

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

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE) and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for her support of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the Walnut Grove Land Exchange Act should not need to exist. It is a simple bill which swaps 4 acres of public property, which currently houses a community, cemetery, and church with 6 acres of private timberland. And as was mentioned, this church and cemetery was established decades before the Forest Service.

To those who hear this and think, 10 acres? Why on Earth would it take an act of Congress to exchange a total of 10 acres? Rest assured that I had the same initial reaction. Not that this bill or the church itself are unimportant. On the contrary, the Walnut County Community Church is vital to the rural residents of Garland County.

The church is not only a place of worship. It has held countless community meetings and more. Its cemetery is the final resting place for many of Garland County's servicemen and -women, and the church itself has served as a search-and-rescue command post in the past.

However, under the current law, the church does not own the land on which it worships or buries its dead. As such, the Forest Service has the authority to raise the church's use fee each year and has done so over the past decade. Worse yet, any improvement or restoration to the church must be done with the explicit permission of the Federal Government. As a result, the Walnut Grove congregation has not been able to modify or upgrade their 80-year-old building, despite the need to expand to match the growing demands of the community.

Members of the congregation have tried for decades to resolve this issue with the Forest Service. They have called, written, and petitioned both the local and regional offices to purchase or exchange the land. They have willingly taken on maintenance of the property and have graciously accepted higher and higher usage fees under the guise that an exchange was coming. An exchange never came.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we stop this 20-year merry-go-round. This bill is vitally important to this congregation, and it is past time that we help them resolve their issue.

My bill has wide bipartisan and bicameral support, having passed the committee unanimously and having a companion measure in the Senate. I urge swift passage of this bill.

□ 1600

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5923, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### RURAL BROADBAND PERMITTING EFFICIENCY ACT OF 2018

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4824) to allow certain State permitting authority to encourage expansion of broadband service to rural communities, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4824

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Rural Broadband Permitting Efficiency Act of 2018".

#### SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **BROADBAND PROJECT.**—The term "broadband project" means an installation by a broadband provider of wireless or broadband infrastructure, including but not limited to, copper lines, fiber optic lines, communications towers, buildings, or other improvements on Federal land.

(2) **BROADBAND PROVIDER.**—The term "broadband provider" means a provider of wireless or broadband infrastructure that enables a user to originate and receive high-quality voice, data, graphics, and video telecommunications.

(3) **INDIAN LANDS.**—The term "Indian Lands" means—

(A) any land owned by an Indian Tribe, located within the boundaries of an Indian reservation, pueblo, or rancharia; or

(B) any land located within the boundaries of an Indian reservation, pueblo, or rancharia, the title to which is held—

(i) in trust by the United States for the benefit of an Indian Tribe or an individual Indian;

(ii) by an Indian Tribe or an individual Indian, subject to restriction against alienation under laws of the United States; or

(iii) by a dependent Indian community.

(4) **INDIAN TRIBE.**—The term "Indian Tribe" means a federally recognized Indian Tribe.

(5) **OPERATIONAL RIGHT-OF-WAY.**—The term "operational right-of-way" means all real property interests (including easements) acquired for the construction or operation of a project, including the locations of the roadway, bridges, interchanges, culverts, drainage, clear zone, traffic control signage, landscaping, copper and fiber optic lines, utility shelters, and broadband infrastructure as installed by broadband providers, and any rest areas with direct access to a controlled access highway or the National Highway System.

(6) **SECRETARY CONCERNED.**—The term "Secretary concerned" means—

(A) the Secretary of Agriculture (acting through the Chief of the Forest Service), with respect to National Forest System land; and

(B) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to land managed by the Department of the Interior (including land held in trust for an Indian Tribe).

