000 below the fiscal year 2006 level, which included one time supplemental funding to address hurricane damage in Louisiana and Mississippi.

#### OIL SPILL RESPONSE

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

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

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$15,629,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	16,506,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	16,506,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+877,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

(dollars in thousands)				
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Request
-----				
Oil Spill Response				
Compliance				
Compliance assistance and centers (also EPM; HSS; LUST).....	284	280	280	-4
Enforcement				
Civil enforcement (also EPM; HSS).....	1,910	1,826	1,826	-84
IT / Data management / Security				
IT / Data management (also S&T; EPM; HSS; LUST).....	31	33	33	+2
Oil				
Oil spill: Prevention, preparedness and response...	12,066	12,965	12,965	+899
Operations and administration				
Facilities infrastructure and operations (also S&T; EPM; B&F; HSS; LUST).....	500	499	499	-1
Research: Land protection				
Research: Land protection and restoration (also S&T; HSS; LUST).....	838	903	903	+65
Total, Oil Spill Response.....	15,629	16,506	16,506	+877
=====				

The Committee recommends \$16,506,000, the budget request, for oil spill response, an increase of \$877,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

The State and Tribal Assistance Grants account provides grant funds for programs operated primarily by State, local, tribal and other governmental partners. The account provides funding for infrastructure projects through the State Revolving Funds, geographic specific projects in rural Alaska and Alaska Native Villages, Puerto Rico, and on the United States-Mexico Border, and other targeted special projects. In addition, the account funds Brownfields assessment and revitalization grants, grants for clean school buses, and miscellaneous other categorical grant programs.

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

Categorical grant programs include non-point source grants under Section 319 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, Public Water System Supervision grants, Section 106 water quality grants, grants to improve targeted watersheds, Clean Air Act Section 105 and 103 air grants targeted to environmental information, Brownfields cleanup grants, and other grants used by the States, tribes, and others to meet Federal environmental statutory and regulatory requirements.

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$3,213,709,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	2,797,448,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	3,007,348,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	-206,361,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	+209,900,000

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted	Request
(dollars in thousands)					
-----					
State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG)					
Air toxics and quality					
Clean school bus initiative.....	6,897	---	---	-6,897	---
Brownfields					
Brownfields projects.....	88,676	89,119	89,119	+443	---
Infrastructure assistance					
Infrastructure assistance: Alaska Native villages..	34,485	14,850	14,850	-19,635	---
Infrastructure assistance: Clean water state revolving fund (SRF).....	886,759	687,555	687,555	-199,204	---
Diesel emissions reduction grants.....	---	49,500	26,000	+26,000	-23,500
Infrastructure assistance: Drinking water state revolving fund (SRF).....	837,495	841,500	841,500	+4,005	---
Infrastructure assistance: Mexico border.....	49,264	24,750	24,750	-24,514	---
Infrastructure assistance: Puerto Rico.....	---	990	990	+990	---
Subtotal, Infrastructure assistance.....	1,808,003	1,619,145	1,595,645	-212,358	-23,500
STAG infrastructure grants / Congressional priorities.	197,058	---	200,000	+2,942	+200,000
Subtotal, State and Tribal Assistance Grants (excluding categorical grants).....	2,100,634	1,708,264	1,884,764	-215,870	+176,500
-----					

(dollars in thousands)					
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Enacted	Recommended versus Request
<b>Categorical grants</b>					
Categorical grant: Beaches protection.....	9,853	9,900	9,900	+47	---
Categorical grant: Brownfields.....	49,264	49,495	49,495	+231	---
Categorical grant: Environmental information.....	19,706	14,850	14,850	-4,856	---
Categorical grant: Hazardous waste financial assistance.....	101,944	103,345	103,345	+1,401	---
Categorical grant: Homeland security.....	4,926	4,950	4,950	+24	---
Categorical grant: Lead.....	13,499	13,563	13,563	+64	---
Categorical grant: Nonpoint source (Sec. 319).....	204,278	194,040	204,340	+62	+10,300
Categorical grant: Pesticides enforcement.....	18,622	18,711	18,711	+89	---
Categorical grant: Pesticides program implementation.....	12,907	12,969	12,969	+62	---
<b>Categorical grant: Pollution control (Sec. 106)</b>					
Water quality monitoring.....	18,228	18,500	18,500	+272	---
Pollution control (Sec. 106) (other activities)...	197,944	203,161	203,161	+5,217	---
<b>Subtotal, Categorical grant: Pollution control (Sec. 106).....</b>	<b>216,172</b>	<b>221,661</b>	<b>221,661</b>	<b>+5,489</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>Categorical grant: Pollution prevention.....</b>					
Categorical grant: Public water system supervision (PWSS).....	4,926	5,940	5,940	+1,014	---
Categorical grant: Radon.....	98,279	99,099	99,099	+820	---
Categorical grant: Sector program.....	7,439	8,074	8,074	+635	---
Categorical grant: State and local air quality management.....	2,217	2,227	2,227	+10	---
Categorical grant: Targeted watersheds.....	220,261	185,180	220,280	+19	+35,100
Categorical grant: Toxics substances compliance.....	16,608	6,930	15,930	-678	+9,000
Categorical grant: Tribal air quality management...	5,074	5,098	5,098	+24	---
	10,887	10,940	10,940	+53	---

(dollars in thousands)				
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted Request
Categorical grant: Tribal general assistance program.....	56,654	56,925	56,925	+271
Categorical grant: Underground injection control (UIC).....	10,838	10,890	10,890	+52
Categorical grant: Underground storage tanks.....	11,774	37,567	17,567	+5,793
Categorical grant: Wastewater operator training.....	1,182	---	---	-1,182
Categorical grant: Water quality cooperative				
Categorical grant: Wetlands program development.....	15,765	16,830	15,830	+65
Subtotal, Categorical grants.....	1,113,075	1,089,184	1,122,584	+9,509
Subtotal, State and Tribal Assistance Grants.....	3,213,709	2,797,448	3,007,348	-206,361
Rescission of expired contracts, grants, and interagency agreements (various EPA accounts).....	-80,000	---	---	+80,000
Total, State and Tribal Assistance Grants.....	3,133,709	2,797,448	3,007,348	-126,361
				+209,900

The Committee recommends \$3,007,348,000 for State and tribal assistance grants, a decrease of \$206,361,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level and \$209,900,000 above the budget request. These numbers do not reflect the one-time rescission of \$80 million in fiscal year 2006 from expired contracts, grants and interagency agreements. While the rescission was included under the STAG heading, it applied to all EPA appropriation accounts and did not affect base program funding in any account for fiscal year 2006. Changes to the budget request are detailed below.

*Infrastructure Assistance: Clean Water State Revolving Fund.*—The Committee recommends a decrease of \$23,500,000 for diesel emissions reduction grants.

*State and Tribal Infrastructure Grants/Congressional Priorities.*—The Committee recommends an increase of \$200,000,000 for targeted STAG infrastructure grants including the following:

	State	Grantee name	Grantee city/county—description	Amount
1.	AL	City of Glencoe	Glencoe—Storm drainage & sewer system improvements.	\$330,000
2.	AL	City of Jasper	Jasper Corridor X—Interchange sewer project.	1,400,000
3.	AL	City of Scottsboro	Scottsboro—Water infrastructure improvements.	242,000
4.	AR	Northwest Arkansas Conservation Authority.	Rogers—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	750,000
5.	AR	Southside Public Water Authority	Batesville—Wastewater infrastructure planning.	50,000
6.	AR	Town of Etowah	Etowah—Wastewater infrastructure improvements.	41,000
7.	AZ	City of Mesa	Mesa—Arsenic mitigation water infrastructure improvements.	500,000
8.	AZ	City of Safford	Safford—Wastewater infrastructure improvements.	1,000,000
9.	CA	Bighorn-Desert View Water Agency	Landers—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements (water resources plan).	500,000
10.	CA	City of Arcadia	Arcadia & Sierra Madre—Water infrastructure improvements.	1,000,000
11.	CA	City of Banning	Banning—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements (Brinton Reservoir).	500,000
12.	CA	City of Beaumont	Beaumont—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements (recycled water reservoir).	500,000
13.	CA	City of Bellflower	Bellflower—Water infrastructure improvements.	300,000
14.	CA	City of Calimesa	Calimesa—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements (storm drain project).	600,000
15.	CA	City of Colfax	Colfax—Wastewater infrastructure improvements.	500,000
16.	CA	City of Downey	Downey—Groundwater well supply	300,000
17.	CA	City of Lodi	Lodi—Water infrastructure improvements.	1,000,000
18.	CA	City of Placerville	Placerville—Wastewater treatment plant upgrade (Hangtown Creek).	1,500,000
19.	CA	Hi-Desert Water District	Yucca Valley—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	350,000
20.	CA	Mission Springs Water District	Desert Hot Springs—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	1,000,000
21.	CA	Monterey County Water Resources Agency.	Monterey—Water management	750,000

	State	Grantee name	Grantee city/county—description	Amount
22.	CA .....	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission.	City & County of San Francisco—Flood control project.	700,000
23.	CO .....	Southeastern Colorado Water Conservancy District.	Pueblo/Otero/Bent/Prowers/Crowley Counties—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	675,000
24.	CO .....	Town of Eckley .....	Eckley—Water treat plant	150,000
25.	CT .....	City of New Haven .....	New Haven—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	303,000
26.	CT .....	City of Norwalk .....	Norwalk—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	1,000,000
27.	CT .....	CT Regional Drinking Water Pipeline.	New Britain/Plainville/Bristol—Water infrastructure improvements.	1,000,000
28.	CT .....	Town of Enfield .....	Enfield—Wastewater infrastructure improvements.	550,000
29.	FL .....	City of Largo .....	Largo—Wastewater infrastructure improvements.	2,000,000
30.	FL .....	City of West Palm Beach .....	West Palm Beach—Drinking water algae control.	1,000,000
31.	FL .....	Gadsden County .....	Quincy—Wastewater infrastructure design.	490,000
32.	FL .....	Marion County .....	Ocala/Marion County—Silver Springs pollution abatement program.	700,000
33.	FL .....	Southwest Florida Water Management District.	Polk County—Lake Peace River & Myakka River watershed & drinking water improvements.	1,000,000
34.	FL .....	St. Johns River Water Management District.	Brevard/Orange/Osceola Counties—Expansion of Taylor Creek Reservoir.	1,000,000
35.	FL .....	Town Of Callahan .....	Callahan—Wastewater treatment plant.	1,000,000
36.	FL .....	Village of Wellington .....	Village of Wellington—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	700,000
37.	GA .....	Banks County .....	Homer/Banks County—Wastewater treatment plant.	1,000,000
38.	GA .....	City of Albany .....	Albany—Interceptor pipeline upgrade (sewer).	1,000,000
39.	GA .....	City of Valdosta .....	Valdosta—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	500,000
40.	GA .....	Metropolitan Georgia Water Planning District.	North Georgia—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	1,000,000
41.	IA .....	Riverpoint West Project .....	Des Moines—Water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.	700,000
42.	ID .....	City of Castleford .....	Castleford—Water system upgrade	300,000
43.	ID .....	City of Twin Falls .....	Twin Falls—Wastewater treatment	1,000,000
44.	IL .....	City of Aurora .....	Aurora—Wastewater infrastructure improvements.	300,000
45.	IL .....	City of Virginia .....	Virginia—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	1,000,000
46.	IL .....	Kane County .....	Kane County—Water supply management plan.	275,000
47.	IL .....	Northeastern Illinois Sewer Consortium.	Lake Forest/Lake Bluff/Highland Park/Highwood—Sewer improvements.	500,000
48.	IL .....	Village of Lynwood .....	Lynwood—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	281,000
49.	IL .....	Village of Orion .....	Orion—Removal & replacement of groundwater storage tank.	123,000
50.	IL .....	Village of Richton Park .....	Richton Park—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	190,000
51.	IL .....	Village of Ridgewood .....	Ridgewood—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	700,000

	State	Grantee name	Grantee city/county—description	Amount
52.	IL	Village of Steward	Steward—Wastewater infrastructure improvements.	300,000
53.	IL	Village of Sublette	Sublette—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	340,000
54.	IN	City of Charlestown	Charlestown—Wastewater infrastructure improvements.	400,000
55.	IN	City of South Bend	South Bend—Sewer overflow sensory control network.	1,000,000
56.	IN	Dearborn County Regional Sewer District	Dearborn County—Wastewater infrastructure improvements.	600,000
57.	IN	Town of Merrillville	Merrillville—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	500,000
58.	IN	Wadesville/Blairsville Regional Sewer District	Wadesville—Wastewater infrastructure improvements.	1,000,000
59.	KS	Chautauqua County Rural Water District No 4.	Sedan—Water infrastructure improvements.	1,000,000
60.	KS	City of Fairway	Fairway and Mission—Water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.	500,000
61.	KY	City of Harlan	City of Harlan—Sewer line expansion.	1,500,000
62.	KY	City of Warsaw	Warsaw—Water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.	400,000
63.	KY	Louisville Metropolitan Sewer District	Louisville—Combined sewer & sanitary sewer overflow mitigation.	1,000,000
64.	KY	Oldham County Sewer District	Goshen—Wastewater infrastructure improvements.	700,000
65.	LA	City of Monroe	Monroe—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	1,000,000
66.	LA	West Jefferson Medical Center	Metairie—Water infrastructure improvements.	385,000
67.	MA	City of Boston	Boston—Water infrastructure improvements (groundwater depletion).	750,000
68.	MA	City of Northampton	Northampton—Drinking water filtration plant.	500,000
69.	MA	Pioneer Valley Planning Commission	West Springfield—Combined sewer overflow cleanup.	1,500,000
70.	MD	City of College Park	College Park—Watershed stormwater management plan.	100,000
71.	MI	City of Detroit, Water and Sewerage Department	Detroit—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	1,000,000
72.	MI	Oakland County Drain Commission	Waterford—Evergreen/Farmington sanitary sewer overflow control.	1,000,000
73.	MI	Wayne County	Wayne County—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	1,000,000
74.	MN	City of Minneapolis	Minneapolis—Wastewater infrastructure improvements.	1,000,000
75.	MO	City of Joplin	Joplin—Wastewater infrastructure improvements.	1,100,000
76.	MS	Tate County School District	Independence—Water infrastructure improvements.	825,000
77.	MT	City of Conrad	Conrad—Wastewater infrastructure improvements.	750,000
78.	NC	Brunswick County	Bolivia—Waccamaw waterline extension.	375,000
79.	NC	Caldwell County	Lenoir & Morgantown—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	750,000
80.	NC	City of Charlotte	Charlotte—Sardis Road booster station expansion.	750,000
81.	NC	City of Durham	Durham—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	250,000
82.	NC	City of Marion	Marion—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	1,000,000

	State	Grantee name	Grantee city/county—description	Amount
83.	NC	Montgomery County Pump Station Improvement Project.	Montgomery County—Water infrastructure improvements.	500,000
84.	NC	Stanly County Water Improvement Project.	Stanly County—Water infrastructure improvements.	500,000
85.	NC	Town of Ahoskie	Ahoskie—Wastewater infrastructure improvements.	750,000
86.	NC	Town of Cary	Cary—Regional water reclamation facility planning/design/permitting.	750,000
87.	NC	Town of Elkin	Elkin/Jonesville/Rhonda—Wastewater infrastructure improvements.	750,000
88.	NC	Town of Laurel Park	Laurel Park—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	1,760,000
89.	NC	Tuckaseegee Water and Sewer Authority.	Sylva—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	574,000
90.	NE	City of South Sioux City	South Sioux City—Sanitary sewer crossing between Nebraska & Iowa.	1,000,000
91.	NH	City of Somersworth	Somersworth—Wastewater infrastructure improvements.	700,000
92.	NJ	Borough of Dumont	Borough of Dumont—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	1,000,000
93.	NJ	Borough of Hopatcong	Borough of Hopatcong—Wastewater infrastructure improvements.	1,000,000
94.	NM	Albuquerque Bernalillo Water Utility Authority.	Albuquerque—Water infrastructure improvements.	1,000,000
95.	NV	Moapa Valley Water District	Overton—Arsenic treatment facility	1,000,000
96.	NY	City of Goshen	Goshen—Water infrastructure improvements.	300,000
97.	NY	City of Rye	Rye—Sewer pump station repairs	200,000
98.	NY	Monroe County Water Authority	Rochester—Reservoir cover	1,000,000
99.	NY	NY Botanical Garden	Bronx—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements (Twin Lakes).	500,000
100.	NY	Saratoga County	Ballston Spa—Water infrastructure improvements.	1,000,000
101.	NY	Town of Bethel	Bethel—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	1,000,000
102.	NY	Town of Greenburgh, NY	Town of Greenburgh—Stormwater infrastructure improvements.	300,000
103.	NY	Town of Lancaster	Lancaster—Water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.	1,000,000
104.	NY	Town of New Windsor, NY	New Windsor—Wastewater infrastructure improvements.	700,000
105.	OH	Butler County Board of Commissioners.	Butler County—Wastewater infrastructure improvements.	1,000,000
106.	OH	City of Jeromesville	Jeromesville—Wastewater infrastructure improvements.	1,000,000
107.	OH	City of Perrysburg	City of Perrysburg—Wastewater infrastructure improvements.	300,000
108.	OH	Fayette County	Fayette County—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	1,575,000
109.	OH	Ottawa County	Ottawa County—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	1,000,000
110.	OK	City of Wewoka	City of Wewoka—Water tower	165,000
111.	PA	Bucks County Water and Sewer Authority.	Warrington Township—Wastewater infrastructure improvements.	1,000,000
112.	PA	Cecil Township Municipal Authority	Cecil Township—Wastewater infrastructure improvements.	750,000
113.	PA	City of Beaver Falls	Beaver Falls—Wastewater infrastructure & streambank stabilization.	258,000

	State	Grantee name	Grantee city/county—description	Amount
114.	PA	Clinton County Municipal Authority	Lock Haven—Sewer pump station	500,000
115.	PA	Delaware County Regional Water Quality Control Authority.	Chester—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	200,000
116.	PA	Duboistown Borough Municipal Authority.	Duboistown—Sewage pump station replacement.	300,000
117.	PA	Fairmont Park Commission	Philadelphia—Watershed water quality improvements.	165,000
118.	PA	Jefferson Township Sewer Authority	Jefferson Township—Expand sewer system.	2,000,000
119.	PA	New Brighton Borough Sanitary Authority.	New Brighton—Water and wastewater, infrastructure improvements.	500,000
120.	PA	Somerset County	Somerset—Interconnection water project.	2,000,000
121.	RI	Town of Cumberland	Cumberland—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	125,000
122.	SC	Gaffney Board of Public Works	Gaffney—Wastewater treatment plant renovation and expansion.	500,000
123.	SC	Town of Denmark	Denmark—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	715,000
124.	SC	Town of Olanta	Olanta—Water infrastructure improvements.	110,000
125.	TN	East TN Development District	Harrogate \$137,000; Anderson County \$275,000; Claiborne County \$838,000—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	1,250,000
126.	TN	SE TN Development District	Cleveland \$500,000; Copperhill \$250,000—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	750,000
127.	TN	West Knox Utility District	Knox County—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	700,000
128.	TX	Fort Bend County	Arcola/Fresno area—Water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.	500,000
129.	TX	City of Grandview	Grandview—Water infrastructure improvements.	500,000
130.	TX	City of Jarrell	Jarrell—Wastewater treatment facility.	350,000
131.	UT	City of Salt Lake	Salt Lake City—Water infrastructure improvements.	700,000
132.	VA	City of Alexandria and Arlington County.	Alexandria/Arlington County—Four Mile Run restoration.	500,000
133.	VA	Fairfax County—Stormwater Planning Division.	Fairfax County—Stormwater management.	1,000,000
134.	VA	Hanover County	Hanover County—Wastewater infrastructure improvements.	1,000,000
135.	VA	Henry County Public Service Authority.	Henry County—Water infrastructure improvements.	1,000,000
136.	VA	Town of Onancock	Onancock—Wastewater infrastructure improvements.	1,000,000
137.	WA	Cascade Water Alliance	Bellevue—Central pipeline segment/water infrastructure improvements.	500,000
138.	WA	City of Carnation	Carnation—Wastewater infrastructure improvements.	500,000
139.	WA	Mason County	Mason County/Skokomish Indian Tribe—Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements.	1,000,000
140.	WI	City of Spooner	Spooner—Wastewater infrastructure improvements.	1,238,000
141.	WI	Lake Holcombe Sanitary District	Holcombe—Wastewater infrastructure improvements.	1,265,000
142.	WV	City of Milton	Milton—Drinking water renovation & extension.	1,000,000
143.	WV	City of Pennsboro	Pennsboro—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	550,000

	State	Grantee name	Grantee city/county—description	Amount
144.	WV .....	City of Weston .....	Weston—Water & wastewater infrastructure improvements.	250,000
145.	WV .....	City of Westover .....	Westover—Sanitary sewer service extension.	825,000
146.	WV .....	Sugar Creek Public Service District	Frametown—Water infrastructure improvements.	500,000

*Categorical Grants.*—The Committee recommends a net increase of \$33,400,000 for categorical grants, including increases of \$10,300,000 for nonpoint source (Sec. 319), \$35,100,000 for State and local air quality management, and \$9,000,000 for targeted watersheds, and decreases of \$20,000,000 for implementing underground storage tank requirements in the Energy Policy Act of 2005, and \$1,000,000 for wetlands program development.

