

role in the crimes, and releases all documents pertaining to the issue, it will encourage the Indonesian government to do the same.

This anniversary should be a reminder that although we want to move on, although nothing will wake the dead or make whole what has been broken, we must stop, honor the lives destroyed, acknowledge our role in the destruction, and allow the healing process to begin.

#### CBO COST ESTIMATE—S. 720

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, in compliance with paragraph 11(a) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources has obtained from the Congressional Budget Office an estimate of the costs of S. 720, the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2015, as reported from the committee. I respectfully ask unanimous consent that the summary of the opinion of the Congressional Budget Office be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The full estimate is available on CBO's Web site [www.cbo.gov](http://www.cbo.gov).

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

##### S. 720—ENERGY SAVINGS AND INDUSTRIAL COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2015

(October 19, 2015)

Summary: S. 720 would amend current law and authorize appropriations for a variety of activities and programs related to energy efficiency. The bill would require federal agencies that guarantee mortgages to consider whether homes with energy-efficient improvements would affect borrowers' ability to repay mortgages. The bill also would modify certain energy-related goals and requirements for federal agencies.

CBO estimates that enacting S. 720 would increase direct spending by \$15 million over the 2016–2025 period; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures apply. Enacting the bill would not affect revenues. In addition, CBO estimates that implementing the legislation would cost \$218 million over the next five years, assuming appropriation actions consistent with the legislation.

CBO estimates that enacting S. 720 would not increase on-budget deficits or net direct spending by more than \$5 billion in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2026. S. 720 would impose an intergovernmental mandate, as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA), by requiring states and tribal governments to certify to the Department of Energy (DOE) whether or not they have updated residential and commercial building codes to meet the latest standards developed by building efficiency organizations. CBO estimates that the cost of that mandate would fall well below the annual threshold established in UMRA for intergovernmental mandates (\$77 million in 2015, adjusted annually for inflation.) This bill contains no private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA.

#### CBO COST ESTIMATE—S. 2011

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, in compliance with paragraph 11(a) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources has obtained from the

Congressional Budget Office an estimate of the costs of S. 2011, the Offshore Production and Energizing National Security Act of 2015, as reported from the committee. I respectfully ask unanimous consent that the summary of the opinion of the Congressional Budget Office be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The full estimate is available on CBO's Web site [www.cbo.gov](http://www.cbo.gov).

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

##### S. 2011—OFFSHORE PRODUCTION AND ENERGIZING NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 2015

(October 6, 2015)

Summary: S. 2011 would amend existing laws related to oil and gas leasing on the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) and would remove restrictions on exporting crude oil produced in the United States. The legislation would modify the terms and conditions governing certain leasing activities and authorize new direct spending of proceeds from federal oil and gas leasing for certain programs and for payments to certain coastal states. In addition, the bill would authorize appropriations for grants to Indian tribes for capital projects and other activities aimed at adapting to climate change.

CBO estimates that enacting S. 2011 would reduce net direct spending by about \$0.2 billion over the 2016–2025 period. Provisions in titles I–III would affect oil and gas leasing on the OCS and CBO estimates those provisions would have a net cost about \$1.3 billion over the 10 year period. Increased collections from eliminating restrictions on exports of crude oil would total \$1.4 billion over the same period.

In addition, CBO estimates that implementing the bill would increase spending subject to appropriation by about \$700 million over the 2016–2020 period mainly for programs to assist Indian tribes. Because enacting the legislation would affect direct spending, pay-as-you-go procedures apply. Enacting the bill would not affect revenues.

CBO estimates that enacting the legislation would increase both direct spending and net on-budget deficits by more than \$5 billion in at least one of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2026.

The bill contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments. To the extent that the bill would increase royalties and other revenue from offshore oil and gas development, the bill would benefit certain coastal states through the sharing of leasing receipts with the federal government. Some local and tribal governments, as well as 2 institutions of higher education, also would benefit from receipt sharing and grant programs funded by leasing revenues.

The bill contains no private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA.

#### CBO COST ESTIMATE—S. 2012

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, in compliance with paragraph 11(a) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources has obtained from the Congressional Budget Office an estimate of the costs of S. 2012, the Energy Policy Modernization Act of 2012, as re-

ported from the committee. I respectfully ask unanimous consent that the summary of the opinion of the Congressional Budget Office be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The full estimate is available on CBO's Web site [www.cbo.gov](http://www.cbo.gov).

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

##### S. 2012—ENERGY POLICY MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2015

(October 15, 2015)

Summary: S. 2012 would amend current law and authorize appropriations for a variety of activities and programs administered primarily by the Department of Energy (DOE). The legislation also would:

Expand and extend federal agencies' authority to use certain types of long-term contracts to invest in energy conservation measures and related services;

Specify various energy-related goals and requirements for federal agencies;

Modify DOE's authority to guarantee loans under Title 17 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; and

Establish a pilot program to streamline the review and approval of applications for permits to drill for oil and gas on federal lands.

Assuming appropriation of amounts specifically authorized and estimated to be necessary under S. 2012—roughly \$40 billion over the 2016–2020 period (and an additional \$3 billion in later years)—CBO estimates that implementing this legislation would result in outlays totaling \$32 billion over the 2016–2020 period from those appropriations, with additional spending of about \$11 billion occurring after 2020.

CBO also estimates that the bill would result in additional direct spending. The estimated amount of direct spending depends on the budgetary treatment of federal commitments through certain types of long-term energy-related contracts, which CBO expects would increase under the bill. In CBO's view, commitments under such contracts are a form of direct spending because agencies enter into such contracts without appropriations in advance to cover their full costs. On the basis of that view, CBO estimates that enacting S. 2012 would increase direct spending by \$659 million over the 2016–2025 period.

However, for purposes of determining budget-related points of order for legislation considered by the Senate, section 3207 of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016 specifies a scoring rule for provisions related to such contracts (referred to in this document as the scoring rule for energy contracts). Specifically, that rule requires CBO to calculate, on a net present value basis, the lifetime net cost or savings attributable to projects financed by such contracts and to record that amount as an upfront change in spending subject to appropriation. Under that rule, CBO estimates that S. 2012 would increase direct spending by \$29 million over the 2016–2025 period.

Enacting S. 2012 could affect revenues, but CBO estimates any such effects would be insignificant in any year. Because the bill would affect direct spending and revenues, pay-as-you-go procedures apply.

CBO estimates that enacting S. 2012 would not increase net direct spending or on-budget deficits by more than \$5 billion in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2026.

S. 2012 would impose an intergovernmental and private-sector mandate, as defined in the