#### SEC. 3. STATE OR TRIBAL PERMITTING AUTHORITY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary concerned shall establish (or in the case where both Department of the Interior and National Forest System land would be affected, shall jointly establish) a voluntary program under which any State or Indian Tribe may offer, and the Secretary concerned may agree, to enter into a memorandum of understanding to allow for the State or Indian Tribe to prepare environmental analyses required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) for the permitting of broadband projects within an operational right-of-way on National Forest System land, land managed by the Department of the Interior, and Indian Lands. Under such a memorandum of understanding, an Indian Tribe or State may volunteer to cooperate with the signatories to the memorandum in the preparation of the analyses required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

(b) **ASSUMPTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In entering into a memorandum of understanding under this section, the Secretary concerned may assign to the State or Indian Tribe, and the State or Indian Tribe may agree to assume, all or part of the responsibilities of the Secretary concerned for environmental analyses under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(2) **STATE OR INDIAN TRIBE RESPONSIBILITY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A State or Indian Tribe that assumes any responsibility under paragraph (1) shall be subject to the same procedural and substantive requirements as would apply if the responsibility were carried out by the Secretary concerned.

(B) **EFFECT OF ASSUMPTION OF RESPONSIBILITY.**—A State or Indian Tribe that assumes any responsibility, including financial responsibility, under paragraph (1) shall be solely responsible and solely liable for carrying out, in lieu of the Secretary concerned, the responsibilities assumed under that paragraph until the date on which the program is terminated under subsection (g).

(C) **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW.**—A State or Indian Tribe that assumes any responsibility under paragraph (1) shall comply with the environmental review procedures under parts 1500–1508 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), and the regulations of the Secretary concerned.

(3) **FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY.**—Any responsibility of the Secretary concerned described in paragraph (1) that is not explicitly assumed by the State or Indian Tribe in the memorandum of understanding shall remain the responsibility of the Secretary concerned.

(c) **OFFER AND NOTIFICATION.**—A State or Indian Tribe that intends to offer to enter into a memorandum of understanding under this section shall provide to the Secretary concerned notice of the intent of the State or Indian Tribe not later than 90 days before the date on which the State or Indian Tribe submits a formal written offer to the Secretary concerned.

(d) **TRIBAL CONSULTATION.**—Within 90 days of entering into any memorandum of understanding with a State, the Secretary concerned shall initiate consultation with relevant Indian Tribes.

(e) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—A memorandum of understanding entered into under this section shall—

(1) be executed by the Governor or the Governor's designee, or in the case of an Indian Tribe, by an officer designated by the governing body of the Indian Tribe;

(2) be for a term not to exceed 10 years;

(3) be in such form as the Secretary concerned may prescribe;

(4) provide that the State or Indian Tribe—

(A) agrees to assume all or part of the responsibilities of the Secretary concerned described in subsection (b)(1);

(B) expressly consents, including through the adoption of express waivers of sovereign immunity, on behalf of the State or Indian Tribe, to accept the jurisdiction of the Federal courts for the compliance, discharge, and enforcement of any responsibility of the Secretary concerned assumed by the State or Indian Tribe;

(C) certify that State laws and regulations, with respect to States, or Tribal laws and regulations, with respect to Indian Tribes, are in effect that—

(i) authorize the State or Indian Tribe to take the actions necessary to carry out the responsibilities being assumed; and

(ii) are comparable to section 552 of title 5, United States Code, including providing that any decision regarding the public availability of a document under the State laws is reviewable by a court of competent jurisdiction;

(D) agrees to maintain the financial resources necessary to carry out the responsibilities being assumed;

(E) agrees to provide to the Secretary concerned any information the Secretary concerned considers necessary to ensure that the State or Indian Tribe is adequately carrying out the responsibilities assigned to and assumed by the State or Indian Tribe;

(F) agrees to return revenues generated from the use of public lands authorized under this section to the United States annually, in accordance with the Federal Land Policy Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and

(G) agrees to send a copy of all authorizing documents to the United States for proper notation and recordkeeping;

(5) prioritize and expedite any analyses under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) under the memorandum of understanding;

(6) not be granted to a State on Indian Lands without the consent of the relevant Indian Tribe; and

(7) not be granted to an Indian Tribe on State lands without the consent of the relevant State.

(f) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this section permits a State or Indian Tribe to assume—

(1) any rulemaking authority of the Secretary concerned under any Federal law; and

(2) Federal Government responsibilities for government-to-government consultation with Indian Tribes.