*Bill Language.*—Bill language is recommended requiring that STAG special project funding from fiscal year 2001 or earlier must have an approved grant by September 1, 2007 or those funds will be rescinded. Language, proposed in the budget request, is not included limiting Clean Diesel grants to non-attainment areas. Language is included specifying that funds under the Clean Diesel program are for Federal grants. Given the limited funds available for this program, the Committee believes it should be centrally managed by EPA. Language is also included making a technical correction to the fiscal year 2005 appropriation for STAG special project funding.

The Committee agrees to the following:

1. The Committee supports the Diesel Emissions Reduction Grant Program and has provided \$26,000,000 for that program. This and other important efforts, authorized by the Energy Policy Act of 2005, cannot be funded at the levels requested when there are insufficient funds requested for other critical mission essential programs that entail EPA research and program implementation by the States and EPA. The funds recommended by the Committee are a substantial increase over funds provided for diesel emission reduction efforts in 2006 and should enable EPA to expand its truck and school bus retrofit programs and to expand its idle reduction programs, including advanced truck stop electrification.

2. The EPA should report to the Committee at least once a year and within 30 days of the close of each fiscal year with a list of the technical corrections it has made to STAG special project infrastructure grants during that fiscal year.

3. Funds for the Targeted Watersheds program include \$6,000,000 for the Chesapeake Bay program and should focus on watershed remediation. Projects should be chosen based upon their contribution to pounds of nitrogen, phosphorous, and sediment removed.

4. The Committee is pleased that EPA is working with the Environmental Council of the States to assess the actual costs incurred by States to implement environmental regulations and then compare those costs with EPA estimates. The EPA should provide periodic briefings to the Committee on this effort.

5. The EPA should streamline its process for responding to requests from States for greater flexibility in managing their environmental programs. These requests deserve careful consideration and

should neither be met with an automatic denial nor delayed by multiple bureaucratic reviews.

6. The Committee has not provided categorical grant funding for the underground storage tank program authorized in the Energy Policy Act of 2005. This important National issue is a high priority for the legislative committee of jurisdiction and for the Congress as a whole. The Committee suggests that EPA use the funds that will be freed up in 2008 from the financial information system replacement effort to fund this activity in the 2008 budget request.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Bill language is recommended limiting reimbursements for consultants. This language is identical to a provision carried in fiscal year 2005 and earlier.

#### TITLE III—RELATED AGENCIES

##### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

##### FOREST SERVICE

The U.S. Forest Service manages 192 million acres of public lands for multiple use Nationwide, including lands in 44 States and Puerto Rico, and cooperates with States, other Federal agencies, Tribes and others to sustain the Nation's forests and grasslands. The Forest Service administers a wide variety of programs, including forest and rangeland research, State and private forestry assistance, wildfire suppression and fuels reduction, cooperative forest health programs, and human resource programs. The National Forest System (NFS) includes 155 National forests, 20 National grasslands, 20 National recreation areas, a National tallgrass prairie, 6 National monuments, and 6 land utilization projects. The NFS is managed for multiple use, including timber production, recreation, wilderness, minerals, grazing, fish and wildlife habitat management, and soil and water conservation.

The Committee is aware of the Administration's proposal to sell up to 300,000 acres of national forest system lands to generate revenues to fund the needs of rural schools in the vicinity of national forests. While the Committee believes that the Congress must find a fair approach to assist rural schools, this proposal is entirely unacceptable. The Committee feels that any disposal of land should occur only if there has been local prioritization and public input, as well as careful, site by site analysis. Only lands which lack Federal importance and which are disjunct from Federal lands, and are difficult to manage, should be considered for sale or trade. Furthermore, while the Committee applauds efforts to draw attention to the economic needs of rural communities near national forest areas, the Administration's proposal is inequitable in its basic funding allocation. Communities in the Southeast and Midwest would be net donors of acres of forest lands disposed, but would receive far less of the resulting revenues than would communities in the Pacific Northwest. The Committee looks forward to working with the Administration to reauthorize the rural schools program, but cannot support this unacceptable mechanism to do so.

## FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

Forest and rangeland research and development sponsors basic and applied scientific research. This research provides both credible and relevant knowledge about forests and rangelands and new technologies that can be used to sustain the health, productivity, and diversity of private and public lands to meet the needs of present and future generations. Research is conducted across the U.S. through six research stations, the Forest Products Laboratory, and the International Institute of Tropical Forestry in Puerto Rico as well as cooperative research efforts with many of the Nation's universities. The Committee stresses that this research and development should support all of the Nation's forests and rangelands; it should be closely coordinated with other Federal science bureaus and extramural partners, and that technology transfer and practical applications are vital.

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$277,711,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	267,791,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	280,318,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+2,607,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	+12,527,000

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:



The Committee recommends \$280,318,000 for forest and rangeland research, an increase of \$12,527,000 above the budget request and \$2,607,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The Forest Service should treat the funding for the forest inventory and analysis (FIA) program as a budget line item; it is displayed as a distinct activity. Funding for FIA under this heading is \$62,329,000, \$3,000,000 above the requested level and \$2,949,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The Committee notes that an additional \$5,000,000 for the FIA program is provided within the State and private forestry appropriation under the forest resource information and analysis budget line item. There is thus a total increase for the two FIA program components of \$5,839,000 above the request, a \$3,012,000 increase above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

The Committee recommendation includes all project funding as stipulated in the budget request and supporting documents, with the following exceptions. No funding is provided for: the new ecosystem services initiative; Morgantown, WV pests and pathogen research; and the Northeastern States research cooperative. Program reductions are recommended for the new marketing and utilization research initiative (a reduction of \$965,000 for a total recommendation of \$2,500,000) and for the advanced wood structure consortium (a reduction of \$478,000 for a program total of \$1,000,000). Program increases are recommended for: the gypsy moth slow-the-spread research (increase of \$1,407,000 above the request); sudden oak death research (increase of \$72,000 above the request for a program total of \$2,500,000); the southern pine beetle initiative (increase of \$2,500,000 above the request); the Olympic Natural Resource Center, WA (\$292,000 above the request); and the National agroforestry research center (\$140,000 above the request for a program total of \$786,000). Previous Congressional priorities in North Carolina should be maintained at the fiscal year 2006 funding levels. Uncontrollable cost increases not funded in the request receive \$6,309,000 and \$3,487,000 is provided to reestablish the fiscal year 2006 base program funding level.

*Bill Language.*—The Committee recommends continuing bill language designating a specific allocation, \$62,329,000, for the forest inventory and analysis program.

#### STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY

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

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$308,966,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	244,410,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	228,608,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	- 80,358,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	- 15,802,000

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

	(dollars in thousands)			
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted Request
State and Private Forestry				
Forest Health Management				
Federal lands forest health management.....	53,163	49,849	54,236	+1,073
Cooperative lands forest health management.....	46,904	34,581	47,629	+725
Subtotal, Forest Health Management.....	100,067	84,430	101,865	+1,798
Cooperative Fire Protection				
State fire assistance.....	32,895	26,960	33,000	+105
Volunteer fire assistance.....	5,912	5,858	6,000	+88
Subtotal, Cooperative Fire Protection.....	38,807	32,818	39,000	+193
Cooperative Forestry				
Forest stewardship.....	34,144	33,880	37,000	+2,856
Forest Legacy.....	56,524	61,515	12,680	-43,844
Use of prior year balances.....	---	---	-3,400	-3,400
Urban and Community Forestry.....	28,413	26,846	29,513	+1,100
Economic action programs.....	9,537	---	---	-9,537
Forest resource information and analysis.....	4,588	---	5,000	+412
Subtotal, Cooperative Forestry.....	133,206	122,241	80,793	-52,413
International program.....				
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148).....	6,886	4,921	6,950	+64
	30,000	---	---	-30,000
Total, State and Private Forestry.....	308,966	244,410	228,608	-80,358

The Committee recommends \$228,608,000 for State and private forestry, \$15,802,000 below the budget request and \$50,358,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level not counting emergency supplemental appropriations. Aspects of the budget request are approved, unless otherwise stated below. Funding levels are presented as changes from the request.

*Forest Health Management.*—The Committee recommends \$101,865,000 for forest health management, \$17,435,000 above the request and \$1,798,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. Once again the Committee emphasizes its concern for forest health and its concern that the Administration again has greatly reduced its request for these important programs. The funding recommended is equal to the enacted funding level in fiscal year 2005. The Committee is also concerned about invasive exotic pests, which have proven to have huge impacts on American forests and trees. Forest health funding provides important control programs such as: (1) the slow-the-spread gypsy moth program; (2) the Asian longhorned beetle, the emerald ash borer, Dutch elm disease and other pests in urban settings; (3) adelgids in the east; and (4) various mountain pine beetles throughout the Rockies and the west. The Committee recommendation includes \$16,000,000 for southern pine beetle forest health activities, including forest rehabilitation, disease prevention, and education. This consists of \$5,000,000 within the Federal lands activity and \$11,000,000 within the cooperative lands activity to assist State and private forest managers.

*Federal Lands Forest Health Management.*—The Committee recommends \$54,236,000 for Federal lands forest health management, \$4,387,000 above the request and \$1,073,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

*Cooperative Lands Forest Health Management.*—The Committee recommends \$47,629,000 for cooperative lands forest health management, \$13,048,000 above the budget request and \$725,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The Committee notes that the budget request maintains funding for the American Chestnut Foundation; this is a very worthwhile partnership.

The Committee strongly encourages the Administration to use the Secretary's authority under Public Law 97-46 to fund the survey, evaluation, control and management of unplanned, emerging pest occurrences from funds available to the agencies or corporations of the Department of Agriculture. This approach has been used in the past for the Forest Service and has been used in previous years for emergency pest projects by the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

*Cooperative Fire Protection.*—The Committee recommends \$39,000,000 for cooperative fire protection, \$6,182,000 above the request and \$193,000 above the fiscal year 2006 funding level. The Committee notes that the cooperative fire portion of the national fire plan within the wildland fire management account includes a total of \$43,000,000 for State fire assistance and \$12,810,000 for volunteer fire assistance.

*State Fire Assistance.*—The Committee recommends \$33,000,000 for State fire assistance, \$6,040,000 above the budget request and \$105,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

*Volunteer Fire Assistance.*—The Committee recommends \$6,000,000 for volunteer fire assistance, \$142,000 above the request and \$88,000 above the enacted level.

*Cooperative Forestry.*—The Committee recommends \$80,793,000 for cooperative forestry, \$41,448,000 below the budget request and \$52,413,000 below the 2006 enacted level.

*Forest Stewardship.*—The Committee recommends \$37,000,000 for forest stewardship, \$3,120,000 above the budget request and \$2,856,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. Increases to the budget request include: \$300,000 for watershed activities in the New York City watershed (program total of \$800,000); \$320,000 for the Chesapeake Bay program (program total of \$1,270,000); \$2,000,000 for the conservation education activities of the Education Research Consortium of Western North Carolina and its partners in Pennsylvania and California; and \$500,000 for North Carolina State University’s small industry and wood products natural resources initiative.

*Forest Legacy Program.*—The Committee recommends \$9,280,000 for forest legacy, \$52,235,000 below the request and a decrease of \$47,244,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The recommendation provides \$12,680,000 for projects and administration, and uses \$3,400,000 in prior year funds to offset the total.

The Committee has been concerned about the internal Forest Service administrative policy to extend, in some cases up to five years, the availability of funding for individual forest legacy projects. This is a highly competitive and sought after program during a very challenging fiscal time. If a project encounters difficulty that prevents the timely expenditure of funds, the Committee should be notified and, if appropriate, the Service should forward a reprogramming request for those funds to be used for the next most highly ranked project.

The Committee has worked with the Forest Service and the States to develop a credible, competitive process. The Committee relies on the recommendations of the State Committees. Therefore, projects that are not contained in the President’s budget will not be considered. In addition, there will be no assumption of further phases of a particular project, if that project is not selected through the competitive process.

The Committee recommends the following distribution of funds:

<i>Project</i>	<i>Amount</i>
Birdsboro Waters, PA .....	\$300,000
Willard Pond, NH .....	3,000,000
Southern Monadnock Plateau, MA .....	2,500,000
Tahuya Headwaters Pope, WA .....	1,880,000
Subtotal .....	7,680,000
Program Administration .....	5,000,000
Use of prior year funds .....	–3,400,000
Total .....	\$9,280,000

*Urban and Community Forestry.* —The Committee recommends \$29,513,000 for urban and community forestry, \$2,667,000 above the budget request and \$1,100,000 above the fiscal year 2006 level. The increase above the request includes \$700,000 for continued support of the longstanding and successful northeastern Pennsylvania community forestry program and \$500,000 for the Tacoma, WA regional urban forestry restoration program, and a \$1,467,000

general increase to restore the base program nearly to the fiscal year 2006 level.

*Economic Action Programs.*—As recommended by the Administration, the Committee has eliminated funds for the economic action programs, a reduction of \$9,537,000 below the fiscal year 2006 level. The Committee notes that the many cooperative forestry and fire programs, as well as national forest system programs and wild-fire management programs, are available to assist local communities. The Committee also notes the cooperative biomass grant program funding of \$5,000,000 within the hazardous fuels program.

*Forest Resource Information and Analysis.*—The Committee recommends \$5,000,000 for forest resource information and analysis, \$5,000,000 above the budget request and \$412,000 above the 2006 enacted level. These funds should focus on those States which provide cost-share or in-kind services to FIA, and should be used in partnership with the State foresters and others to enhance the forest inventory and analysis program.

*International Program.*—The Committee recommends \$6,950,000 for the international program, \$2,029,000 above the request and \$64,000 above the fiscal year 2006 level. The Committee is encouraged by the successful partnerships in the international program and the growing importance of Forest Service expertise, including international support to counter invasive pests harming America's forests and efforts to conserve and protect migratory species.

*Bill Language.*—The Committee recommends continuing bill language deriving forest legacy funds from the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) and language requiring notification of the Appropriations Committees before allocating forest legacy project funds.

#### NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

Within the National Forest System (NFS), which covers 192 million acres, there are 51 Congressionally designated areas, including 20 National recreation areas, and 7 National scenic areas. The NFS includes a substantial amount of the Nation's softwood inventory. In fiscal year 2005 over 249,000 acres of national forest vegetation was managed through timber sale activities, which produced nearly 2.1 billion board feet of timber volume. The NFS hosted over 204 million visits in fiscal year 2004. The NFS includes over 133,000 miles of trails and 25,000 developed facilities, including 4,389 campgrounds, 58 major visitor centers, and about one-half of the Nation's ski-lift capacity. Wilderness areas cover 35 million acres, nearly two-thirds of the wilderness in the contiguous 48 States. The Forest Service also has major habitat management responsibilities for more than 3,000 species of wildlife and fish, and 10,000 plant species and provides important habitat and open space for over 422 threatened or endangered species. Half of the Nation's big game habitat and coldwater fish habitat, including salmon and steelhead, is located on NFS lands and waters. In addition, in the 16 western States, where the water supply is sometimes critically short, about 55 percent of the total annual yield of water is from National forest system lands.

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$1,435,646,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	1,398,066,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	1,445,659,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+10,013,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	+47,593,000

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

(dollars in thousands)					
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended Enacted	Recommended versus Request
National Forest System					
Land management planning.....	57,675	55,555	55,555	-2,120	---
Inventory and monitoring.....	166,638	154,135	166,000	-638	+11,865
Recreation, heritage and wilderness.....	258,797	250,880	262,000	+3,203	+11,120
Wildlife and fish habitat management.....	131,734	123,548	131,000	-734	+7,452
Grazing management.....	47,826	39,735	48,000	+174	+8,265
Forest products.....	277,583	310,114	310,114	+32,531	---
Vegetation and watershed management.....	179,852	187,582	180,000	+148	-7,582
Minerals and geology management.....	84,164	81,242	84,000	-164	+2,758
Landownership management.....	90,932	84,285	91,000	+68	+6,715
Law enforcement operations.....	110,937	110,000	112,000	+1,063	+2,000
Valles Caldera National Preserve.....	5,074	990	990	-4,084	---
Challenge cost share.....	4,434	---	5,000	+566	+5,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148).....	20,000	---	---	-20,000	---
<b>Total, National Forest System.....</b>	<b>1,435,646</b>	<b>1,398,066</b>	<b>1,445,659</b>	<b>+10,013</b>	<b>+47,593</b>

The Committee recommends \$1,445,659,000 for the National forest system, an increase of \$47,593,000 above the request and \$10,013,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. All funds requested for the healthy forests initiative are included. Aspects of the budget request are approved, unless otherwise stated below. Funding levels are presented as changes from the request.

*Land Management Planning.*—The Committee recommends \$55,555,000 for land management planning as requested, a decrease of \$2,120,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

*Inventory and Monitoring.*—The Committee recommends \$166,000,000 for inventory and monitoring, \$11,865,000 above the budget request and \$638,000 below the fiscal year 2006 level. The increase above the request is to restore partially the base program.

*Recreation, Heritage and Wilderness.*—The Committee recommends \$262,000,000 for recreation, heritage and wilderness, \$11,120,000 above the budget request and \$3,203,000 above the fiscal year 2006 level. The increase above the request is to restore partially the base program.

*Wildlife and Fish Habitat Management.*—The Committee recommends \$131,000,000 for wildlife and fish habitat management, an increase of \$7,452,000 above the budget request and \$734,000 below the fiscal year 2006 level. The increase above the request is to restore partially existing programs.

*Grazing Management.*—The Committee recommends \$48,000,000 for grazing management, \$8,265,000 above the budget request and \$174,000 above the fiscal year 2006 funding level. The increase above the request is to maintain existing programs.

*Forest Products.*—The Committee recommends \$310,114,000 for forest products as requested, an increase of \$32,531,000 above the fiscal year 2006 funding level. Within this funding is a \$500,000 increase for the base program for the National Forests in North Carolina. The Committee directs the service not to follow the Administration's proposal that focuses the large funding increase above last year's enacted level to a portion of the Pacific Northwest. The Forest Service should not follow the allocations in special exhibit 16 in the budget justification; rather, the Forest Service should use the final fiscal year 2005 forest products program funding allocations as the base from which to make the fiscal year 2007 allocations. The Forest Service should not use the Knutson-Vandenberg fund to supplant normal program funding.

The Committee is very concerned about the manner in which the forest products funding and associated programs were allocated during fiscal year 2006. There needs to be much greater transparency and explanation of how the Service allocates funding to various regions and national forests, and how trade-offs are made and successful programs recognized. Accordingly, before allocating any forest products funding to the field, the Committee directs the Forest Service to provide the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a fourteen day review period during which the allocations and the methodology can be examined.

The Committee also recognizes that one of the many factors to consider when allocating funding for forest products and hazardous fuels programs is the need to maintain forest industry infrastructure. This will enhance the likelihood of lower cost mechanical treatments, while enhancing rural community stability.

*Vegetation and Watershed Management.*—The Committee recommends \$180,000,000 for vegetation and watershed management, a decrease of \$7,582,000 below the request and an increase of \$148,000 above the fiscal year 2006 funding level.

*Minerals and Geology Management.*—The Committee recommends \$84,000,000 for minerals and geology management, an increase of \$2,758,000 above the request and \$164,000 below the 2006 funding level. The increase to the request is to offset partially the requested decrease to the environmental compliance program.

*Land Ownership Management.*—The Committee recommends \$91,000,000 for land ownership management, \$6,715,000 above the budget request and \$68,000 above the 2006 funding level. The increase above the request is to maintain existing programs.

The Committee notes that the Washington State Wilderness Act of 1984 removed from wilderness designation 800 acres of land adjacent to the White Pass Ski Area in Washington State for potential ski development. The Committee notes that the Gifford Pinchot National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan allocated the 800-acre area as Developed Recreation to allow for ski area expansion, while concurrently inventorying the same land as roadless to reflect its current physical character. The Committee recognizes that it was the intent of Congress to permit ski area expansion into this 800-acre area and urges the Secretary of Agriculture, once the Environmental Impact Statement for the White Pass Ski Area's Master Development Plan is properly completed, to move forward expeditiously in approving the expansion plans in accordance with all applicable laws, rules, and regulations.

*Law Enforcement Operations.*—The Committee recommends \$112,000,000 for law enforcement operations, \$2,000,000 above the budget request and \$1,063,000 above the 2006 funding level. The increase above the request includes a total of \$1,000,000 for anti-drug activities on the Daniel Boone National Forest, KY, and \$1,000,000 for similar work on the Mark Twain NF, MO.

*Challenge Cost-Share.*—The Committee notes that the challenge cost share effort featured in fiscal year 2005 has been very successful. Hundreds of individual partner projects have been funded in all regions of the Nation bringing in many millions of dollars in partner contributions which enhance the national forest system and improve public services. Therefore, the Committee recommendation includes \$5,000,000 to continue this program which was not included in the request, an increase of \$566,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. These funds should be used in addition to, and in a complimentary fashion with, other challenge cost share programs included in the budget request for various programs. Preference should be given to funding projects which enhance the conditions of national forest system lands and waters or provide direct recreational services to the public. The Forest Service should continue to display data on these efforts in subsequent budget justifications.

*Other.*—The Committee has provided \$990,000, as requested, for management of the Valles Caldera National Preserve, NM, a reduction of \$4,084,000 from the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The Committee expects that the Preserve management will open more of the area to general public use; the current extensive fencing to

prohibit public access provides a very unfriendly welcome to the public.

The Committee recommendation includes the full funding requested by the Administration for the Quincy Library Group project in California and for the Land Between the Lakes National Recreation Area, KY and TN.

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$1,746,091,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	1,768,195,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	1,810,566,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+64,475,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	+42,371,000

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended Enacted	Recommended versus Request
(dollars in thousands)					
-----					
Wildland Fire Management					
Preparedness.....	660,705	655,887	655,887	-4,818	---
Fire suppression operations.....	690,186	746,176	741,477	+51,291	-4,699
Other operations					
Hazardous fuels.....	280,119	291,792	296,792	+16,673	+5,000
Rehabilitation.....	6,189	1,980	5,000	-1,189	+3,020
Fire plan research and development.....	22,789	20,121	22,800	+11	+2,679
Joint fire sciences program.....	7,882	3,960	8,000	+118	+4,040
Forest health management (federal lands).....	14,779	6,802	14,800	+21	+7,998
Forest health management (co-op lands).....	9,853	4,552	10,000	+147	+5,448
State fire assistance.....	45,816	29,115	43,000	-2,816	+13,885
Volunteer fire assistance.....	7,773	7,810	12,810	+5,037	+5,000
Subtotal, Other operations.....	395,200	366,132	413,202	+18,002	+47,070
-----					
Total, Wildland Fire Management.....	1,746,091	1,768,195	1,810,566	+64,475	+42,371
=====					

The Committee recommends \$1,810,566,000 for wildland fire management, an increase of \$42,371,000 above the budget request and \$64,475,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

The Committee recommendation supports the direction provided by the national fire plan and the healthy forests initiative. All funds requested for the healthy forests initiative are included. In addition, funds are provided for other essential national fire plan related activities which suffered reductions in the request, including forest health management, State fire assistance, the joint fire science program, fire plan research and development, and restoration and rehabilitation. The wildfire suppression operations program is funded at the 10-year average expenditure, adjusted for inflation, \$741,477,000, an increase of \$51,291,000 above the enacted level.

The Committee is concerned that the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior do not have a suitable or comprehensive plan and strategy to deal with the Nation's wildfire management needs. The previous momentum for the national fire plan seems to have waned within the Administration based on the selective recognition of its main features. Accordingly, the Committee directs the wildland fire management council, in partnership with the State wildfire agencies, to develop and implement a comprehensive and cohesive strategy that identifies long-term options and funding needed to respond to wildfire needs. This strategy should incorporate previous documents suggested by the States, and should indicate how the various planning tools, such as fire program analysis and LANDFIRE, fit. The strategy should address all four of the original national fire plan goals, as well as the research and development needs and management needs required to support this effort. As a beginning, the Committee requires a report by the two departments, by January 31, 2007, providing the tactical details on how this fundamental plan, with associated funding needs, will be produced by June 30, 2007.

*Wildfire Preparedness.*—The Committee recommends \$655,887,000 for wildfire preparedness as requested, a decrease of \$4,818,000 below the enacted level.

The Committee is concerned that the allocation of funds between preparedness and suppression operations may not maintain the levels of readiness needed for public safety that were established in fiscal years 2004 and 2005. The Committee believes that decisive action is necessary to manage escalating fire suppression costs. An important component of reducing such costs is maintaining initial attack capability so that more fires can be contained before they escape and cause serious loss of life and property as well as natural resource damage. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Forest Service to analyze current readiness levels to determine whether maintaining preparedness resources in the field at a level not less than that established in fiscal year 2005 will, based on the best information available, result in lower overall firefighting costs. If the Forest Service makes such a determination, the Committee directs the Forest Service to adjust the levels for preparedness and suppression funding accordingly and report on these adjustments to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations. The Secretary of Agriculture should advise the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in writing prior to the decision.

The Committee is very concerned about the cost and utility of the fire program analysis system that is being jointly developed with the Department of the Interior. It is not clear why this system is so expensive and, furthermore, it is not clear that the system being developed will actually be useful for its original purpose of determining the most cost efficient and effective distribution of fire-fighting resources. The overall goals of the system still are important to achieve so the Committee is not prepared at this time to halt development. However, the Committee has included bill language in title IV which limits funding for this effort unless and until the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture certify in writing that the fire program analysis system will be completed in a timely fashion and include the full participation of State partners. The Committee understands that expert, independent technical reviews are currently underway, but it is especially critical that management participate at a high level to ensure the public that overarching goals are attainable in a cost effective manner.

The Committee is concerned that the Department maintains sufficient readiness with its preparedness program. Accordingly, bill language is provided in title IV which limits competitive sourcing activities for wildfire program activities. While contracting is encouraged for activities, at this time it is not warranted to spend limited resources and time to fulfill competitive sourcing quotas.

*Wildfire Suppression Operations.*—The Committee recommends \$741,477,000 for wildfire suppression operations, a decrease of \$4,699,000 below the request and an increase of \$51,291,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted funding level. The Committee recommendation fully meets the 10-year average expenditure which actually occurred, adjusted for inflation. The Committee notes that there is substantial carry-over funding from the fiscal year 2005 urgent wildfire suppression allocation which is still available for wildfire suppression.

The Committee remains concerned about the high costs of large fire incidents. The Department of the Interior, along with the Forest Service, should ensure that cost containment is an important priority when suppressing wildland fires. Therefore, the Committee directs the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service to continue reports directed previously and to examine, using independent panels, any individual wildfire incident which results in expenses greater than \$10,000,000.

The Committee directs the Forest Service not to follow direction in the appendix to the budget of the U.S. government under the fire operations heading concerning early allocation of fire suppression funds to regions, and the direction to allow regions to retain unspent funds and use them for other, non-suppression related purposes. The Committee insists that a national, interdepartmental approach, with full cooperation of States and other partners, is needed to improve the fire program. The cooperative spirit would be disrupted by requiring regions to compete against each other as instructed in the budget appendix. Furthermore, moving funds out of the fire suppression activity during low-cost years would disrupt the rationale of allocating the ten-year average cost, because the savings afforded during low-cost years would not be available for the subsequent, high cost years which are bound to occur.

The Committee has included bill language which requires the Forest Service to treat wildfire suppression like other non-emergency appropriations with regard to indirect cost pools which support agency overhead. All programs in the agency should pay the full cost of operations including overhead. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Forest Service to charge appropriate overhead expenses to wildfire suppression in a manner commensurate with the method for assessing other activities and to continue this procedure hereafter.

*Hazardous Fuels.*—The Committee recommends \$296,792,000 for hazardous fuels reduction work, \$5,000,000 above the budget request and \$16,673,000 above the fiscal year 2006 level. The recommendation includes \$5,000,000 for biomass grants as requested and an increase of \$5,000,000 above the normal base funding for the San Bernardino NF, CA, to treat the urgent and dangerous situation caused by drought and a catastrophic bark beetle outbreak. The Committee encourages the service to carefully evaluate the need for fire breaks near Payson, AZ and proceed accordingly.

The recommendation retains the authority to use up to \$15,000,000 on adjacent, non-Federal lands when hazard reduction activities are planned on national forest system lands.

The Committee commends the Service for its work on the hazardous fuels program but it is still not clear that funding is being used to address the Nation's highest priority fuels projects. The Committee continues to stress that the Service must coordinate all hazardous fuels activities with the Department of the Interior, State fire agencies, and community wildfire protection plans. The Committee expects the Service to provide a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations before distributing funds to the regions, which indicates clearly how funding is prioritized and allocated. Furthermore, all subsequent budget justifications for this program should clearly indicate the rationale for the requested budget and provide the recommended funding split and projected accomplishments by region or State. The Committee reiterates its previous directions for the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture to have a common hazardous fuels allocation process to ensure funding goes to areas which protect communities, lives, property, and ecosystems, and which rewards successful field units that design projects in accordance with community wildfire protection plans or their equivalent and includes partnerships with States and others. The Departments need to implement in fiscal year 2007 additional program metrics beyond merely acres treated; these metrics must account for important tactical goals including protection of communities and populations, as well as mechanical treatments and biomass removed.

*Rehabilitation.*—The Committee has restored \$5,000,000 for the burned area rehabilitation and restoration program, \$3,020,000 above the budget request and \$1,189,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. As outlined in the budget request, the Committee expects the Forest Service, in close partnership with the Department of the Interior, to continue the native plant materials program at the fiscal year 2006 level. The increase above the request is for general program delivery.

*Fire Plan Research and Development.*—The Committee recommends includes \$22,800,000 for research and development,

\$2,679,000 above the budget request and \$11,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

*Joint Fire Sciences Program.*—The Committee recommends \$8,000,000 for the joint fire science program, an increase of \$4,040,000 above the request and an increase of \$118,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The Committee stresses that it is vital that both the Interior Department and the Forest Service work on these research efforts jointly, and that the program continue to stress practical solutions and collaboration with the Nation's forestry schools and other partners.

*Forest Health Management, Federal Lands and Co-op Lands.*—The Committee recommends \$24,800,000 for the forest health portion of the national fire plan, including \$14,800,000 for Federal lands and \$10,000,000 for cooperative efforts with the States and others. This funding level is \$13,446,000 above the request and \$168,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The increase above the request is for general program delivery. This funding should be used in conjunction with the similar funding in State and private forestry to continue a more integrated approach to forest health, including prevention, and restoration and rehabilitation of forests and rangelands. The Committee expects the Forest Service to focus on major problems, such as southern pine beetles, western mountain bark beetles, adelgids, and other pests and pathogens, which harm forests and subsequently increase wildfire hazards. The Committee reiterates that Federal forest health funding is designated for all Federal land managing bureaus so the Forest Service must work closely with the Department of the Interior to ascertain prevention, suppression and restoration needs for both Departments. The Committee is concerned that the Administration does not recognize forest health management as a vital component of the healthy forests initiative and a critical tool for reducing risks of catastrophic wildfires. This work is an essential part of the national fire plan, and is vital to the success of the healthy forests initiative as well.

*State Fire Assistance.*—The Committee recommends \$43,000,000 for State fire assistance, \$13,885,000 above the request and \$2,816,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The program is essential to maintain and enhance the partnership between State foresters and State fire agencies and the Federal wildfire management enterprise. The Committee has focused additional funding here because the Committee has agreed to the Administration's request to eliminate the Department of the Interior State and local fire assistance program. The Committee expects that the Forest Service will work closely with Interior bureaus to ensure that State and volunteer assistance funding goes for the most meritorious State and local fire department projects. These rural and local fire units are extremely important for the Nation's readiness and they should be commended for their hard work and success at initial attack and shared participation during emergencies. The Committee also expects that fire assistance provided through the Federal Emergency Management Agency will carefully consider the needs and success of rural fire assistance providers.

The increase above the request for State fire assistance is for general program delivery and \$1,000,000 is for South Lake Tahoe wildfire protection as a grant to the South Lake Tahoe Public Util-

ity District. The Committee expects the Forest Service to support and expand the Fire Safe Councils in California. State fire assistance funds should also be used preferentially to support community wildfire protection planning and plan implementation.

*Volunteer Fire Assistance.*—The Committee has also included \$12,810,000 for volunteer fire assistance, an increase of \$5,000,000 above the request and \$5,037,000 above the enacted level. Use of this increase, as noted above, should be coordinated with the Department of the Interior. This brings the volunteer fire funding to a total of \$18,810,000, including funding in State and private forestry.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT AND MAINTENANCE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$438,334,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	382,601,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	411,025,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	– 27,309,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	+28,424,000

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

(dollars in thousands)					
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended Enacted	Recommended versus Request
<b>Capital Improvement and Maintenance</b>					
<b>Facilities</b>					
Maintenance.....	50,172	69,466	64,466	+14,294	-5,000
Construction.....	73,526	60,674	50,574	-22,952	-10,100
Subtotal, Facilities.....	123,698	130,140	115,040	-8,658	-15,100
<b>Roads</b>					
Maintenance.....	144,832	92,787	133,244	-11,588	+40,457
Construction.....	75,856	90,000	80,000	+4,144	-10,000
Subtotal, Roads.....	220,688	182,787	213,244	-7,444	+30,457
<b>Trails</b>					
Maintenance.....	40,908	35,509	40,908	---	+5,399
Construction.....	33,297	24,832	32,500	-797	+7,668
Subtotal, Trails.....	74,205	60,341	73,408	-797	+13,067
<b>Infrastructure improvement.....</b>					
	12,743	9,333	9,333	-3,410	---
Subtotal, Capital improvement and maintenance...	431,334	382,601	411,025	-20,309	+28,424
<b>Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148).....</b>					
	7,000	---	---	-7,000	---
Total, Capital Improvement and Maintenance.....	438,334	382,601	411,025	-27,309	+28,424

The Committee recommends \$411,025,000 for capital improvement and maintenance, \$28,424,000 above the request and \$27,309,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The Committee directs the Forest Service to display in the budget and track Forest Service maintenance funding and capital improvement funding as separate budget line items for facilities, roads, and trails activities.

The Committee expects to continue to receive regular updates, and a continued display in the budget justification, on progress in addressing the huge backlog of deferred maintenance and repair, especially as it relates to the activities funded through the road and trails fund, the Forest Service Facility Realignment and Enhancement Act of 2005, and the infrastructure improvement funds.

*Facilities Maintenance.*—The Committee recommends \$64,466,000 for facilities maintenance, \$5,000,000 below the request and \$14,294,000 above the fiscal year 2006 level. The Committee notes that it has accepted the Forest Service recommendation to fund small projects out of maintenance and not out of construction; hence the transfer of funds between these two accounts. In addition, the Committee notes that it has maintained the bill language begun last year allowing assessment of programs for maintenance of facilities; this limit has been raised to \$45,000,000 service-wide.

*Facilities Capital Improvement.*—The Committee recommends \$50,574,000 for facilities capital improvement, \$10,100,000 below the request and \$22,952,000 below the fiscal year 2006 level. Changes to the budget request for projects include the following increases: Allegheny NF recreation sites, PA (\$1,900,000); Chattanooga airtanker base completion, TN (\$1,050,000); Cherokee NF recreation sites, TN (\$1,100,000); Keenwild helibase, CA (\$500,000); and National Forests of North Carolina recreation sites (\$2,500,000). The recommendation does not include the \$15,144,000 requested for the Forest Products Lab, WI, or the funding requested for the SE Alaska discovery center, lighting upgrade or the Tenderfoot campground, AK, and the R10 building planning and design is reduced by \$206,000 for a total of \$753,000. The Committee needs further justification for the Forest Product Lab project and the research mission of the Lab before embarking on an endeavor which would cost well over \$40,000,000.

The Committee requests that the Forest Service report by November 30, 2006 on various options concerning expansion of the El Portal rain forest center on the Caribbean NF, PR, so the facility or its environs could be expanded to provide lodging to expand technology transfer and environmental education.

*Road Maintenance.*—The Committee recommends \$133,244,000 for road maintenance, \$40,457,000 above the request and \$11,588,000 below the fiscal year 2006 level. The Committee has maintained the road decommissioning authority at \$15,000,000. The Committee notes that at these funding levels, the number of failed roads will continue to increase.

*Road Capital Improvement.*—The Committee recommends \$80,000,000 for road capital improvement, \$10,000,000 below the request and \$4,144,000 above the fiscal year 2006 level.

*Trail Maintenance.*—The Committee recommends \$40,908,000 for trail maintenance, \$5,399,000 above the budget request and equal

to the fiscal year 2006 level. The Committee recommendation includes \$1,350,000 for operation of the national scenic and historic trails as in the request, and provides increases above the budget request of \$400,000 for operations at the Florida National Scenic Trail, \$1,000,000 for operations at the Continental Divide National Scenic Trail, \$75,000 for the Appalachian Trail, \$75,000 for the North Country Trail, \$250,000 for operations at the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail, \$400,000 for operations at the Nez Perce National Historic Trail and \$433,000 for other named national scenic and historic trails. The remainder of the increase above the request is for general program delivery. In addition, the Forest Service should maintain a full time Pacific Crest Trail (PCT) manager; provide funds to work with the Pacific Crest Trail Association; and aid PCT trail relocation reviews. The Forest Service should make every effort to work with volunteer groups, which contribute work, time, and money to enhance Federal resources.

The Committee expects that the specific increased allocations provided for operation of the National scenic and historic trails will become part of the base budgets for these trails in the forests and the regions which host these important resources so that this detailed level of Committee oversight will not be required in future years. The Committee understands that operation of these trails includes planning, NEPA compliance, feasibility studies, archaeological surveys, threatened, endangered and sensitive species surveys, maintenance, and improvements. The Service should continue to report annually its accomplishments for these trails and display the funding needed to support them, including the amount needed to construct new sections of these trails, in the budget justification.

*Trail Capital Improvement.*—The Committee recommends \$32,500,000 for trail capital improvement, \$7,668,000 above the budget request and \$797,000 below the fiscal year 2006 level. Within the increase above the request for trails construction, the Committee has included: \$1,000,000 for construction at the Florida National Scenic Trail; \$1,500,000 for construction at the Continental Divide trail; and \$1,000,000 for construction at the Pacific Crest National Scenic trail. The Committee expects the Forest Service to work diligently at updating national forest trail plans in accordance with the November, 2005 travel management rule.