(g) TERMINATION.—

(1) TERMINATION BY THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary concerned may terminate the participation of any State or Indian Tribe in the program established under this section if—

(A) the Secretary concerned determines that the State or Indian Tribe is not adequately carrying out the responsibilities assigned to and assumed by the State or Indian Tribe;

(B) the Secretary concerned provides to the State or Indian Tribe—

(i) notification of the determination of noncompliance; and

(ii) a period of at least 30 days during which to take such corrective action as the Secretary concerned determines is necessary

to comply with the applicable agreement; and

(C) the State or Indian Tribe, after the notification and period provided under subparagraph (B), fails to take satisfactory corrective action, as determined by the Secretary concerned.

(2) TERMINATION BY THE STATE OR INDIAN TRIBE.—A State or Indian Tribe may terminate the participation of the State or Indian Tribe in the program established under this section at any time by providing to the Secretary concerned a notice of intent to terminate by not later than the date that is 90 days before the date of termination.

(3) TERMINATION OF MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH STATE OR INDIAN TRIBE.—A State or an Indian Tribe may terminate a joint memorandum of understanding under this section at any time by providing to the Secretary concerned a notice of intent to terminate by not later than the date that is 90 days before the date of termination.

#### SEC. 4. FEDERAL BROADBAND PERMIT COORDINATION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary concerned shall establish a broadband permit streamlining team comprised of qualified staff under subsection (b)(4) in each State or regional office that has been delegated responsibility for issuing permits for broadband projects.

(b) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary concerned, in consultation with the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers and the National Tribal Historic Preservation Officers Association, shall enter into a memorandum of understanding to carry out this section with—

(A) the Secretary of Agriculture or of the Interior, as appropriate;

(B) the Director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs; and

(C) the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the memorandum of understanding under paragraph (1) is to coordinate and expedite permitting decisions for broadband projects.

(3) STATE OR TRIBAL PARTICIPATION.—The Secretary concerned may request that the Governor of any State or the officer designated by the governing body of the Indian Tribe with one or more broadband projects be a party to the memorandum of understanding under paragraph (1).

(4) DESIGNATION OF QUALIFIED STAFF.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of entrance into the memorandum of understanding under paragraph (1), the head of each Federal agency that is a party to the memorandum of understanding (other than the Secretary concerned) may, if the head of the Federal agency determines it to be appropriate, designate to each State or regional office an employee of that Federal agency with expertise in regulatory issues relating to that Federal agency, including, as applicable, particular expertise in—

(i) planning under the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.) and planning under the Federal Land Policy Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.);

(ii) the preparation of analyses under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); or

(iii) consultation and the preparation of biological opinions under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536).

(B) DUTIES.—Each employee designated under subparagraph (A) shall—

(i) be responsible for any issue relating to any broadband project within the jurisdiction of the State or regional office under the

authority of the Federal agency from which the employee is assigned;

(ii) participate as part of the team of personnel working on one or more proposed broadband projects, including planning and environmental analyses; and

(iii) serve as the designated point of contact with any applicable State or Indian Tribe that assumes any responsibility under section 3(b)(1) relating to any issue described in clause (i).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE) and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 4824, introduced by JOHN CURTIS of Utah, is the Rural Broadband Permitting Efficiency Act of 2018. The bill, which I have cosponsored, provides much-needed efficiency to the broadband permitting process on Federal lands to ensure underserved communities receive this vital utility.

Approximately 40 percent of rural Americans do not have access to broadband internet. Without adequate and consistent internet access, people are unable to effectively communicate, gain access to vital information services, and increasingly participate in the American workforce.

Currently, providers who wish to install broadband infrastructure in existing utility and road rights-of-way on Federal land are frequently required to obtain approval from multiple Federal and State agencies. If the infrastructure crosses Indian Country, the Bureau of Indian Affairs is involved. This cumbersome process also includes extensive environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act.

H.R. 4824 streamlines broadband permitting in existing rights-of-way, saving time and money in broadband deployment. Specifically, this bill authorizes a program to enhance the permitting process for broadband internet projects in each of the Bureau of Land Management's State offices.