*Infrastructure Improvement.*—The Committee recommends \$9,333,000 for infrastructure improvement as requested, a decrease of \$3,140,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

*Bill Language.*—The recommendation includes bill language, which transfers \$7,400,000 of the \$10,000,000 previously appropriated (P.L. 108–287, Section 8098b) to build a wildland fire training center in the San Bernardino, CA area, to the wildland fire management appropriation account for the purpose of reducing hazardous fuels on the San Bernardino NF, CA. The Committee directs the Forest Service not to reduce the base funding for hazardous fuels reduction on this forest because of this additional funding being made available.

LAND ACQUISITION

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$41,772,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	25,075,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	7,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	-34,272,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	-17,575,000

The Committee recommends \$7,500,000 for land acquisition, \$34,272,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level and \$17,575,000 below the budget request. The total reflects the use of prior year funds (\$4,000,000) from the La Madera property in the Cibola National Forest.

The Committee recommends the following distribution of funds:

Columbia River Gorge NSA, OR/WA .....	\$1,000,000
Uwharrie Trail NF, NC .....	500,000
Wisconsin Wild Waterways, WI .....	1,500,000
Wayne NF, OH .....	500,000
<hr/>	
Subtotal .....	3,500,000
Acquisition Management .....	8,000,000
Use of Prior Year Balance .....	-4,000,000
<hr/>	
Total .....	\$7,500,000

*Bill Language.*—Language is included prohibiting the Forest Service from acquiring land for the Homewood Conservation Project in Lake Tahoe, California. This language applies to any funds available to the Forest Service in this Act, the Santini-Burton Act, or any other Act.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS SPECIAL ACTS

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$1,053,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	1,053,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	1,053,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	0
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The Committee recommends \$1,053,000 for acquisition of lands for National forests, special acts, as requested. These funds are used pursuant to several special acts, which authorize appropriations from the receipts of specified National forests for the purchase of lands to minimize erosion and flood damage to critical watersheds needing soil stabilization and vegetative cover.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS TO COMPLETE LAND EXCHANGES

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$231,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	231,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	231,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	0
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The Committee recommends \$231,000, as requested, for acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges under the Act of December 4, 1967 (16 U.S.C. 484a). Under the Act, deposits made by public school districts or public school authorities to provide for cash equalization of certain land exchanges can be appropriated to acquire similar lands suitable for National forest system purposes in

the same State as the National forest lands conveyed in the exchanges.

#### RANGE BETTERMENT FUND

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$2,920,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	3,932,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	3,932,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+1,012,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The Committee recommends \$3,932,000, as requested, for the range betterment fund, to be derived from grazing receipts from the National forests (Public Law 94-579, as amended) and to be used for range rehabilitation, protection, and improvements including seeding, reseeding, fence construction, weed control, water development, and fish and wildlife habitat enhancement in 16 western States.

#### GIFTS, DONATIONS AND BEQUESTS FOR FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$63,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	63,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	63,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	0
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The Committee recommends \$63,000, the budget estimate, for gifts, donations and bequests for forest and rangeland research. Authority for the program is contained in Public Law 95-307 (16 U.S.C. 1643, section 4(b)). Amounts appropriated and not needed for current operations may be invested in public debt securities. Both the principal and earnings from the receipts are available to the Forest Service.

#### MANAGEMENT OF NATIONAL FOREST LANDS FOR SUBSISTENCE USES

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$4,975,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	5,311,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	5,311,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+336,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The Committee recommends \$5,311,000, the same as the budget request and \$336,000 above the enacted level, for the management of national forest lands for subsistence uses in Alaska.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, FOREST SERVICE

The Committee has continued administrative provisions included in previous years. The Committee has also continued the wildland fire transfer authority, which allows use of funds from other accounts available to the Forest Service during wildfire emergencies when other wildfire emergency funds are not available. As was the case last year, the first transfer of funds into the wildland fire management account shall include unobligated funds from the land acquisition and the forest legacy accounts.

The Committee limits funding for the working capital fund of the Department of Agriculture to the \$73,052,000 requested in the

budget. The Committee is concerned that the Department of Agriculture over-assesses the Forest Service for the “greenbook” charges. The Department should report to the Committees on Appropriations specifically what each charge is for and how it is calculated; charging solely on an FTE basis is insufficient.

The Committee has amended previous language concerning interactions with foreign countries to clarify that the Forest Service International Program has the authority to sign agreements directly with the U.S. Agency for International Development, the Department of State, and natural resource institutions around the world to address natural resource issues.

The Committee continues the authority for transfers to the National Forest Foundation and the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation; the former at the requested level of \$2,500,000 and the latter recommendation is \$2,250,000, a reduction of \$400,000 below the requested level. The Committee notes that it is acceptable for these foundations to make grants to Federal recipients, including Forest Service offices. The Committee allows \$100,000 in administrative funds to be used by the National Forest Foundation, but encourages the Foundation to work to be independent of this Federal administrative funding support like the National Park and National Fish and Wildlife foundations.

The Committee remains very concerned that once again the Forest Service may be taking questionable management steps because of a need to accomplish quotas for its competitive sourcing program. The Committee notes that its investigations staff previously found widespread management lapses which required legislative action and notes the recent failure of the fleet maintenance contract in California. Public Law 109–54 Sec. 422(d) requires the Forest Service to report, “in accordance with full cost accounting principles, all costs attributable to developing, implementing, supporting, managing, monitoring, and reporting on competitive sourcing, including personnel, consultant, travel, and training costs associated with program management.” This is apparently not occurring. Accordingly, this issue is addressed once again in bill language, included under Title IV—General Provisions, limiting the use of funds for competitive sourcing efforts and providing certain other guidance. Competitive sourcing efforts may continue, but the cost is limited to \$2,500,000. The Committee reiterates that all associated activities related to competitive sourcing need to be charged against the funding cap. This includes all staff time engaged in feasibility studies as well as all staff time spent on training and answering data calls related to competitive sourcing tasks.

The Committee requires information concerning costs incurred in the past and planned for the future related to competitive sourcing. Therefore, by December 31, 2006, the service should report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, and the House Agriculture, Resources, and Government Reform Committees, explaining the accounting procedures which have been implemented to track these costs in accordance with full cost accounting principles, and providing fiscal year 2005 costs and accounting procedures, expected costs for fiscal year 2006, and those presumed under the requested budget.

The Committee is also extremely concerned about the continuing reports of problems related to the two large efforts to improve ad-

ministrative functions through detailed and expensive business process reengineering of financial services and human resources. The Albuquerque Service Center (ASC) appears to be a tremendous source of frustration for vendors and personnel who rely on it for basic financial transactions. The true costs of the ASC do not appear to be reflected in reports provided to the Administration or the Committee. The Forest Service must improve in this area. Before committing additional funds to the ASC, the Forest Service should demonstrate to the Appropriations Committees and to the public that the tasks and plan for its operation are well thought out and clear and include specific benchmarks and metrics. Therefore, the Committee directs the Forest Service to provide quarterly reports on business process reengineering efforts and transmit these to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and post them in an easily found location on the agency web-site. The Committee expects the Forest Service, working closely with the Department of Agriculture, to provide adequate Congressional notification at key benchmarks in these processes, and directs the Forest Service to document the funding requirements and accomplishments in subsequent budget justifications.

The Committee understands that the Forest Service is considering a long term lease for a large building with hundreds of office work stations in Albuquerque, NM, to house approximately half of its headquarters personnel. The Committee understands that in 2008 the Service will lose its office lease in Rosslyn, VA, which currently houses almost half of the Washington office staff. The Committee encourages the Forest Service to review seriously the costs of such a move and to consult with the House Committees on Appropriations, Agriculture, and Resources and the Senate Committees on Appropriations and Energy and Natural Resources before committing to a long term lease. The Service should evaluate carefully management, policy, and leadership needs at both the national and regional levels. Given the Forest Service budget situation, the efficiencies available with modern computing and telecommunications devices, and the huge cost of maintaining so many regional offices, the Committee suggests that greater administrative savings could be achieved from a streamlined regional role and structure. Furthermore, the Committee notes the large cost overruns which occurred last year and this year when the Forest Service paid change of station costs for many more personnel than the Service had predicted would move to Albuquerque. It seems likely that similar cost overruns would occur in 2008 if the Forest Service has to pay for new office space at headquarters, or pay extensive relocation or termination costs, and also support a large, new facility in New Mexico. Such important management decisions, with such large cost implications, should have the benefit of open, public discussion and Congressional coordination.

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

### INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

#### INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES

The provision of Federal health services to Indians is based on a special relationship between Indian tribes and the U.S. Govern-

ment first set forth in the 1830s by the U.S. Supreme Court under Chief Justice John Marshall. Numerous treaties, statutes, constitutional provisions, and international law have reconfirmed this relationship. Principal among these is the Snyder Act of 1921, which provides the basic authority for most Indian health services provided by the Federal Government to American Indians and Alaska Natives. The Indian Health Service (IHS) provides direct health care services in 33 hospitals, 52 health centers, 2 school health centers, and 38 health stations. Tribes and tribal groups, through contracts and compacts with the IHS, operate 15 hospitals, 220 health centers, 9 school health centers, and 260 health stations (including 162 Alaska Native village clinics). The IHS, tribes, and tribal groups also operate 11 regional youth substance abuse treatment centers and 2,241 units of staff quarters.

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$2,692,009,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	2,822,500,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	2,830,136,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+138,037,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	+7,636,000

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

(dollars in thousands)					
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted	Request
<b>Indian Health Services</b>					
<b>Clinical Services</b>					
IHS and tribal health delivery					
Hospital and health clinic programs.....	1,339,539	1,429,772	1,439,047	+99,508	+9,275
Dental health program.....	117,731	126,957	126,957	+9,226	---
Mental health program.....	58,455	61,695	61,695	+3,240	---
Alcohol and substance abuse program.....	143,198	150,634	150,634	+7,436	---
Contract care.....	499,562	536,259	536,259	+36,697	---
Catastrophic health emergency fund.....	17,735	18,000	18,000	+265	---
Subtotal, Clinical Services.....	2,176,220	2,323,317	2,332,592	+156,372	+9,275
<b>Preventive Health</b>					
Public health nursing.....	48,959	53,043	53,043	+4,084	---
Health education.....	13,584	14,490	14,490	+906	---
Community health representatives program.....	52,946	55,790	55,790	+2,844	---
Immunization (Alaska).....	1,621	1,708	1,708	+87	---
Subtotal, Preventive Health.....	117,110	125,031	125,031	+7,921	---
<b>Urban health projects.....</b>					
Indian health professions.....	32,744	---	32,744	---	+32,744
Tribal management.....	31,039	31,697	31,697	+658	---
Direct operations.....	2,394	2,488	2,488	+94	---
Self-governance.....	62,194	63,804	63,804	+1,610	---
Contract support costs.....	5,668	5,847	5,847	+179	---
Fixed cost decrease.....	264,730	270,316	270,316	+5,586	---
Subtotal, Urban health projects.....	---	---	-34,383	-34,383	-34,383

(dollars in thousands)				
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted Request
Medicare/Medicaid Reimbursements				
Hospital and clinic accreditation (Est. collecting)	(648,208)	(684,119)	(684,119)	(+35,911)
Total, Indian Health Services	2,692,099	2,822,500	2,830,136	+138,037
(Non-contract services)	(2,174,802)	(2,268,241)	(2,275,877)	(+101,075)
(Contract care)	(499,562)	(536,259)	(536,259)	(+36,697)
(Catastrophic health emergency fund)	(17,735)	(18,000)	(18,000)	(+265)

The Committee recommends \$2,830,136,000 for Indian Health Services, an increase of \$7,636,000 above the budget request and \$138,037,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. Changes to the budget request are detailed below.

*Clinical Services.*—The Committee recommends an increase of \$9,275,000 in hospital and health clinic programs for the Indian Health Care Improvement Fund. Direction on the distribution of these funds is provided below.

*Urban Indian Health Clinics.*—The Committee recommends an increase of \$32,744,000 to restore funding for the 32 urban Indian clinics.

*Fixed Cost Decreases.*—The Committee recommends a decrease of \$34,383,000, which will enable the Service to fund 60 percent of its fixed cost increases for medical inflation and population growth.

The Committee agrees to the following:

1. Funds for the Indian Health Care Improvement Fund should be distributed using the same methodology as in 2003. Of the available funds, 70 percent is for the 28 units funded below 40 percent of need in 2005 and 30 percent is for the remaining 133 units funded below 60 percent of need in 2005.

2. The budget continues funding in the dental program for Clinical and Preventive Support Centers. This is a critical national effort and the Committee expects the Service to continue to manage and fund these programs through IHS headquarters. These funds should not be subject to tribal share distributions.

3. The Committee continues to be concerned about the high vacancy rates of health care providers at IHS and tribal facilities and expects the Service to investigate the feasibility of establishing a central credentialing system, which would enhance the use of volunteers in fields such as dentistry. The Service should report to the Committee by February 28, 2006, addressing the feasibility of using the Defense Department's credentialing system or developing a separate IHS system. The report should specifically address streamlining the process for credentialing volunteers, including credentialing volunteers to work at multiple sites and over multiple years without having to be re-credentialed.

4. The pharmacist intern program is continued at the fiscal year 2006 level. The Committee is pleased with the success of this program, which was established with funds recommended by the Committee 7 years ago, and notes that the Service has retained 90 percent of interns beyond their initial residency year.

5. The Service should use a weighted formula for distributing loan repayment funding to address its most critical vacancies. As of March 13, 2006, the key categories, including the number of vacant positions and the vacancy rate by category, were:

- 1) Dentistry—116 vacancies—28%;
- 2) Podiatry—10 vacancies—25%;
- 3) Medical imaging—58 vacancies—20%;
- 4) Nursing—738 vacancies—18%;
- 5) Therapy—19 positions—17%;
- 6) Medical technology—43 vacancies—12%;
- 7) Physician—100 vacancies—11%;
- 8) Pharmacy—59 vacancies—11%; and
- 9) Optometry—17 positions—11%.

6. The Service should continue and expand its efforts to collect reimbursements from private insurance providers, including the use of contract bill collectors who provide services in exchange for a reasonable percentage of monies collected.

7. The Service should complete its revision of its contract support cost policy as soon as possible. The Committee will consider providing funding for new and expanded contracts in future fiscal years based upon the revised policy.

8. Funding for the urban health program has been restored and the proposal to eliminate this program is rejected. Funding for IHS urban clinics is levered with nearly \$2 for every \$1 contributed by the Service. The Program Assessment Rating Tool score for the program was one point shy of “moderately effective”, which is a score that many of the government programs in this bill can only hope to achieve in the future. The Committee encourages the Service to work with HHS to help these clinics get additional funding through the Community Health Centers program and to work with the individual clinics on continued improvements in health services delivery.

INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$353,211,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	347,287,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	363,573,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+10,362,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	+16,286,000

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

(dollars in thousands)					
	FY 2006	FY 2007	Recommended	Recommended	Recommended versus
	Enacted	Request	Enacted	Request	Request
<b>Indian Health Facilities</b>					
Maintenance and improvement.....	51,633	52,668	52,668	+1,035	---
Sanitation facilities.....	92,143	94,003	94,003	+1,860	---
Construction facilities.....	37,779	17,664	36,664	-1,115	+19,000
Facilities and environmental health support.....	150,709	161,333	161,333	+10,624	---
Equipment.....	20,947	21,619	21,619	+672	---
Fixed cost decrease.....	---	---	-2,714	-2,714	-2,714
<b>Total, Indian Health Facilities.....</b>	<b>353,211</b>	<b>347,287</b>	<b>363,573</b>	<b>+10,362</b>	<b>+16,286</b>

The Committee recommends \$363,573,000 for Indian health facilities, an increase of \$16,286,000 above the budget request and \$10,362,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. Changes to the budget request are detailed below.

*Health Care Facilities Construction.*—The Committee recommends an increase of \$19,000,000 for health care facilities construction, which will continue the construction of the Kayenta and San Carlos, AZ clinics and restore partially funding for the Services dental facilities program, small ambulatory facilities program, and joint ventures program. Funding is detailed in the table below.

*Fixed Cost Decreases.*—The Committee recommends a decrease of \$2,714,000, which will enable the Service to fund 60 percent of its fixed cost increases for medical inflation and population growth.

The Committee agrees to the following distribution of health care facilities construction funds:

Project	2007 Request	Committee Recommendation
Ambulatory Care Centers:		
Kayenta, AZ Health Center .....	0	\$6,000,000
Phoenix, AZ SW Health Center .....	\$17,664,000	17,664,000
San Carlos, AZ Health Center .....	0	4,000,000
Other Facilities:		
Dental Facilities Program .....	0	2,000,000
Joint Ventures .....	0	2,000,000
Small Ambulatory Facilities .....	0	5,000,000
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>\$17,664,000</b>	<b>\$36,664,000</b>

The Committee agrees to the following:

1. The Service needs to do a better job of requesting and justifying construction funding for its hospital and clinic facility needs. At the level of funding requested in 2007, it would take 48 years to complete the facilities on the current priority list. There are many facilities that should to be added to the list now and, in 48 years, all of the IHS facilities will need to be replaced or require major renovation. Even when the facilities construction program was much more generously funded, it took between 11 and 15 years from the time a proposal was received from a tribe until construction was completed. At the funding level requested for 2007, some facilities on the current priority list would wait more than 60 years from proposal submission until completion of construction and tribal facilities not on the list would wait considerably longer than that. Sixty years is beyond the reasonable life expectation for a hospital or clinic. Currently, about one third of the IHS-operated hospitals and health centers are more than 40 years old.

2. The current IHS maintenance budget is less than half of what is required, if you apply commercial sector health care standards. Without progress on new and renovated facilities, the maintenance backlog will grow at a rapid pace from the current backlog level of nearly half a billion dollars.

3. In determining priorities for project funding under the joint ventures program for hospitals and clinics, the Service should provide additional credit to tribes that are willing to provide full funding for facility equipment in addition to providing full funding for facility construction.

4. Funding for small ambulatory facilities should be used to select additional projects from the most recent solicitation.

5. The Service should continue to apply a cap of \$2,000,000 for any single small ambulatory facility project and most, if not all projects should be funded substantially below that level.

6. Funds for sanitation facilities for new and renovated housing should be used to serve housing provided by the Bureau of Indian Affairs housing improvement program, new homes, and homes renovated to like-new condition. Onsite sanitation facilities may also be provided for homes occupied by the disabled or sick who have physician referrals indicating an immediate medical need for adequate sanitation facilities at home.

7. Sanitation funds should not be used to provide sanitation facilities for new homes funded by the housing programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). HUD should provide any needed funds to the IHS for that purpose.

8. The IHS may use up to \$5,000,000 in sanitation funding for projects to clean up and replace open dumps on Indian lands pursuant to the Indian Lands Open Dump Cleanup Act of 1994.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES

The National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, an agency within the National Institutes of Health, was authorized in section 311(a) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 and in section 126(g) of the Superfund amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 to conduct certain research and worker training activities associated with the nation’s Hazardous Substance Superfund program.

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$79,108,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	78,414,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	79,414,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+306,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	+1,000,000

The Committee recommends \$79,414,000 for the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, an increase of \$1,000,000 above the budget request and \$306,000 above fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The increase above the budget request is for individual project grants.

*Bill Language.*—The Committee recommends bill language providing two-year funding availability for individual project grants.

The Committee encourages the Institute to expand its individual project grants over the next 3 years so that a more robust program is developed. In 2006, \$2,000,000 is being used for these grants. The Committee has provided a total of \$3,000,000 for 2007 and encourages the Institute to provide \$4,000,000 in 2008 and \$5,000,000 in 2009 and subsequent years.

AGENCY FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND DISEASE REGISTRY

TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL PUBLIC HEALTH

The Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR), an agency of the Public Health Service, was created in section

104(i) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980. The ATSDR's primary mission is to conduct surveys and screening programs to determine relationships between exposure to toxic substances and illness. Other activities include the maintenance and annual update of a list of hazardous substances most commonly found at Superfund sites, the preparation of toxicological profiles on each such hazardous substance, consultations on health issues relating to exposure to hazardous or toxic substances, and the development and implementation of certain research activities related to ATSDR's mission.

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$74,905,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	75,004,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	76,754,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+1,849,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	+1,750,000

The Committee recommends \$76,754,000 for toxic substances and environmental public health programs, an increase of \$1,750,000 above the budget request and \$1,849,000 above the fiscal year 2006 level. The increase above the budget request provides funding for 50 percent of the agency's fixed cost increases.

*Bill Language.*—The Committee recommends bill language capping the administrative costs paid to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) at 7.5 percent of the total appropriation for the Agency of Toxic Substance and Disease Registry. This language was carried in the past (2003 and earlier). Administrative charges paid to CDC have nearly doubled since the cap was removed in 2004. Over the same period, the agency's total budget has declined by 8 percent before considering any adjustments for inflation.

The Committee encourages the ATSDR to continue to support the minority health professions community under its cooperative agreement activities in fiscal year 2007.

OTHER RELATED AGENCIES

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) was established by Congress under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). The Office of Environmental Quality (OEQ), which provides professional and administrative staff for the Council, was established in the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970. The Council on Environmental Policy has statutory responsibility under NEPA for environmental oversight of all Federal agencies and is to lead interagency decision-making of all environmental matters.

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$2,677,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	2,627,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	2,627,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	- 50,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The Committee recommends \$2,627,000, the budget request, for the Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality, a decrease of \$50,000 below the fiscal year 2006 level.

CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board was authorized by the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 to investigate accidental releases of certain chemical substances resulting in, or that may cause, serious injury, death, substantial property damage, or serious adverse effects on human health. The Board became operational in fiscal year 1998.

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$9,064,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	9,108,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	9,208,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+144,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	+100,000

The Committee recommends \$9,208,000 for salaries and expenses of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board, an increase of \$100,000 above the budget request and \$144,000 above the fiscal year 2006 level. The \$100,000 increase above the budget request is for an annual financial audit.

*Bill Language.*—The Committee recommends bill language discontinuing the use of the Environmental Protection Agency’s Inspector General (IG) as the IG for the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board. Language is also recommended limiting funding for the Board of Directors to \$600,000.

OFFICE OF NAVAJO AND HOPI INDIAN RELOCATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The dispute between the Hopi and Navajo tribes is centuries-old. The Hopi trace their origin on the land back to the Anasazi race whose presence is recorded back to 1150 A.D. Later in the 16th century Navajo settlement led to the isolation of the Hopi Reservation as an island within the area occupied by the Navajo reservation. In 1882, President Arthur issued an Executive Order, which granted the Hopi a 2.5 million acre reservation to be occupied by the Hopi and such other Indians as the Secretary of the Interior saw fit to resettle there. Intertribal problems arose between the Navajo tribe and the Hopi tribe revolving around the question of the ownership of the land as well as cultural differences between the two tribes. Efforts to resolve these conflicts were not successful and led Congress to pass legislation in 1958, which authorized a lawsuit to determine ownership of the land. When attempts at mediation of the dispute as specified in an Act passed in 1974 failed, the district court in Arizona partitioned the Joint Use Area equally between the Navajo and Hopi tribes under a decree that has required the relocation of members of both tribes. Most of those to be relocated are Navajo living on the Hopi partitioned land.

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$8,474,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	5,940,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	5,940,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	-2,534,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The Committee recommends \$5,940,000 for salaries and expenses of the Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation, the same as the budget request and \$2,534,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

#### INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT

##### PAYMENT TO THE INSTITUTE

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$6,207,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	6,703,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	6,703,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+496,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The Committee recommends \$6,703,000 for the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development, the same as the budget request and \$496,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

The Committee commends the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development (IAIA) for its commitment to the preservation and teaching of American Indian and Alaska Native arts and culture. However, IAIA has submitted a request for matching construction dollars during the budget process for the last several years based on its original charter. The Institute is not authorized to receive construction funding to expand its facilities and therefore the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has denied these requests and the Committee fully supports OMB's decision.

#### SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The Smithsonian Institution is the world's largest museum and research complex, with 18 museums and galleries, the National Zoo, and nine research centers around the world. Funded by both private and Federal sources, the Smithsonian is unique in the Federal establishment. Created by an act of Congress in 1846 to carry out the trust included in James Smithson's will, it has been engaged for more than 150 years in the "increase and diffusion of knowledge." In 2005, the Smithsonian attracted more than 24,000,000 visitors to its museums, galleries, and zoological park. Additional millions also view Smithsonian traveling exhibitions and participate in the annual Folklife Festival on the National Mall. As custodian of the National Collections, the Smithsonian is responsible for more than 140 million art objects, natural history specimens, and artifacts. These scientific and cultural collections are a vital resource for global research and conservation efforts. The collections are displayed for the enjoyment and education of visitors and are available for research by the staff of the Institution and by hundreds of visiting students, scientists, and historians each year.

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$516,568,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	537,394,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	517,094,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+526,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	-20,300,000

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended Recommended	Enacted	Recommended versus Request
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION					
Salaries and Expenses					
Museum and Research Institutes					
Anacostia Museum and Center for African American History and Culture.....	1,908	1,948	1,948	+40	---
Archives of American Art.....	1,791	1,851	1,851	+60	---
Arthur M. Sackler Gallery/Freer Gallery of Art.....	5,548	5,687	5,687	+139	---
Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage.....	2,108	2,161	2,161	+53	---
Cooper-Hewitt, National Design Museum.....	2,979	3,058	3,058	+79	---
Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.....	3,994	4,106	4,106	+112	---
National Air and Space Museum.....	16,248	16,782	16,782	+534	---
National Museum of African American History and Culture.....	2,888	2,968	2,968	+80	---
National Museum of African Art.....	4,196	4,284	4,284	+88	---
Smithsonian American Art Museum.....	12,224	8,265	8,265	-3,959	---
National Museum of American History.....	20,236	20,807	20,807	+571	---
National Museum of the American Indian.....	30,470	31,159	31,159	+689	---
National Museum of Natural History.....	43,314	44,546	44,546	+1,232	---
National Portrait Gallery.....	8,532	5,400	5,400	-3,132	---
National Zoological Park.....	19,972	20,652	21,352	+1,380	+700
Astrophysical Observatory.....	22,349	22,831	22,831	+482	---
Center for Materials Research and Education.....	2,859	2,940	2,940	+81	---
Environmental Research Center.....	3,113	3,119	3,119	+6	---
Tropical Research Institute.....	11,489	12,116	12,116	+627	---
Subtotal, Museums and Research Institutes.....	216,218	214,680	215,380	-838	+700



The Committee recommends \$517,094,000 for salaries and expenses, an increase of \$526,000 above the enacted level and \$20,300,000 below the budget request. Changes to the request include an additional \$700,000 for the National Zoological Park to provide staffing for the opening of the new Asia I exhibit and for enhanced pest control throughout the Zoo, an additional \$500,000 for Fellowships and an additional \$500,000 for scientific research equipment. The Committee believes that these are higher priorities than providing the requested increase of \$2,000,000 for transit benefits for employees. There is also an undistributed reduction of \$5,000,000.

*Bill Language.*—The Committee takes seriously the age and deteriorating condition of the facilities at the National Zoological Park. Bill language is included under salaries and expenses setting aside \$10,000,000 of the facilities maintenance funds for critical backlog maintenance at the National Zoological Park for fiscal year 2007. The Committee strongly urges the Smithsonian to maintain this level in future budgets.

In addition, the Committee is uncomfortable with the fact that decisions on how to allocate facility maintenance funds are not detailed in the annual budget justification. While the Committee understands the need for flexibility, the Smithsonian should, in future requests, include a list of how funds will be distributed with justifications. Should funds need to be moved during the year, the Smithsonian should notify the Committee in writing of any changes on a quarterly basis. Reprogramming guidelines should be closely followed.

FACILITIES CAPITAL

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$98,529,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	107,000,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	107,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+8,471,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The Committee recommends \$107,000,000 for facilities capital, the same as the budget request and an increase of \$8,471,000 above the enacted level.

*Bill Language.*—The Committee has provided \$20,000,000 for the National Zoological Park, an increase of \$4,000,000 above the request. These additional funds should come from the other revitalization projects activity. This increase is provided in addition to the \$1,000,000 in the budget for addressing critical infrastructure needs, specifically to provide fire detection and suppression systems throughout the Zoo. The budget justification and testimony before the Committee indicates that “the current utility and fire-protection infrastructure is totally inadequate to meet the needs of the Zoo and to protect and support its animals”. The Committee strongly urges the Smithsonian to continue to provide significant funding in future budgets for revitalization of the aging infrastructure at the National Zoological Park. The Committee considers development of Asia II as a major part of that effort.

The Committee has provided the full amount for Facilities Planning and Design, however, it has not agreed to the list of projects. In light of the additional funds provided to the Zoological Park, a

new list should be forwarded to the Committee adjusting for additional long term project planning for the Zoo.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The bill includes new language limiting the Smithsonian’s ability to execute any contract or legal agreement which could limit access by the public to the Smithsonian collections. Language is also included limiting compensation of Smithsonian employees to the rate of pay of the President of the United States.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

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

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$95,179,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	101,794,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	101,794,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+6,615,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

(dollars in thousands)				
	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended versus Enacted Request
NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART				
Salaries and Expenses				
Care and utilization of art collections.....	33,522	34,788	34,788	+1,266
Operation and maintenance of buildings and grounds.....	22,787	26,155	26,155	+3,368
Protection of buildings, grounds and contents.....	20,017	21,072	21,072	+1,055
General administration.....	18,853	19,779	19,779	+926
Total, Salaries and Expenses.....	95,179	101,794	101,794	+6,615

The Committee recommends \$101,794,000, the budget request, for salaries and expenses of the National Gallery of Art, an increase of \$6,615,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

#### REPAIR, RESTORATION AND RENOVATION OF BUILDINGS

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$15,962,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	14,949,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	14,949,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	-1,013,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The Committee recommends \$14,949,000, the budget request, for repair, restoration and renovation of buildings at the National Gallery of Art, a decrease of \$1,013,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

#### JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts is a living memorial to the late President Kennedy and is the National Center for the Performing Arts. The Center consists of over 1.5 million square feet of usable floor space with visitation averaging 10,000 on a daily basis.

#### OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$17,538,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	18,909,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	18,909,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+1,371,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The Committee recommends \$18,909,000 for operations and maintenance, the same as the budget request and \$1,371,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

#### CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$12,809,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	19,800,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	19,800,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+6,991,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The Committee recommends \$19,800,000 for construction, the same as the budget request and \$6,991,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

The Committee notes that the Kennedy Center has responded to the directives and recommendations in the Government Accountability Office report in a very positive manner. Given the very tight fiscal budget situation, it is imperative that the Kennedy Center manage federal funds in a cost effective manner and avoid the cost overruns experienced in the past. The Committee continues to urge the Center to use the Smithsonian Inspector General for oversight.

WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars is a unique institution with a special mission to serve as a living memorial to President Woodrow Wilson. The Center performs this mandate through its role as an international institute for advanced study as well as a facilitator for discussions among scholars, public officials, journalists and business leaders from across the country on major long-term issues facing this Nation and the world.

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$9,065,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	9,438,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	9,438,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+373,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The Committee recommends \$9,438,000 for salaries and expenses of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars as requested, an increase of \$373,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The Committee notes the useful and successful oversight hearing held earlier this year, and commends the Center for its important contributions to American society.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES  
NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$124,406,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	124,412,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	124,412,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+6,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended	Recommended Enacted	versus Request
(dollars in thousands)					
-----					
National Endowment for the Arts					
Grants and Administration					
Grants					
Direct grants.....	43,787	44,904	44,904	+1,117	---
Challenge America grants.....	10,496	8,458	8,458	-2,038	---
National Initiative: American Masterpieces.....	5,911	5,911	5,911	---	---
State partnerships					
State and regional.....	23,182	23,578	23,578	+396	---
Underserved set-aside.....	6,274	6,386	6,386	+112	---
Challenge America grants.....	7,063	5,639	5,639	-1,424	---
National Initiative: American Masterpieces.....	3,941	3,941	3,941	---	---
Subtotal, State partnerships.....	40,460	39,544	39,544	-916	---
Subtotal, Grants.....	100,654	98,817	98,817	-1,837	---
Program support.....	1,672	1,761	1,761	+89	---
Administration.....	22,080	23,834	23,834	+1,754	---
Total, Arts.....	124,406	124,412	124,412	+6	---
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

The Committee recommends \$124,412,000 for the National Endowment for the Arts, the same as the budget request and \$6,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$125,728,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	126,049,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	126,049,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+321,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The amounts recommended by the Committee compared with the budget estimates by activity are shown in the following table:

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Recommended Request	Recommended Enacted	Recommended versus Request
(dollars in thousands)					
-----					
National Endowment for the Humanities					
Grants and Administration					
Grants					
Federal/State partnership.....	30,926	31,082	31,082	+156	---
Preservation and access.....	18,368	17,988	17,988	-380	---
Public programs.....	12,381	12,124	12,124	-257	---
Research programs.....	12,692	12,428	12,428	-264	---
Education programs.....	12,266	12,012	12,012	-254	---
Program development.....	375	368	368	-7	---
We The People Initiative grants.....	15,239	15,239	15,239	---	---
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Subtotal, Grants.....	102,247	101,241	101,241	-1,006	---
Administrative Areas					
Administration.....	23,481	24,808	24,808	+1,327	---
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total, Grants and Administration.....	125,728	126,049	126,049	+321	---
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

The Committee recommends \$126,049,000 for grants and administration, the same as the budget request and \$321,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

#### MATCHING GRANTS

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$15,221,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	14,906,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	14,906,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	- 315,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The Committee recommends \$14,906,000 for matching grants, the same as the budget request and \$315,000 below the fiscal year 2006 level.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The Committee has retained the administrative provision proposed by the Administration's 2007 fiscal year budget request for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities including the proviso that exempts grants and contracts solely funded by non-appropriated funds from matching funding requirements.

#### COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

The Commission of Fine Arts was established in 1910 to meet the need for a permanent body to advise the government on matters pertaining to the arts, and particularly, to guide the architectural development of Washington, DC. Over the years the Commission's scope has been expanded to include advice on areas such as plans for parks, public buildings, location of National monuments, and development of public squares. As a result, the Commission annually reviews approximately 500 projects. In fiscal year 1988 the Commission was given responsibility for the National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs program.

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$1,865,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	1,951,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	1,951,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+86,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The Committee recommends \$1,951,000 for salaries and expenses of the Commission of Fine Arts, as requested, an increase of \$86,000 over the fiscal year 2006 enacted level and the same as the budget request.

#### NATIONAL CAPITAL ARTS AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$7,143,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	6,534,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	6,534,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	- 609,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs program was established in Public Law 99-190 to support artistic and cultural programs in the Nation's Capital. The Committee recommends

\$6,534,000, a decrease of \$609,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level and the same as the budget request.

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 established the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. The Advisory Council was reauthorized as part of the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-333). The Council's mandate is to further the National policy of preserving historic and cultural resources for the benefit of present and future generations. The Council advises the President and Congress on preservation matters and provides consultation on historic properties threatened by Federal action.

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$4,789,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	5,118,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	5,118,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+329,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The Committee recommends \$5,118,000 for salaries and expenses of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, an increase of \$329,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level and the same as the budget request.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The National Capital Planning Act of 1952 designated the National Capital Planning Commission as the central planning agency for the Federal government in the National Capital Region. The three major functions of the Commission are to prepare and adopt the Federal elements of the National Capital Comprehensive Plan, prepare an annual report on a five-year projection of the Federal Capital Improvement Program, and review plans and proposals submitted to the Commission.

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$8,123,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	8,265,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	7,623,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	- 500,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	- 642,000

The Committee recommends \$7,623,000, for salaries and expenses of the National Capital Planning Commission, a decrease of \$500,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level and \$642,000 below the budget request.

UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM

HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM

In 1980, Congress passed legislation creating a 65-member Holocaust Memorial Council with the mandate to create and oversee a living memorial/museum to victims of holocausts. The museum opened in April 1993. Construction costs for the museum came

solely from donated funds raised by the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum Campaign and appropriated funds were used for planning and development of programmatic components, overall administrative support, and annual commemorative observances. Since the opening of the museum, appropriated funds have been provided to pay for the ongoing operating costs of the museum as authorized by Public Law 102–529 and Public Law 106–292.

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$42,150,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	43,786,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	43,415,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	+1,265,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	–371,000

The Committee recommends \$43,415,000 for the Holocaust Memorial Museum, a decrease of \$371,000 below the budget request and \$1,265,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. This increase is 3.0% above the enacted funding level.

PRESIDIO TRUST

PRESIDIO TRUST FUND

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$19,706,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	19,256,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	19,256,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	–450,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The Committee recommends \$19,256,000 for the Presidio Trust Fund, the same as the budget request and \$450,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

WHITE HOUSE COMMISSION ON THE NATIONAL MOMENT OF REMEMBRANCE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation enacted, 2006 .....	\$247,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	200,000
Recommended, 2007 .....	200,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006 .....	–47,000
Budget estimate, 2007 .....	0

The White House Commission on the National Moment of Remembrance, established by Public Law 106–579, was created to (1) sustain the American spirit through acts of remembrance, not only on Memorial Day, but throughout the year; (2) institutionalize the National Moment of Remembrance; and (3) to enhance the commemoration and understanding of Memorial Day. The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$200,000, a decrease of \$47,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level and the same as the budget request.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 401 continues a provision providing for public availability of information on consulting services contracts.

Section 402 continues a provision prohibiting activities to promote public support or opposition to legislative proposals.

Section 403 continues a provision providing for annual appropriations unless expressly provided otherwise in this Act.

Section 404 continues a provision limiting the use of personal cooks, chauffeurs or servants.

Section 405 provides for restrictions on departmental assessments unless approved by the Committees on Appropriations.

Section 406 prohibits the transfer of funds unless provided in this or other Acts.

Section 407 continues a provision limiting the sale of giant sequoia.

Section 408 continues a limitation on accepting and processing applications for patents and on the patenting of Federal lands; permits processing of grandfathered applications; and permits third-party contractors to process grandfathered applications.

Section 409 continues a provision limiting payments for contract support costs in past years to the funds available in law and accompanying report language in those years for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service.

Section 410 continues a limitation on completing and issuing the five-year program under the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act.

Section 411 continues a provision permitting the Forest Service to use the roads and trails fund for backlog maintenance and priority forest health treatments.

Section 412 continues a provision limiting the use of answering machines during core business hours except in case of emergency and requires an option of talking to a person. The American taxpayer deserves to receive personal attention from public servants.

Section 413 continues a provision clarifying the Forest Service land management planning revision requirements.

Section 414 continues a provision limiting preleasing, leasing, and related activities within the boundaries of National monuments.

Section 415 continues a provision providing the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to enter into reciprocal agreements with foreign nations concerning the personal liability of firefighters.

Section 416 continues a provision authorizing the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to give consideration to rural communities, local and non-profit groups, and disadvantaged workers in entering into contracts for hazardous fuels and watershed projects.

Section 417 continues a provision limiting the use of funds for filing declarations of takings or condemnations. This provision does not apply to the Everglades National Park Protection and Environmental Act.

Section 418 provides guidance on competitive sourcing activities and clarifies annual reporting requirements to specify the reporting of the full costs associated with sourcing studies and related activities. Language is also included concerning the Forest Service so the problems associated with the previous, faulty competitive sourcing studies are not repeated in the future.

Section 419 prohibits the expenditure of funds on Safecom and Disaster Management.

Section 420 amends the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000, to extend an authority concerning Forest Service administration of rights-of-way and land uses.