H.R. 4824 also authorizes the Bureau and the U.S. Forest Service to enter into agreements with States and Tribes to allow those entities to carry out environmental reviews for broadband projects within existing rights-of-way on Federal land. This coordinated approach should help alleviate unnecessary delays in permit processing and encourage providers and States to pursue broadband deployment projects, particularly in rural areas.

Congressman CURTIS should be commended for his work on this bill and his efforts to have it considered by the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,  
Washington, DC, August 1, 2018.

Hon. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,  
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write regarding H.R. 4824, the Rural Broadband Permitting Efficiency Act of 2018, which was primarily referred to the Committee on Natural Resources and additionally referred to your committee. The Natural Resources Committee ordered the bill favorably reported by voice vote on June 6, 2018, and my staff has shared with your staff a draft bill report, a copy of the bill as ordered reported and the cost estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office.

I ask that you allow your committee to be discharged from further consideration of the bill so that it may be quickly scheduled by the Majority Leader. I agree that this discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have your committee be represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and your response in the report for the bill and in the Congressional Record during debate on the bill to document our agreement.

Thank you very much for your consideration of my request, and I look forward to bringing H.R. 4824 to the Floor soon.

Sincerely,

ROB BISHOP,  
Chairman,  
Committee on Natural Resources.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, DC, July 30, 2018.

Hon. ROB BISHOP,  
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for the opportunity to review H.R. 4824, the Rural Broadband Permitting Efficiency Act of 2018. As you are aware, the bill was primarily referred to the Committee on Natural Resources, while the Agriculture Committee received an additional referral.

I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner and, accordingly, I agree to discharge H.R. 4824 from further consideration by the Committee on Agriculture. I do so with the understanding that by discharging the bill, the Committee on Agriculture does not waive any future jurisdictional claim on this or similar matters. Further, the Committee on Agriculture reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees, if it should become necessary.

I ask that you insert a copy of our exchange of letters into the Congressional Record during consideration of this measure on the House floor.

Thank you for your courtesy in this matter and I look forward to continued cooperation between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,  
Chairman.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Expanding broadband access in rural America and communities adjacent to

public lands is a bipartisan priority on the Natural Resources Committee.

I want to thank Representative CURTIS for working with committee Democrats to improve this bill since it was introduced.

H.R. 4824 gives States the primary responsibility for issuing environmental review permits for broadband projects in those areas that already have rights-of-way for existing infrastructure, such as roads, bridges, and trails.

At markup, Representative CURTIS amended the bill to address several concerns brought forward by Native American stakeholders and committee Democrats. This includes guarantees that Tribal governments are consulted and can participate in the development of memoranda of understanding for projects that cross their land. This is a critical improvement.

The bill we are considering today also removes language that would have broadly exempted certain projects from any environmental reviews and eliminated public comment periods.

However, there are still a number of outstanding issues that I hope can be addressed as this bill makes its way through the legislative process in the Senate. For example, I believe that we should continue to perfect language that allows for public comment periods and strengthens the ability of our Federal land management agencies to enforce any MOU that is signed with a State government.

We would also like to continue discussions in order to ensure that everyday citizens receive protection under the Equal Access to Justice Act, a law that ensures all citizens have the ability to participate in government decisionmaking.

I believe these are commonsense changes that won't hamper rural broadband development. I do not oppose passage of the legislation through the House at this time, but I look forward to continued bipartisan and bicameral work on the remaining issues.

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

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS).

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased the House is considering my bill today, H.R. 4824, the Rural Broadband Permitting Efficiency Act of 2018.

I want to express my appreciation to Senator ORRIN HATCH, who introduced the bill in the Senate, as well Chairman ROB BISHOP for moving the bill through the Natural Resources Committee.

I would also like to thank various stakeholders that have taken part in the process creating this bill. Additionally, I would like to thank the 12 Members who joined me on this important bill as cosponsors, including my good friend from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE).

The need to give greater access to high-speed broadband services for rural communities is broadly supported, evi-

denced by the diverse coalition of stakeholders supporting my commonsense legislation, including NTCA, WTA, the American Library Association, the Utah Education and Telehealth Network, the Utah Governor's Office of Economic Development, the Utah Rural Broadband Association, and the Navajo Nation, to name just a few.

The purpose of my bill is simple: We need to do a better job connecting our rural and remote communities with greater access to broadband and high-speed internet. I believe that increasing access to broadband services in rural areas, like many places in my home State of Utah, is an important first step to help bridge the digital divide and to provide an enhanced quality of life for these areas. This infrastructure is critical to ensure schools, hospitals, libraries, and small businesses have access to modern-day internet speeds. This legislation will provide economic development opportunities for small businesses and residents in our rural towns.

Currently, the permitting process for a broadband project across Federal lands can take many years, in some cases, as much as 8 or 9 years. In my view, this is completely unacceptable. My bill improves and speeds up the permitting process on Federal lands, while also safeguarding and enforcing current-day Federal environmental laws.

I have visited three different Native American Tribes since my election to Congress and have learned some of the unique problems facing these communities. I was proud to work with several Native American Tribes, including the Navajo Nation in my district, to ensure Tribal governments can utilize these new programs established within my bill.

I was touched by a letter of support I received this week from President Begaye, the president of the Navajo Nation. I have visited the Navajo Nation three times since coming to Congress, and I hope this bill passes so that, on my next visit, we can celebrate the passage of this bill together.

My bill is a big win for Americans living in rural communities, especially Utahns, and I encourage my House colleagues to join me in voting in support of H.R. 4824. I hope the Senate will also quickly take up this measure and send it to the President's desk.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4824, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to allow certain

State and tribal permitting authority to encourage expansion of broadband service to rural and tribal communities, and for other purposes.”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MODERNIZING THE PITTMAN-ROBERTSON FUND FOR TOMORROW'S NEEDS ACT

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2591) to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to modernize the funding of wildlife conservation, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.  
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2591

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the “Modernizing the Pittman-Robertson Fund for Tomorrow’s Needs Act”.*

#### SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

*The first section of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669) is amended by adding at the end the following: “One of the purposes of this Act is to provide financial and technical assistance to the States for the promotion of hunting and recreational shooting.”.*

#### SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

*Section 2 of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669a) is amended—*

*(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (8) as paragraphs (4) through (10), respectively; and*

*(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:*

*“(2) for the purposes of determining the number of paid hunting-license holders in a State, the term ‘fiscal year’ means the fiscal year or license year of the State;*

*“(3) the term ‘hunter recruitment and recreational shooter recruitment’ means any activity or project to recruit or retain hunters and recreational shooters, including by—*

*“(A) using social media, marketing, advertising, surveying, television spots, print, and media;*

*“(B) providing education, mentoring, and field demonstrations;*

*“(C) enhancing access for hunting and recreational shooting, including through range construction;*

*“(D) providing education to the public about the role of hunting and recreational shooting in funding wildlife conservation; and*

*“(E) using any other means to ensure the growth of hunting and recreational shooting, as determined by the Secretary.”.*

#### SEC. 4. ALLOCATION AND APPORTIONMENT OF AVAILABLE AMOUNTS.

*(a) APPORTIONMENT TO STATES.—Section 4(b) of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669c(b)) is amended—*

*(1) in the first sentence, by striking “The Secretary of the Interior” and inserting the following:*

*“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”;*

*(2) in the second sentence, by striking “Such apportionments” and inserting the following:*

*“(2) ADJUSTMENTS.—The apportionments under paragraph (1)”;*

*(3) by striking the third sentence; and*

*(4) by adding at the end the following:*

*“(3) USE OF FUNDS.—*

*“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), amounts apportioned under this subsection*

*may be used for hunter recruitment and recreational shooter recruitment.*

*“(B) LIMITATION.—A State may make an expenditure under subparagraph (A) only if the amount of the expenditure during the fiscal year in which the expenditure is made plus the amount of the expenditures for hunter recruitment and recreational shooter recruitment made during the 4 fiscal years preceding that fiscal year is not greater than 25 percent of the total amount apportioned to the State under this subsection during that 5-fiscal-year period.”.*