Section 421 allows the Secretary of Agriculture to complete an exchange of a leasehold interest at the San Bernardino International Airport for lands and buildings located adjacent to the former Norton Air Force Base in California. This exchange will allow the Secretary to relocate the forest supervisor’s office of the San Bernardino National Forest into buildings owned by the United States, which will result in lease cost savings and improved service to the public.

Section 422 prohibits the use of funds in this Act for competitive sourcing studies by the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service for activities relating to wildfire management or wildfire suppression programs.

Section 423 requires that before funding in this Act can be used to support the work on the Fire Program Analysis (FPA) system, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior must certify, in writing, that the FPA system will accomplish the existing work plan for the system, as determined by the Wildland Fire Leadership Council, and that State wildfire agencies will be full participants in the use of the system.

Section 424 limits compensation of Smithsonian employees to the rate of pay of the President of the United States.

Section 425 expresses the sense of the Congress with respect to greenhouse gas emissions control.

TITLE V—SUSPENSION OF ROYALTY RELIEF

Title V provides direction to the Secretary of the Interior on suspension of royalty relief for oil and gas production on Federal lands.

RESCISSIONS

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(2), rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following table is submitted describing the rescissions recommended in the accompanying bill:

Department of the Interior: Land and Water Conservation Fund (contract authority) .....	\$30,000,000
Environmental Protection Agency: State and Tribal Assistance Grants .....	indefinite

TRANSFERS OF FUNDS

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(2), rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following table is submitted describing the transfers of funds provided in the accompanying bill.

APPROPRIATION TRANSFERS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

Account from which transfer is to be made	Amount	Account to which transfer is to be made	Amount
Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Wildland Fire Management.	\$9,000,000	Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Wildland Fire Management.	\$9,000,000
Department of the Interior, Indian Land and Water Claim Settlements and Miscellaneous Payments to Indians.	200,000	Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Management of Lands and Resources.	200,000

Account from which transfer is to be made	Amount	Account to which transfer is to be made	Amount
Environmental Protection Agency, Hazardous Substance Superfund.	13,316,000	Office of Inspector General .....	13,316,000
Environmental Protection Agency, Hazardous Substance Superfund.	30,011,000	Science and Technology .....	30,011,000
Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Wildland Fire Management.	9,000,000	Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Wildland Fire Management.	9,000,000
Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Capital Improvement and Maintenance.	7,400,000	Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Wildland Fire Management.	7,400,000

CHANGES IN APPLICATION OF EXISTING LAW

Pursuant to clause 3, rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following Statements are submitted describing the effect of provisions in the accompanying bill, which directly or indirectly change the application of existing law. In most instances these provisions have been included in prior appropriations Acts.

The Bill includes the following changes in application of existing law:

OVERALL BILL

1. Providing that certain appropriations remain available until expended or extends the availability of funds beyond the fiscal year where programs or projects are continuing but for which legislation does not specifically authorize such extended availability. This authority tends to result in savings by preventing the practice of committing funds on low priority projects at the end of the fiscal year to avoid losing the funds.

2. Limiting, in certain instances, the obligation of funds for particular functions or programs. These limitations include restrictions on the obligation of funds for administrative expenses, travel expenses, the use of consultants, and programmatic areas within the overall jurisdiction of a particular agency.

3. Limiting official entertainment or reception and representation expenses for selected agencies in the bill.

4. Continuing ongoing activities of those Federal agencies, which require annual authorization or additional legislation, which has not been enacted.

*TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR*

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

5. Providing funds to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation under certain conditions.

6. Permitting the use of fees from communication site rentals.

7. Permitting the collection of fees for processing mining applications and for certain public land uses.

8. Permitting the use of mining fee collections for program operations.

9. Providing for a Youth Conservation Corps.

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

10. Permitting the repayments of funds transferred from other accounts for firefighting.

11. Permitting the use of funds for lodging and subsistence of firefighters.

12. Permitting the use of grants, contracts and cooperative agreements for hazardous fuels reduction, including cost-sharing and local assistance.

13. Permitting reimbursement to the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service for consultation activities under the Endangered Species Act.

14. Permitting the use of firefighting funds for the leasing of properties or the construction of facilities.

15. Providing for the transfer of funds between the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture.

16. Providing funds for support of Federal emergency response actions.

#### OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

17. Authorizing the transfer of collections from the Oregon and California Land Grants Fund to the Treasury.

#### FOREST ECOSYSTEMS HEALTH AND RECOVERY FUND

18. Permitting the use of salvage timber receipts in the forest ecosystems health and recovery fund.

#### SERVICE CHARGES, DEPOSITS, AND FORFEITURES

19. Allowing the use of service charges, deposits and forfeitures funds on any damaged public lands.

20. Authorizing the Secretary to use monies from forfeitures, compromises or settlements for improvement, protection and rehabilitation of public lands under certain conditions.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

21. Permitting the payment of rewards for information on violations of law on Bureau lands

22. Providing for cost-sharing arrangements for printing services.

23. Amending 30 U.S.C. 28 making a minor technical change to mining law to clarify the time of day annual work on claims must be registered and extending the existing mine claim maintenance fee authority.

24. Permitting the use of refunds and rebates from an information technology vendor.

#### *UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE*

#### RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

25. Allowing for the maintenance of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge. Without this language, the long-horned cattle would have to be removed from the refuge.

26. Providing for a Youth Conservation Corps.

27. Limiting funding for certain Endangered Species Act listing programs.

28. Permitting payment for information or rewards in the law enforcement program.

29. Earmarking funds for contaminant analysis.

LAND ACQUISITION

30. Limiting the use of funds for administrative overhead, planning, and other management costs.

LANDOWNER INCENTIVE PROGRAM

31. Providing matching landowner incentive grants to States and territories.

PRIVATE STEWARDSHIP GRANTS PROGRAM

32. Providing private stewardship grants for private conservation efforts.

STATE TRIBAL WILDLIFE GRANTS

33. Specifying the State and Tribal Wildlife grants distribution formula, the planning and cost-sharing requirements, requiring that funds unobligated after two years be reapportioned, and limiting administrative costs.

34. Providing that no State, Territory, or other jurisdiction shall receive a grant if its conservation plan is disapproved.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

35. Limiting the purchase of motor vehicles.

36. Providing for repair of damage to public roads.

37. Providing options for the purchase of land not to exceed \$1.

38. Permitting cost-shared arrangements for printing services.

39. Permitting the use of funds for employment related legal services.

40. Permitting the acceptance of donated aircraft.

41. Limiting the use of funds for establishing new refuges.

*NATIONAL PARK SERVICE*

OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

42. Allowing road maintenance service to trucking permittees on a reimbursable basis. This provision has been included in annual appropriations Acts since 1954.

43. Providing for a Youth Conservation Corps program.

44. Restricting the use of funds for the United States Park Police.

45. Providing that funds may be spent without regard to the "no net loss" law enforcement policy.

NATIONAL RECREATION AND PRESERVATION

46. Limiting the use of cooperative agreements and any form of cash grant for the rivers, trail, and conservation assistance program.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND

47. Providing grants for Save America's Treasures and Preserve America to be matched by non-Federal funds, that individual projects are only eligible for one grant and are subject to consultation, and that funds for Federal projects are available by transfer to individual agencies.

## CONSTRUCTION

- 48. Limiting funds for Park Service Partnership projects with certain exceptions.
- 49. Limiting donation or services associated with new facilities.
- 50. Providing funds for modified water deliveries to Everglades National Park with certain restrictions.
- 51. Permitting the issuance of procurements for the full scope of projects for the National Mall and other historical sites.

## LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

- 52. Rescinding \$30,000,000 in land and water conservation fund contract authority.

## LAND ACQUISITION AND STATE ASSISTANCE

- 53. Prohibiting the use of funds to establish a contingency fund.

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

- 54. Preventing the implementation of an agreement for the redevelopment of the southern end of Ellis Island.
- 55. Providing for a grant to the Washington Tennis and Education Foundation.
- 56. Limiting the use of funds for the United Nation's Biodiversity Convention.
- 57. Permitting the use of funds for workplace safety needs.
- 58. Allowing the Secretary of the Interior to appeal value determinations.
- 59. Allowing certain franchise fees to be available for expenditure without further appropriation to extinguish or reduce liability for certain possessory interests.

*UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY*

## SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

- 60. Providing for two-year availability of funds for biological research and for the operations of cooperative research units.
- 61. Prohibiting the conduct of new surveys on private property without permission.
- 62. Requiring cost sharing for cooperative topographic mapping and water resource data collection activities.

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

- 63. Permitting the use of certain contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements.
- 64. Recognizing students and recent graduates as Federal employees for the purposes of travel and work injury compensation.
- 65. Requiring the continued operation of the Mid-Continent Mapping Center in Rolla, MO.

*MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE*

## ROYALTY AND OFFSHORE MINERALS MANAGEMENT

- 66. Permitting the use of excess receipts from Outer Continental Shelf leasing activities.

- 67. Providing no year funding availability for computer acquisitions.
- 68. Providing for reasonable expenses related to volunteer beach and marine cleanup activities.
- 69. Providing for refunds for overpayments on Indian allottee leases.
- 70. Permitting the use of receipts for administration of the Coastal Impact Assistance Program.

*OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT*

REGULATION AND TECHNOLOGY

- 71. Permitting the use of monies collected pursuant to assessment of civil penalties to reclaim lands affected by coal mining after August 3, 1977.
- 72. Permitting payment to State and tribal personnel for travel and per diem expenses for training.

ABANDONED MINE RECLAMATION FUND

- 73. Earmarking Abandoned Mine Reclamation funds for acid mine drainage.
- 74. Limiting grants to minimum program States.
- 75. Allowing the use of debt recovery to pay for debt collection.
- 76. Reallocating amounts in the Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation fund dedicated to the rural program (collected under section 402(g)(2) of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977), to the federal share portion of the fund (section 402(g)(3)).
- 77. Allowing funds to be used for travel expenses while attending training.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

- 78. Permits the Secretary to transfer title for computer equipment to States and Tribes.

*BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS*

OPERATION OF INDIAN PROGRAMS

- 79. Limiting funds for welfare assistance payments, except for disaster relief.
- 80. Limiting funds for contract support costs and for administrative cost grants for schools.
- 81. Permitting the use of tribal priority allocations for general assistance payments to individuals, for contract support costs, and school operations costs.
- 82. Providing for an Indian self-determination fund.
- 83. Allowing the transfer of certain forestry funds.

CONSTRUCTION

- 84. Providing for the transfer of Navajo irrigation project funds to the Bureau of Reclamation.
- 85. Providing that six percent of Federal Highway Trust Fund contract authority may be used for construction management costs.
- 86. Providing Safety of Dams funds on a nonreimbursable basis.

87. Requiring the use of administrative and cost accounting principles for certain school construction projects and exempting such projects from certain requirements.

88. Requiring conformance with building codes and health and safety standards and allowing the Secretary to assume control of a construction project under certain conditions.

89. Specifying the procedure for dispute resolution.

90. Allowing reimbursement of construction costs from the Office of Special Trustee.

#### MISCELLANEOUS PAYMENTS TO INDIANS

91. Permitting payment for the Quinault Indian Nation boundary settlement.

92. Providing funding for the Snake River Water Rights Act of 2004, including funding for habitat restoration by the State of Idaho and transfer of funds to the Bureau of Land Management for mitigation of land transfers.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

93. Allowing contracting for the San Carlos Irrigation Project.

94. Limiting use of funds for passenger motor vehicles.

95. Limiting the use of funds for contracts, grants and cooperative agreements.

96. Allowing tribes to return appropriated funds for distribution to other tribes.

97. Prohibiting funding of Alaska schools.

98. Limiting the number of schools and the expansion of grade levels in individual schools.

99. Permitting the use of Indian Student Equalization Program funds to offset costs associated with significant enrollment increases.

100. Specifying distribution of indirect and administrative costs for certain Tribes.

#### *DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES*

##### INSULAR AFFAIRS, ASSISTANCE TO TERRITORIES

101. Earmarking funds for various programs and for salaries and expenses for the Office of Insular Affairs and providing two year funding availability for the latter.

102. Requiring audits of the financial transactions of the Territorial governments by the GAO.

103. Providing grant funding under certain terms of the Agreement of the Special Representatives on Future United States Financial Assistance for the Northern Mariana Islands.

104. Allowing grants for the Pacific Basin Development Council.

105. Providing a grant to the Close Up foundation.

106. Providing for capital infrastructure in various Territories.

107. Allowing appropriations for disaster assistance to be used as non-Federal matching funds for hazard mitigation grants.

##### DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

108. Deriving funds for appraisal services and Take Pride in America activities from Land and Water Conservation Fund.

- 109. Permitting payments to former Bureau of Mines workers.
- 110. Limiting the establishment of additional reserves in the working capital fund.

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

- 111. Excluding any payment pursuant to the Payments in Lieu of Taxes that is less than \$100.

OFFICE OF SPECIAL TRUSTEE FOR AMERICAN INDIANS

FEDERAL TRUST PROGRAMS

- 112. Limiting the amount of funding available for the historical accounting of Indian trust fund accounts.
- 113. Allowing transfers to other Department of the Interior accounts.
- 114. Specifying that the statute of limitations shall not commence on any claim resulting from trust funds losses.
- 115. Exempting quarterly statements for Indian trust accounts \$15 or less.
- 116. Requiring annual statements and records maintenance for Indian trust accounts.
- 117. Limiting use of funds to correct administrative errors in Indian trust accounts.
- 118. Permitting the use of recoveries from erroneous payments pursuant to Indian trust accounts.

INDIAN LAND CONSOLIDATION

- 119. Permitting transfers of funds to the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Departmental Management accounts from Indian land consolidation for administrative expenses.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

- 120. Allowing the sale of existing aircraft with proceeds used to offset the purchase price of replacement aircraft.
- 121. Prohibiting the use of working capital or consolidated working funds to augment certain offices.
- 122. Requiring description of working capital fund charges in annual budget justifications.
- 123. Requiring Committee approval of departures from Working Capital Fund estimates.
- 124. Requiring reports on National Business Center activities.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

- 125. Allowing transfer of funds in certain emergency situations and requiring replacement with a supplemental appropriation request.
- 126. Permitting the Department to use limited funding for certain services.
- 127. Restricting various oil preleasing, leasing, exploration and drilling activities within the Outer Continental Shelf in the Georges Bank North Atlantic planning area, Mid Atlantic and South Atlantic planning areas, Eastern Gulf of Mexico planning area, North Aleutian Basin planning area, Northern, Southern and

Central California planning areas, and Washington/Oregon planning area.

128. Permitting the transfer of funds between the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Office of Special Trustee for American Indians.

129. Permitting the redistribution of certain Indian funds with limitations.

130. Permitting the conveyance of the Twin Cities Research Center.

131. Allowing the use of helicopters and motor vehicles on Sheldon and Hart National Wildlife Refuges.

132. Authorizing funding transfers for Shenandoah Valley Battlefield NHD and Ice Age NST.

133. Prohibiting the closure of the underground lunchroom at Carlsbad Caverns NP.

134. Prohibiting demolition of the bridge between New Jersey and Ellis Island.

135. Limiting compensation for the Special Master and Court Monitor for the Cobell v. Norton litigation.

136. Allowing payment of attorney fees for Federal employees related to the Cobell v. Norton litigation.

137. Requiring the Fish and Wildlife Service to mark hatchery salmon.

138. Addressing the use of certain Indian lands for gaming purposes.

139. Preventing funds to study or reduce the water level at Lake Powell.

140. Limiting the amount of fees that may be collected by the National Indian Gaming Commission.

141. Providing for a tribal trust demonstration program.

142. Providing for the renewal of certain grazing permits in the Jarbidge Field office of the Bureau of Land Management.

143. Authorizing the acquisition of lands and leases for Ellis Island.

144. Permitting the Secretary of the Interior to issue grazing permits within the Mojave National Preserve.

145. Implementing rules concerning winter snowmobile use at Yellowstone National Park.

146. Limiting the use of funds for Centers of Excellence and Partnership Skills Bank Training.

## *TITLE II—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY*

### SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

147. Limiting certain per diem rates and certain other operating expenses.

### ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

148. Limiting certain per diem rates, other operating expenses, official representation and reception expenses and providing two year funding availability for administrative costs of Brownfields program.

### HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND

149. Limiting construction and repair expenses.

150. Providing for the allocation of funds to other Federal agencies under certain circumstances.

151. Providing for the transfer of funds within certain agency accounts.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

152. Limiting construction and repair expenses.

153. Providing that, in fiscal year 2007 and thereafter, the Inspector General shall not serve as Inspector General for the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board.

LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK PROGRAM

154. Limiting construction and repair expenses.

STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

155. Permitting the use of limited State Revolving Funds for decentralized projects.

156. Earmarking funds for the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds for grants to United States-Mexico border programs, Alaska for water and wastewater infrastructure needs.

157. Earmarking funds for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements with a minimum of 45% cost-share per project.

158. Earmarking funds for Brownfields grants, diesel grants, and categorical grants to States.

159. Earmarking grants for water quality monitoring, leaking underground storage tanks and competitive targeted watershed grants.

160. Providing waivers for certain uses of State water pollution control State revolving funds for grants to Federally-recognized Indian Tribes, and for the cap on grants at the discretion of the Administrator.

161. Prohibiting the use of funds for jurisdictions that permit development or construction of additional colonial areas.

162. Making a technical correction to the 2005 appropriations for special project funding.

163. Providing for the transfer of special project funds, unawarded after 7 years, to the appropriate State Revolving Funds.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

164. Allowing awards of grants to federally-recognized Indian tribes.

165. Authorizing the collection of pesticide registration service fees.

166. Limiting the use of funds for consultants.

167. Requiring EPA to finalize a rule incorporating financial incentives for States that implement adequate National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System fee programs.

GENERAL PROVISION, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

168. Prohibiting the use of funds in contravention of executive order 12898 and 15 U.S.C. 2862(c)(3).

*TITLE III—RELATED AGENCIES**FOREST SERVICE*

## FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

169. Earmarking funds for the forest inventory and analysis program.

## STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY

170. Deriving forest legacy funding from the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

171. Requiring notification to the House and Senate Appropriations Committee before releasing forest legacy project funds.

## NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

172. Allowing 50 percent of the fees collected under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act to remain available until expended.

173. Requiring the budget justification to display unobligated balances available at the start of fiscal year.

## WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

174. Allowing the use of wildland fire funds to repay advances from other accounts.

175. Allowing reimbursement of States for certain wildfire emergency activities.

176. Requiring 50 percent of any unobligated balances remaining at the end of the fiscal year, except hazardous fuels funding, to be transferred to the Knutson-Vandenberg Fund as repayment for past advances.

177. Permitting the use of funds for the joint fire science program.

178. Permitting the use of forest and rangeland research funds for fire science research.

179. Permitting the use of funds for emergency rehabilitation and restoration and hazardous fuels reduction to support emergency response and wildfire suppression.

180. Earmarking funds for hazardous fuels reduction, rehabilitation, restoration, and research and permitting competitive research grants.

181. Earmarking funds for State fire assistance, volunteer fire assistance and forest health on Federal and State and private lands.

182. Permitting funding transfers with Committee approval in certain cases.

183. Providing for cost-shared cooperative agreements.

184. Providing for the use of funds on adjacent, non-Federal lands for hazard reduction.

185. Providing for the use of hazardous fuels reduction funds to create incentives for increased use of biomass on National Forest lands.

186. Providing that funds for wildfire suppression shall be assessed for indirect costs.

187. Providing for the transfer of wildland fire funds between the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture.

## CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT AND MAINTENANCE

188. Allowing capital improvement and maintenance funds to be used for road decommissioning.

189. Requiring that no road decommissioning be funded until notice and an opportunity for public comment has been provided.

## RANGE BETTERMENT FUND

190. Providing that six percent of range betterment funds may be used for administrative expenses.

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

191. Permitting the purchase of passenger motor vehicles.

192. Providing that proceeds from the sale of aircraft may be used to purchase replacement aircraft.

193. Allowing funds for certain employment contracts.

194. Allowing funds to be used for purchase and alteration of buildings.

195. Allowing for acquisition of certain lands and interests.

196. Allowing expenses for certain volunteer activities.

197. Providing for the cost of uniforms.

198. Providing for debt collections on certain contracts.

199. Permitting the transfer of funds for emergency firefighting from other forest service accounts under certain circumstances.