*(b) APPORTIONMENT OF CERTAIN TAXES.—The first subsection (c) of section 4 of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669c) is amended—*

*(1) by inserting “APPORTIONMENT OF REVENUES FROM PISTOLS, REVOLVERS, BOWS, AND ARROWS.—” after the enumerator;*

*(2) by striking “One-half” and inserting the following:*

*“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), 1/2”;*

*(3) by striking “: Provided, That” and inserting a period;*

*(4) by striking “each State shall be apportioned not more than 3 per centum and not less than 1 per centum of such revenues” and inserting the following:*

*“(2) CONDITION.—The amount apportioned to each State under paragraph (1) shall be not greater than 3 percent and not less than 1 percent of the revenues described in such paragraph”;*

*(5) by striking “For the purpose” and inserting the following:*

*“(3) POPULATION DETERMINATION.—For the purpose”;*

*(6) by adding at the end the following:*

*“(4) USE OF FUNDS.—In addition to other uses authorized under this Act, amounts apportioned under this subsection may be used for hunter recruitment and recreational shooter recruitment.”.*

*(c) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 4 of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669c) is amended by redesignating the second subsection (c) and subsection (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively.*

#### SEC. 5. EXPENDITURES FOR MANAGEMENT OF WILDLIFE AREAS AND RESOURCES.

*Section 8 of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669g) is amended—*

*(1) in subsection (a), in the third sentence, by striking “and public relations”;*

*(2) in subsection (b), in the first sentence, by striking “, as a part of such program”.*

#### SEC. 6. FIREARM AND BOW HUNTER EDUCATION AND SAFETY PROGRAM GRANTS.

*Section 10(a)(1)(A) of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669h-1(a)(1)(A)) is amended—*

*(1) in clause (iii), by striking “and” at the end; and*

*(2) by adding at the end the following:*

*“(v) the enhancement of hunter recruitment and recreational shooter recruitment; and”.*

#### SEC. 7. MULTISTATE CONSERVATION GRANT PROGRAM.

*Section 11 of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669h-2) is amended—*

*(1) in subsection (a)(1)—*

*(A) by striking “Not more than” and inserting the following:*

*“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not more than”;*

*(B) by adding at the end the following:*

*“(B) AVAILABILITY FOR HUNTER AND RECREATIONAL SHOOTER GRANTS.—Not more than \$5,000,000 of the revenues covered into the fund from any tax imposed under section 4161(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for a fiscal year shall be available to the Secretary exclusively for making hunter recruitment and recreational shooter recruitment grants that promote a national hunting and shooting sport recruitment program, including related communication and outreach activities.”;*

*(2) in the matter preceding subsection (b)(3)(A), by striking “International”;*

*(3) in the matter preceding subsection (c)(2)(A)(i), by striking “International”;*

*(4) in subsection (c)(2)(A)(i), by inserting “or to recreational shooting activities” after “wildlife”;*

*(5) in subsection (d), by inserting “or to recreational shooting activities” after “wildlife”.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE) and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 2591, introduced by Representative AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, is a bipartisan bill which I cosponsored that amends the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to modernize the funding for wildlife conservation.

The Pittman-Robertson fund, which relies on excise tax fees paid by hunters and recreational shooters, has been a driving force for wildlife habitat preservation in the United States for nearly 80 years, contributing over \$10 billion in that time. The fund is also responsible for important hunter education programs, as well as the construction and maintenance of public shooting ranges.

The long-term viability of the Pittman-Robertson fund is at risk, however, because of the diminishing number of hunters and recreational shooters nationwide. Recent surveys have shown a decline of over 2 million hunters since 2011. This has largely been caused by growing urbanization and suburbanization, which has made it more difficult for Americans to participate in these activities.

This legislation will give States additional flexibility to use their Pittman-Robertson dollars to fund programs to recruit, retain, and reactivate hunters and target shooters. Empowering the States with this added flexibility will help promote safe and responsible hunting and shooting, while also ensuring this American system of wildlife conservation funding remains strong into the future.

Congressman SCOTT should be commended for his work on this bipartisan measure. I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides States with increased flexibility to utilize