200. Providing that the first transfer of funds for emergency firefighting shall include land acquisition and forest legacy funds.

201. Allowing funds to be used through the Agency for International Development for work in foreign countries and to support other forestry activities outside of the United States.

202. Prohibiting the transfer of funds under the Department of Agriculture transfer authority under certain conditions.

203. Prohibiting reprogramming of funds without approval.

204. Limiting funds to be transferred to the USDA Working Capital Fund.

205. Providing for a Youth Conservation Corps program.

206. Limiting the use of funds for official reception and representation expenses.

207. Providing for matching funds and administrative expenses for the National Forest Foundation and matching funds for the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation.

208. Permitting the use of funds for payments to counties in the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area.

209. Limiting reimbursements to the Office of General Counsel for travel and related expenses and requiring the display of such transfers in the budget request.

210. Allowing the limited use of funds for law enforcement emergencies.

211. Providing Federal employee status for certain individuals employed under the Older American Act of 1965.

212. Permitting funding assessments for facilities maintenance, rent, utilities, and other support services.

*INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE*

## INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES

213. Providing that Tribal contract and grant funding is deemed obligated at the time of grant or contract award and remains available until expended.

214. Limiting funds for catastrophic care and loan repayment and providing no year availability for loan repayment funds.

215. Providing that certain contracts and grants may be performed in two fiscal years.

216. Permitting the use of Indian Health Care Improvement Fund monies for facilities improvement and providing no year funding availability.

217. Providing no year funding availability for scholarship funds.

218. Exempting certain Tribal funding from fiscal year constraints.

219. Limiting contract support cost spending.

220. Providing for use of collections and reporting of collections under Title IV of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act.

221. Providing for the collection of individually identifiable health information relating to the Americans with Disabilities Act by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

## INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

222. Providing that facilities funds may be used to purchase land, modular buildings and trailers.

223. Providing for TRANSAM equipment to be purchased from the Department of Defense.

224. Prohibiting the use of funds for sanitation facilities for new homes funded by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

225. Allowing for the purchase of ambulances.

226. Providing for a demolition fund.

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

227. Providing for payments for telephone service in private residences in the field, purchase of motor vehicles, aircraft and reprints.

228. Providing for purchase and erection of modular buildings.

229. Providing funds for uniforms.

230. Allowing funding for attendance at professional meetings.

231. Providing that health care may be extended to non-Indians at Indian Health Service facilities, subject to charges, and for the use of those funds.

232. Permitting the use of funds transferred from the Department of Health and Human Services.

233. Prohibiting limitations on certain federal travel and transportation.

234. Prohibiting personnel ceilings assessments by the Department of Health and Human Services.

235. Allowing deobligation and reobligation of funds applied to self-governance funding agreements.

236. Prohibiting the expenditure of funds to implement new eligibility regulations.

237. Permitting certain reimbursements and the use of those funds.

238. Providing that reimbursements for training provide total costs.

239. Prohibiting changing the appropriations structure without approval of the Appropriations Committees.

*NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH*

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES

240. Earmarking funds for individual project grants and providing two year funding availability.

*AGENCY FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND DISEASE REGISTRY*

TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL PUBLIC HEALTH

241. Earmarking funds for Individual Learning Accounts and providing no year funding availability.

242. Providing for the conduct of health studies, testing, and monitoring.

243. Providing deadlines for health assessments and studies.

244. Limiting administrative costs paid to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

245. Limiting the number of toxicological profiles.

*EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT*

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

246. Authorizing the appointment and duties of the chairman.

CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

247. Limiting the use of funds for per diem expenses and the number of senior level positions.

248. Providing that in fiscal year 2007 and thereafter the EPA, Inspector General shall not serve as Inspector General for the Board.

*OFFICE OF NAVAJO AND HOPI INDIAN RELOCATION*

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

249. Defining eligible relocatees.

250. Prohibiting movement of any single Navajo or Navajo family unless a new or replacement home is available.

251. Limiting relocatees to one new or replacement home.

252. Establishing a priority for relocation of Navajos to those certified eligible who have selected and received homesites on the Navajo reservation or selected a replacement residence off the Navajo reservation.

*SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION*

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

- 253. Limiting lease terms.
- 254. Providing for purchase of passenger vehicles and certain rental, repair and cleaning of uniforms.
- 255. Earmarking funds for facilities maintenance at the Zoo and for certain programs at the National Museum of African American History and Culture and repatriation of skeletal remains and providing no year funding availability.
- 256. Earmarking funds for fellowships and scholarly awards and providing two year funding availability.
- 257. Providing that funds may be used to support American Overseas Research Centers and earmarking \$125,000 for the Council of Overseas Research Centers.
- 258. Allowing for advance payments to independent contractors performing research services or participating in official Smithsonian presentations.

## FACILITIES CAPITAL

- 259. Earmarking funds for maintenance, repair, rehabilitation, and construction at the Zoo and for consultant services.
- 260. Permitting the Smithsonian Institution to select contractors for certain purposes on the basis of contractor qualifications as well as price.

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

- 261. Precluding any changes to the Smithsonian science program without prior approval of the Board of Regents.
- 262. Limiting the design or expansion of current space or facilities without consultation with the Committees.
- 263. Limiting the use of funds for the Holt House.
- 264. Limiting reprogramming of funds.
- 265. Prohibiting purchase of buildings without prior consultation.
- 266. Limiting the use of funds for contracts and agreements with for-profit entities.
- 267. Limiting the compensation of Smithsonian employees.

*NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART*

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

- 268. Allowing payment in advance for membership in library, museum, and art associations or societies.
- 269. Providing for restoration and repair of works of art by contract without advertising.
- 270. Providing no-year availability of funds for special exhibitions.

## REPAIR, RESTORATION, AND RENOVATION OF BUILDINGS

- 271. Permitting the Gallery to perform work by contract or otherwise and to select contractors for certain purposes on the basis of contractor qualifications as well as price.
- 272. Permitting the Gallery to issue a single procurement for the full scope of the Work Area #3 contract.

*NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES*

## NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS, GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

273. Permitting transfer of funds within certain accounts and requiring funds to be expensed in accordance with Public Law 108-108.

## NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES, MATCHING GRANTS

274. Allowing obligation of National Endowment for the Humanities current and prior year funds from gifts, bequests, and devises of money for which equal amounts have not previously been appropriated.

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

275. Prohibiting the use of funds for grants and contracts which do not include the text of 18 U.S.C. 1913.

276. Prohibiting the use of appropriated funds and permitting the use of nonappropriated funds for reception expenses.

277. Allowing the chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts to approve small grants under certain circumstances.

278. Specifying that grants and contracts supported entirely with nonappropriated funds are not subject to matching requirements.

*COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS*

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

279. Permitting the charging and use of fees for its publications.

*ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION*

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

280. Restricting hiring at Executive Level V or higher.

*NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION*

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

281. Permitting limited use of funds for official reception and representation expenses.

*UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM*

282. Earmarking funds for equipment replacement and for repair, rehabilitation and for exhibition design and production and providing no year availability for these funds.

*TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS*

283. Providing for public availability of information on consulting services contracts.

284. Prohibiting the use of funds to distribute literature either to promote or oppose legislative proposals on which Congressional action is incomplete.

285. Specifying that funds are for one year unless provided otherwise.

286. Prohibiting the use of funds to provide personal cooks, chauffeurs or other personal servants to any office or employee.

287. Limiting assessments against programs funded in this bill.
288. Limiting transfer of funds.
289. Prohibiting the sale of giant sequoia trees in a manner different from 2005.
290. Continuing a limitation on accepting and processing applications for patents and on the patenting of Federal lands; permitting processing of grandfathered applications; and permitting third-party contractors to process grandfathered applications.
291. Limiting the use of funds for contract support costs on Indian contracts.
292. Making reforms in the National Endowment for the Arts, including funding distribution reforms.
293. Limiting funds for completing or issuing the five-year program under the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act.
294. Limiting the use of telephone answering machines.
295. Clarifying the Forest Service land management planning revision requirements.
296. Limiting leasing and preleasing activities within National Monuments.
297. Providing the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to enter into reciprocal agreements with foreign nations concerning the personal liability of firefighters.
298. Permitting consideration, when awarding contracts, to local contractors who provide employment and training for dislocated and displaced workers in economically disadvantaged rural communities.
299. Providing certain limitation of funds for Federal land takings excluding those under the Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act.
300. Limiting the use of funds for competitive sourcing studies.
301. Prohibiting use of funds for certain government-wide activities.
302. Enhancing forest service administration of rights-of-way and land uses (Public Law 106–113).
303. Providing for the exchange of lands in San Bernardino, California, to relocate the forest supervisor's office.
304. Limiting competitive sourcing studies related to wildfire management or wildfire suppression.
305. Limiting contracting for the fire programs analysis system unless the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture certify the program is on track.
306. Limiting the compensation of Smithsonian employees.
307. Expressing the sense of the Congress on greenhouse gas emissions control.

*TITLE V—SUSPENSION OF ROYALTY RELIEF*

308. Providing direction to the Secretary of the Interior on royalty relief suspension for oil and gas leases.

APPROPRIATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED BY LAW

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following table lists the appropriations in the accompanying bill which are not authorized by law:

(Dollars in thousands)

	Last year of authorization	Authorization level	Appropriations in last year of authorization	Appropriations in this bill
Bureau of Land Management:				
All discretionary programs .....	2002	Such sums	\$1,681,437	\$1,785,347
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service:				
Resource Management:				
Endangered Species Act Amendments of 1988 .....	1992	\$41,500	35,721	146,610
Great Lakes Fish & Wildlife Restoration Grants .....	2004	4,000	498	500
Marine Mammal Protection Act Amendments of 1994 .....	1999	10,296	2,008	4,443
General Administration:				
Great Ape Conservation .....	2005	5,000	1,381	1,290
Fisheries Restoration Irrigation Mitigation Act .....	2005	25,000	2,000	4,000
Neotropical Migratory Birds .....	2005	5,000	3,944	4,000
U.S. Geological Survey:				
National Geologic Mapping Reauthorization Act of 1999 .....	2005	64,000	25,162	25,447
Water Resources Research Act of 1984 .....	2005	12,000	6,409	6,404
Environmental Protection Agency:				
Hazardous Substance Superfund .....	1994	5,100,000	1,480,853	1,256,855
State and Tribal Assistance Grants:				
Alaska Native Villages .....	1979	2,000	Not available	14,850
Clean Water SRF .....	1992	1,800,000	2,400,000	687,555
Drinking Water SRF .....	2003	1,000,000	.....	841,500
Clean Air Act .....	1997	Such sums	167,230	231,220
Radon Abatement Act .....	1991	10,000	9,000	8,074
Clean Water Act (FWPCA) .....	1991	.....	.....	457,761
BEACH Act .....	2005	30,000	9,920	9,900
Safe Drinking Water Act .....	2003	115,000	.....	114,939
Solid Waste Disposal Act (RCRA) .....	1988	70,000	71,391	103,345
Toxic Substances Control Act .....	1983	1,500	5,100	18,661
Pollution Prevention Act .....	1993	8,000	6,800	5,940
Indian Environmental General Assistance Program Act .....	1998	Such sums	38,585	56,925
LUST Trust Fund .....	1988	10,000	14,400	17,567
National Endowment for the Arts .....	1993	Such sums	174,460	124,412
National Endowment for the Humanities .....	1993	Such sums	177,403	140,955
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation .....	2005	5,000	4,860	5,118

The Committee notes that authorizing legislation for many of these programs is in various stages of the legislative process and expects these authorizations to be enacted into law later this year.

#### STATEMENT OF GENERAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Pursuant to clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following is a statement of general performance goals and objectives for which this measure authorizes funding:

The Committee on Appropriations considers program performance, including a program's success in developing and attaining outcome-related goals and objectives, in developing funding recommendations.

## FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

ROLL CALL NO. 1

Date: May 10, 2006

Measure: Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2007

Motion by: Mr. Obey

Description of Motion: To increase various programs throughout the bill by \$800,000,000; offset by a reduction to tax cuts for certain income groups.

Results: Rejected 27 yeas to 35 nays.

*Members Voting Yea*

Mr. Berry  
 Mr. Bishop  
 Mr. Boyd  
 Mr. Cramer  
 Ms. DeLauro  
 Mr. Dicks  
 Mr. Edwards  
 Mr. Farr  
 Mr. Fattah  
 Mr. Hinchey  
 Mr. Hoyer  
 Mr. Jackson  
 Ms. Kaptur  
 Ms. Kilpatrick  
 Mrs. Lowey  
 Mr. Mollohan  
 Mr. Moran  
 Mr. Murtha  
 Mr. Obey  
 Mr. Olver  
 Mr. Pastor  
 Mr. Price  
 Mr. Rothman  
 Ms. Roybal-Allard  
 Mr. Sabo  
 Mr. Serrano  
 Mr. Visclosky

*Members Voting Nay*

Mr. Aderholt  
 Mr. Alexander  
 Mr. Bonilla  
 Mr. Carter  
 Mr. Crenshaw  
 Mr. Culberson  
 Mr. Doolittle  
 Mrs. Emerson  
 Mr. Frelinghuysen  
 Mr. Goode  
 Ms. Granger  
 Mr. Hobson  
 Mr. Istook  
 Mr. Kingston  
 Mr. Knollenberg  
 Mr. Kolbe  
 Mr. LaHood  
 Mr. Latham  
 Mr. Lewis  
 Mrs. Northup  
 Mr. Peterson  
 Mr. Regula  
 Mr. Rehberg  
 Mr. Rogers  
 Mr. Sherwood  
 Mr. Simpson  
 Mr. Sweeney  
 Mr. Taylor  
 Mr. Tiahrt  
 Mr. Walsh  
 Mr. Wamp  
 Dr. Weldon  
 Mr. Wicker  
 Mr. Wolf  
 Mr. Young

## FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

ROLL CALL NO. 2

Date: May 10, 2006

Measure: Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2007

Motion by: Mr. Peterson

Description of Motion: To modify the limitation of funds provisions dealing with outer continental shelf leasing and related activities to remove restrictions on natural gas.

Results: Adopted 37 yeas to 25 nays.

*Members Voting Yea*

Mr. Aderholt  
 Mr. Alexander  
 Mr. Berry  
 Mr. Bishop  
 Mr. Bonilla  
 Mr. Carter  
 Mr. Cramer  
 Mr. Culberson  
 Mr. DeLay  
 Mr. Doolittle  
 Mr. Edwards  
 Mrs. Emerson  
 Mr. Goode  
 Ms. Granger  
 Mr. Hobson  
 Mr. Istook  
 Mr. Knollenberg  
 Mr. Kolbe  
 Mr. Latham  
 Mr. Lewis  
 Mr. Mollohan  
 Mr. Murtha  
 Mrs. Northup  
 Mr. Peterson  
 Mr. Regula  
 Mr. Rehberg  
 Mr. Rogers  
 Mr. Sabo  
 Mr. Sherwood  
 Mr. Simpson  
 Mr. Taylor  
 Mr. Tiahrt  
 Mr. Visclosky  
 Mr. Walsh  
 Mr. Wamp  
 Mr. Wicker  
 Mr. Wolf

*Members Voting Nay*

Mr. Boyd  
 Mr. Clyburn  
 Mr. Crenshaw  
 Ms. DeLauro  
 Mr. Dicks  
 Mr. Farr  
 Mr. Fattah  
 Mr. Hinchey  
 Mr. Hoyer  
 Mr. Jackson  
 Ms. Kaptur  
 Ms. Kilpatrick  
 Mr. Kingston  
 Mr. LaHood  
 Mrs. Lowey  
 Mr. Moran  
 Mr. Obey  
 Mr. Olver  
 Mr. Pastor  
 Mr. Price  
 Mr. Rothman  
 Ms. Roybal-Allard  
 Mr. Serrano  
 Dr. Weldon  
 Mr. Young

## COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XIII—CLAUSE 3

In compliance with clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

Section 28 of title 30 U.S.C. is amended as follows:

Sec. 28. The miners of each mining district may make regulations not in conflict with the laws of the United States, or with the laws of the State or Territory in which the district is situated, governing the location, manner of recording, amount of work necessary to hold possession of a mining claim, subject to the following requirements: The location must be distinctly marked on the ground so that its boundaries can be readily traced. \* \* \* The period within which the work required to be done annually on all unpatented mineral claims located since May 10, 1872, including such claims in the Territory of Alaska, [shall commence at 12 o'clock meridian on the 1st day of September] shall commence at 12:00 ante meridian on the 1st day of September succeeding the date of location of such claim.

Section 28f(a) of title 30 U.S.C. is amended as follows:

(a) CLAIM MAINTENANCE FEE.—The holder of each unpatented mining claim, mill, or tunnel site, located pursuant to the mining laws of the United States, whether located before, on or after August 10, 1993, shall pay to the Secretary of the Interior, on or before September 1 of each year[for years 2004 through 2008], a claim maintenance fee of \$100 per claim or site (!1) Such claim maintenance fee shall be in lieu of the assessment work requirement contained in the Mining Law of 1872 (30 U.S.C. 28–28e) (!2) and the related filing requirements contained in section 1744(a) and (c) of title 43.

Section 28g of title 30 U.S.C. is amended as follows:

Sec. 28g. Location fee.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for every unpatented mining claim, mill or tunnel site located after August 10, 1993, [and before September 30, 2008,] pursuant to the Mining Laws of the United States, the locator shall, at the time the location notice is recorded with the Bureau of Land Management, pay to the Secretary of the Interior a location fee, in addition to the claim maintenance fee required by section 28f of this title, of \$25.00 per claim.

## FIVE-YEAR PROJECTION OF OUTLAYS

In compliance with section 308(a)(1)(B) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344), as amended, the following table contains five-year projections associated with the budget authority provided in the accompanying bill:

	[In millions]	
Budget authority (discretionary) .....		25,889
Outlays:		
Fiscal year 2007 .....		16,291
Fiscal year 2008 .....		5,356
Fiscal year 2009 .....		2,337
Fiscal year 2010 .....		1,222
Fiscal year 2011 .....		481

#### ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

In accordance with section 308(a)(1)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), as amended, the financial assistance to State and local governments is as follows:

	[In millions]	
New budget authority .....		5,511
Fiscal year 2007 outlays resulting therefrom .....		2,284

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2006  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2007  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Bureau of Land Management					
Management of lands and resources.....	848,132	863,244	867,738	+19,606	+4,494
Rescission (P.L. 109-148).....	-500	---	---	+500	---
Wildland fire management:					
Preparedness.....	268,839	274,801	274,801	+5,962	---
Fire suppression operations.....	230,721	257,041	257,041	+26,320	---
Other operations.....	255,726	237,718	237,411	-18,315	-307
Subtotal.....	755,286	769,560	769,253	+13,967	-307
Construction.....	11,750	6,476	11,476	-274	+5,000
Land acquisition.....	8,621	8,767	3,067	-5,554	-5,700
Oregon and California grant lands.....	108,451	112,408	111,408	+2,957	-1,000
Range improvements (indefinite).....	10,000	10,000	10,000	---	---
Service charges, deposits, & forfeitures (indefinite).....	25,483	25,483	25,483	---	---
Offsetting fee collections.....	-25,483	-25,483	-25,483	---	---
Miscellaneous trust funds (indefinite).....	12,405	12,405	12,405	---	---
Total, Bureau of Land Management.....	1,754,145	1,782,860	1,785,347	+31,202	+2,487

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2006  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2007  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>United States Fish and Wildlife Service</b>					
Resource management.....	994,037	995,594	1,016,669	+22,632	+21,075
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148).....	7,398	---	---	-7,398	---
Construction.....	45,216	19,722	39,756	-5,460	+20,034
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148).....	30,000	---	---	-30,000	---
Land acquisition.....	27,990	27,079	19,751	-8,239	-7,328
Landowner incentive program.....	23,667	24,400	15,000	-8,667	-9,400
Rescission (P.L. 109-148).....	-2,000	---	---	+2,000	---
Private stewardship grants.....	7,277	9,400	7,000	-2,277	-2,400
Cooperative endangered species conservation fund.....	81,001	80,001	80,507	-494	+506
Rescission (P.L. 109-148).....	-1,000	---	---	+1,000	---
National wildlife refuge fund.....	14,202	10,811	14,202	-2,766	+3,391
North American wetlands conservation fund.....	39,412	41,646	36,646	-2,766	-5,000
Neotropical migratory birds conservation fund.....	3,941	---	4,000	+59	+4,000
Multinational species conservation fund.....	6,404	8,217	6,057	-347	-2,160
State and tribal wildlife grants.....	67,492	74,666	50,000	-17,492	-24,666
<b>Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service..</b>	<b>1,345,037</b>	<b>1,291,536</b>	<b>1,289,588</b>	<b>-55,449</b>	<b>-1,948</b>
<b>National Park Service</b>					
Operation of the national park system.....	1,718,415	1,742,317	1,754,317	+35,902	+12,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148).....	525	---	---	-525	---
United States Park Police.....	80,213	84,775	84,775	+4,562	---
National recreation and preservation.....	54,156	33,261	47,161	-6,995	+13,900
Historic preservation fund.....	72,172	71,858	58,658	-13,514	-13,200
Construction and major maintenance.....	313,858	229,269	229,934	-83,924	+665
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148).....	19,000	---	---	-19,000	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2006  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2007  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Land and water conservation fund (rescission of contract authority).....	-30,000	-30,000	-30,000	---	---
Land acquisition and state assistance.....	63,954	24,343	29,995	-33,959	+5,652
Use of prior year balances.....	-17,000	---	---	+17,000	---
Total, National Park Service (net).....	2,275,293	2,155,823	2,174,840	-100,453	+19,017
United States Geological Survey					
Surveys, investigations, and research.....	961,675	944,760	991,447	+29,772	+46,687
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148).....	8,970	---	---	-8,970	---
Total, United States Geological Survey.....	970,645	944,760	991,447	+20,802	+46,687
Minerals Management Service					
Royalty and offshore minerals management.....	274,121	285,381	286,226	+12,105	+845
Use of receipts.....	-122,730	-128,730	-128,730	-6,000	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148).....	16,000	---	---	-16,000	---
Oil spill research.....	6,903	6,903	6,903	---	---
Total, Minerals Management Service.....	174,294	163,554	164,399	-9,895	+845

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2006  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2007  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement</b>					
Regulation and technology.....	108,810	112,109	112,109	+3,299	---
Receipts from performance bond forfeitures (indefinite).....	99	100	100	+1	---
Subtotal.....	108,909	112,209	112,209	+3,300	---
Abandoned mine reclamation fund (definite, trust fund)	185,248	185,936	185,936	+688	---
Total, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement.....	294,157	298,145	298,145	+3,988	---
<b>Bureau of Indian Affairs</b>					
Operation of Indian programs.....	1,962,190	1,966,594	1,973,403	+11,213	+6,809
Construction.....	271,582	215,049	215,799	-55,783	+750
Indian land and water claim settlements and miscellaneous payments to Indians.....	34,243	33,946	39,213	+4,970	+5,267
Indian guaranteed loan program account.....	6,255	6,262	6,262	+7	---
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	2,274,270	2,221,851	2,234,677	-39,593	+12,826

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2006  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2007  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
----- Departmental Offices -----					
Insular Affairs:					
Assistance to Territories.....	48,440	46,641	49,841	+1,401	+3,200
Northern Marianas.....	27,720	27,720	27,720	---	---
Subtotal.....	76,160	74,361	77,561	+1,401	+3,200
Compact of Free Association.....	3,313	2,862	3,362	+49	+500
Mandatory payments.....	2,000	2,000	2,000	---	---
Subtotal.....	5,313	4,862	5,362	+49	+500
Total, Insular Affairs.....	81,473	79,223	82,923	+1,450	+3,700
Departmental management.....	130,238	118,845	118,303	-11,935	-542
Payments in lieu of taxes.....	232,528	198,000	228,000	-4,528	+30,000
Central hazardous materials fund.....	9,710	9,923	9,923	+213	---
Office of the Solicitor.....	54,624	56,755	56,755	+2,131	---
Office of Inspector General.....	38,541	40,699	39,688	+1,147	-1,011

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2006  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2007  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Office of Special Trustee for American Indians</b>					
Federal trust programs.....	188,774	185,036	150,036	-38,738	-35,000
Indian land consolidation.....	34,006	59,449	34,006	---	-25,443
<b>Total, Office of Special Trustee for American Indians.....</b>	<b>222,780</b>	<b>244,485</b>	<b>184,042</b>	<b>-38,738</b>	<b>-60,443</b>
<b>Natural resource damage assessment fund.....</b>					
	6,016	6,109	6,109	+93	---
<b>Total, Departmental Offices.....</b>	<b>775,910</b>	<b>754,039</b>	<b>725,743</b>	<b>-50,167</b>	<b>-28,296</b>
<b>Total, title I, Department of the Interior.....</b>					
Appropriations.....	9,863,751	9,612,568	9,664,186	-199,565	+51,618
Emergency appropriations.....	(9,815,358)	(9,642,568)	(9,694,186)	(-121,172)	(+51,618)
Rescission.....	(81,893)	---	---	(-81,893)	---
	(-33,500)	(-30,000)	(-30,000)	(+3,500)	---
<b>TITLE II - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY</b>					
<b>Science and technology.....</b>					
(By transfer from Hazardous substance superfund).....	730,810	788,274	808,044	+77,234	+19,770
Environmental programs and management.....	(30,156)	(27,811)	(30,011)	(-145)	(+2,200)
Office of Inspector General.....	2,346,711	2,306,617	2,336,442	-10,269	+29,825
(By transfer from Hazardous substance superfund).....	36,904	35,100	35,100	-1,804	---
Buildings and facilities.....	(13,337)	(13,316)	(13,316)	(-21)	---
Hazardous substance superfund.....	39,626	39,816	39,816	+190	---
Transfer to Office of Inspector General.....	1,242,074	1,258,955	1,256,855	+14,781	-2,100
Transfer to Science and Technology.....	(-13,337)	(-13,316)	(-13,316)	(+21)	---
	(-30,156)	(-27,811)	(-30,011)	(+145)	(-2,200)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2006  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2007  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Leaking underground storage tank program.....	71,953	72,759	72,759	+806	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L.109-148).....	8,000	---	---	-8,000	---
Oil spill response.....	15,629	16,506	16,506	+877	---
Pesticide registration fund.....	15,000	10,000	10,000	-5,000	---
Pesticide registration fees.....	-15,000	-10,000	-10,000	+5,000	---
State and tribal assistance grants.....	2,100,634	1,708,264	1,884,764	-215,870	+176,500
Categorical grants.....	1,113,075	1,089,184	1,122,584	+9,509	+33,400
Subtotal, State and tribal assistance grants....	3,213,709	2,797,448	3,007,348	-206,361	+209,900
Rescissions (various EPA accounts).....	-80,000	---	---	+80,000	---
Total, title II, Environmental Protection Agency.....	7,625,416	7,315,475	7,572,870	-52,546	+257,395
Appropriations.....	(7,697,416)	(7,315,475)	(7,572,870)	(-124,546)	(+257,395)
Emergency appropriations.....	(8,000)	---	---	(-8,000)	---
Rescissions.....	(-80,000)	---	---	(+80,000)	---
(Transfer out).....	(-43,493)	(-41,127)	(-43,327)	(+166)	(-2,200)
(By transfer).....	(43,493)	(41,127)	(43,327)	(-166)	(+2,200)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2006  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2007  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE III - RELATED AGENCIES					
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
Forest Service					
Forest and rangeland research.....	277,711	267,791	280,318	+2,607	+12,527
State and private forestry.....	278,966	244,410	228,608	-50,358	-15,802
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148).....	30,000	---	---	-30,000	---
National forest system.....	1,415,646	1,398,066	1,445,659	+30,013	+47,593
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148).....	20,000	---	---	-20,000	---
Wildland fire management:					
Preparedness.....	660,705	655,867	655,887	-4,818	---
Fire suppression operations.....	690,186	746,176	741,477	+51,291	-4,699
Other operations.....	395,200	366,132	413,202	+18,002	+47,070
Subtotal.....	1,746,091	1,768,195	1,810,566	+64,475	+42,371
Capital improvement and maintenance.....	431,334	382,601	411,025	-20,309	+28,424
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148).....	7,000	---	---	-7,000	---
Land acquisition.....	41,772	25,075	7,500	-34,272	-17,575
Acquisition of lands for national forests, special acts.....	1,053	1,053	1,053	---	---
Acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges (indefinite).....	231	231	231	---	---
Range betterment fund (indefinite).....	2,920	3,932	3,932	+1,012	---
Gifts, donations and bequests for forest and rangeland research.....	63	63	63	---	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2006  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2007  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Management of national forest lands for subsistence uses.....	4,975	5,311	5,311	+336	---
Total, Forest Service.....	4,257,762	4,096,728	4,194,266	-63,496	+97,538
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Indian Health Service					
Indian health services:					
Non-contract services.....	2,174,802	2,268,241	2,275,877	+101,075	+7,636
Contract care.....	499,562	536,259	536,259	+36,697	---
Catastrophic health emergency fund.....	17,735	18,000	18,000	+265	---
Total, Indian health services.....	2,692,099	2,822,500	2,830,136	+138,037	+7,636
Indian health facilities.....	353,211	347,287	363,573	+10,362	+16,286
Total, Indian Health Service.....	3,045,310	3,169,787	3,193,709	+148,399	+23,922
National Institute of Health					
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences...	79,108	78,414	79,414	+306	+1,000
Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry					
Toxic substances and environmental public health.....	74,905	75,004	76,754	+1,849	+1,750
Total, Department of Health and Human Services..	3,199,323	3,323,205	3,349,877	+150,554	+26,672

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2006  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2007  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>OTHER RELATED AGENCIES</b>					
Executive Office of the President					
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality.....	2,677	2,627	2,627	-50	---
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board					
Salaries and expenses.....	9,064	9,108	9,208	+144	+100
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation					
Salaries and expenses.....	8,474	5,940	5,940	-2,534	---
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development					
Payment to the Institute.....	6,207	6,703	6,703	+496	---
Smithsonian Institution					
Salaries and expenses.....	516,568	537,394	517,094	+526	-20,300
Facilities capital.....	98,529	107,000	107,000	+8,471	---
Total, Smithsonian Institution.....	615,097	644,394	624,094	+8,997	-20,300

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2006  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2007  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
-----					
National Gallery of Art					
Salaries and expenses.....	95,179	101,794	101,794	+6,615	---
Repair, restoration and renovation of buildings.....	15,962	14,949	14,949	-1,013	---
Total, National Gallery of Art.....	111,141	116,743	116,743	+5,602	---
-----					
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts					
Operations and maintenance.....	17,538	18,909	18,909	+1,371	---
Construction.....	12,809	19,800	19,800	+6,991	---
Total, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.....	30,347	38,709	38,709	+8,362	---
-----					
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars					
Salaries and expenses.....	9,065	9,438	9,438	+373	---
-----					
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities					
National Endowment for the Arts					
Grants and administration.....	124,406	124,412	124,412	+6	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2006  
 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2007  
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
National Endowment for the Humanities					
Grants and administration.....	125,728	126,049	126,049	+321	---
Matching grants.....	15,221	14,906	14,906	-315	---
Total, National Endowment for the Humanities.....	140,949	140,955	140,955	+6	---
Total, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.....	265,355	265,367	265,367	+12	---
Commission of Fine Arts					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,865	1,951	1,951	+86	---
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs					
Grants.....	7,143	6,534	6,534	-609	---
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation					
Salaries and expenses.....	4,789	5,118	5,118	+329	---
National Capital Planning Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	8,123	8,265	7,623	-500	-642
United States Holocaust Memorial Museum					
Holocaust Memorial Museum.....	42,150	43,786	43,415	+1,265	-371

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2006  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2007  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
-----					
Presidio Trust					
Presidio trust fund.....	19,706	19,256	19,256	-450	---
White House Commission on the National Moment of Remembrance					
Operations.....	247	200	200	-47	---
=====					
Total, title III, related agencies.....	8,598,535	8,604,072	8,707,069	+108,534	+102,997
Appropriations.....	(8,541,535)	(8,604,072)	(8,707,069)	(+165,534)	(+102,997)
Emergency appropriations.....	(57,000)	---	---	(-57,000)	---
=====					
TITLE IV - GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Across-the-board cut (.476%) (rescission) (Sec. 439)...	-589	---	---	+589	---
Across-the-board cut (1.0%) (rescission) (Sec. 601)...	-1,179	---	---	+1,179	---
=====					
Grand total.....	26,085,934	25,532,115	25,944,125	-141,809	+412,010
Appropriations.....	(26,052,541)	(25,562,115)	(25,974,125)	(-78,416)	(+412,010)
Emergency appropriations.....	(146,893)	---	---	(-146,893)	---
Rescissions.....	(-113,500)	(-30,000)	(-30,000)	(+83,500)	---
(Transfer out).....	(-43,493)	(-41,127)	(-43,327)	(+166)	(-2,200)
(By transfer).....	(43,493)	(41,127)	(43,327)	(-166)	(+2,200)
=====					

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF THE HONORABLE DAVID OBEY

The Minority cannot fault the fairness of the process followed by our Committee in producing the fiscal year 2007 Interior Appropriations bill. Minority Members were consulted throughout the process and the bill reflects our input in a number of important areas. But a fair process by itself does not produce an acceptable product. This bill's principal responsibility is to provide for the environmental and conservation needs of America's people and its natural resources. The bill as reported simply does not fulfill that responsibility. Because of this failure, America's water and air will be dirtier, its pristine natural landscapes and historic structures will be less protected, and visitors to its national parks, refuges and forests will experience declining levels of service.

The Interior bill's failings did not occur by accident. The overall lack of funds to address national needs is the direct result of a Republican fiscal plan for 2007 that values tax cuts for the most well-off over critical priorities like protecting the environment. This Republican plan provides \$9.4 billion less for domestic programs than the amount necessary just to maintain current service levels and the 2007 Interior bill now presented to the House reflects the damage which is the inevitable result.

The \$25.9 billion allocated for Interior and Environment programs in this bill is \$145 million below the FY 2006 enacted level and roughly \$800 million below the level necessary to maintain current services for programs under this Subcommittee's jurisdiction. The result is significant and damaging reductions in many conservation and environmental programs and in service programs for Native Americans. Members should be aware of the most critical reductions when they review the bill's impact on their communities and their constituents. For example:

- In most cases the Subcommittee has only been able to fund 70 percent of increases mandated by law for federal pay and for other fixed costs for the federal agencies which manage our national parks, refuges, and forests. As the recent GAO report on the nation's national parks made clear, this inevitably will mean cutbacks in staff and cutbacks in visitor services for people who visit our parks and other federal facilities.

- Despite facility maintenance backlogs of at least \$12 billion in our parks, refuges and forests, funding for construction projects throughout the bill are cut by \$216 million below last year and more than \$400 million below the level six years ago. There is no funding at all for new schools on Indian reservations. The cutbacks in construction funding are shown on the following table:

CONSTRUCTION SUMMARY TABLE

[In millions of dollars]

	FY 2001	FY 2006	FY 2007 President	FY 2007 Committee	Committee v. Pres.	Committee v. FY06	Committee v. FY 2001
BLM .....	17	12	6	11	5	-1	-6
USFWS .....	89	75	20	40	20	-35	-49
NPS .....	300	333	229	230	1	-103	-70
BIA .....	357	272	215	216	1	-56	-141
IHS .....	85	38	18	37	19	-1	-48
USFS .....	521	431	383	411	28	-20	-110
<b>Total, construction</b> .....	<b>1,369</b>	<b>1,161</b>	<b>871</b>	<b>945</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>-216</b>	<b>-424</b> <b>(-31%)</b>

- Funding for the Clean Water Revolving Fund is cut by another \$200 million below the 2006 level. Over the last three years the Clean Water program, which EPA sites as one of its most effective programs, has been reduced by \$662 million or nearly 50 percent. This means either essential infrastructure repairs for this country's aging water infrastructure will not occur or local water and sewer rates will increase as communities pick up the federal share of these costs.

- Other state grant programs broadly supported in the House are cut below the current rate. This includes a \$4 million cut in PILT, as well as significant reductions in wildlife grants and the North American Wetlands programs. Stateside conservation grants are completely eliminated. Over the last 5 years assistance to states for environmental or conservation purposes have been reduced by more than \$750 million as shown below:

STATE GRANTS SUMMARY TABLE  
 [In millions of dollars]

	FY 2001	FY 2006	FY 2007 President	FY 2007 Committee	Committee v. Pres.	Committee v. FY06	Committee v. FY 2001
Clean Water SRF .....	1,350	887	688	688	.....	- 199	- 662
LWCF "Stateside" .....	90	28	0	0	.....	- 28	- 90
North Am. Wetlands Conservation .....	40	39	42	37	.....	- 3	- 3
State Wildlife Grants .....	75	67	75	50	- 25	- 17	- 25
PILT .....	215	232	198	228	30	- 4	13
Landowner Incentives .....	0	24	24	15	- 9	- 9	15
Total, state grants .....	1,770	1,277	1,027	1,018	- 9	- 259	- 752 ( - 42%)

- Funding for federal land acquisition and to help States preserve open spaces is cut by \$98 million in this bill and by more than \$400 million since 2001. Funding in this area has been cut by more than 80 percent in the last four years as follows:

LAND ACQUISITION/CONSERVATION HISTORY TABLE

[In millions of dollars]

Land acquisition	FY 2001	FY 2006	FY 2007 President	FY 2007 Chairman	Chairman v. Pres.	Chairman v. FY 06	Chairman v. FY 2001
BLM .....	47	9	9	3	-6	-6	-44
USFWS .....	121	28	27	20	-7	-8	-101
NPS .....	125	34	23	28	5	-6	-97
USFS .....	151	42	25	8	-17	-34	-143
Subtotal, land acq .....	444	113	84	59	-25	-54	-385
Forest Legacy .....	60	57	61	13	-48	-44	-47
Total, land conservation .....	504	170	145	72	-73	-98	-432 (-86%)

During consideration of the bill in Committee, the Minority offered an amendment to add \$800 million to the bill to address its most critical failings. The amendment was part of a fiscally disciplined, balanced Democratic approach that would return Congressional budgeting to the principle of “paying-as-you-go,” providing additional funding for key domestic investments and reducing the deficit by scaling back supersized tax cuts for those making more than \$1 million per year. The amendment would have reduced their tax savings from \$114,000 per year to approximately \$112,000. Unfortunately this amendment was rejected on a party line vote. The failure of the Majority to adopt this responsible amendment is particularly ironic given that the same day the Majority pushed legislation through the House that provides high income taxpayers additional tax cuts of \$42,000 while families with incomes of \$50,000 per year would only get on average a \$46 tax cut.

While these fiscal failings are very troubling to the Minority, we were pleased that the Full Committee did approve the addition to the bill of an important Sense of the Congress Resolution regarding global climate change. This resolution states, in summary, that global climate change is real; that human activity is an important causal agent of this change; and, importantly, that mandatory controls on greenhouse gases will be necessary to address the problem. This important statement of principles is the first step towards real action on climate change by the Congress. We urge the full House to also endorse it when the bill is considered on the Floor.

In summary, despite an open and fair process, a faulty economic policy from the President and the Republican Majority has left the Congress in the position of not having enough money to fulfill our fundamental stewardship responsibilities for the environment and our public lands. This did not happen by accident. A decision was made to starve domestic government and we are now paying the price.

