

Direct the secretaries to solicit and consider information from state agencies, landowners, and others who might be affected by decisions under the ESA;

Require the secretaries to promulgate regulations establishing criteria that scientific and commercial studies must meet in order to serve as the basis for decisions under the act; and

Direct the secretaries to give greater weight to studies that use empirical or field-tested data.

Based on information from the Department of the Interior and the National Marine Fisheries Service, CBO estimates that funding scientific review boards would cost \$15 million in 2003 and \$79 million over the 2003–2007 period, assuming appropriation of the necessary amounts. That estimate assumes that the secretaries would appoint 200 panels each year at an average cost of \$75,000. Based on information from the agencies, we also estimate that meeting new requirements under H.R. 4840 would increase administrative costs by roughly \$3 million annually, assuming the availability of appropriated funds.

Intergovernmental and private-sector impact: H.R. 4840 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

Estimate prepared by: Federal costs: Megan Carroll; impact on state, local and tribal governments: Marjorie Miller; impact on the private sector: Jean Talarico.

Estimate approved by: Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

COST ESTIMATE FOR H.R. 4912

HON. JAMES V. HANSEN

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 2002

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I request that the attached cost estimate for H.R. 4912 be submitted for the RECORD under General Leave.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, October 25, 2002.

Hon. JAMES V. HANSEN,
Chairman, Committee on Resources, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 4912, a bill to increase the penalties to be imposed for a violation of fire regulations applicable to public lands, National Park System lands, or National Forest System lands when the violation results in damage to public or private property, to specify the purpose for which collected fines may be used, and for other purposes.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contacts are Megan Carroll (for federal costs), and Annie Bartsch (for revenues).

Sincerely,

BARRY B. ANDERSON,
(For Dan L. Crippen, Director).

Enclosure.

H.R. 4912—A bill to increase the penalties to be imposed for a violation of fire regulations applicable to the public lands, National Park System lands, or National Forest System lands when the violation results in damage to public or private property, to specify the purposes for which collected fines may be used, and for other purposes.

CBO estimates that H.R. 4912 would not significantly affect the federal budget. The

bill would increase both revenues and direct spending, but by less than \$500,000 a year. H.R. 4912 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal government.

H.R. 4912 would increase fines and imprisonment terms for violating fire regulations on certain federal lands. The bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to spend, without further appropriation, amounts received from such fines to reimburse the appropriate department for certain costs incurred to respond to fires, rehabilitate damaged lands, and increase public awareness of legal requirements regarding the use of fire on public lands.

Under current law, collections of such fines are recorded in the budget as governmental receipts (revenues) and are deposited in the Crime Victims Fund and later spent. Based on information from the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service, CBO estimates that increasing those fines and authorizing the agencies to spend them would increase revenues and direct spending by less than \$500,000 annually. We also estimate that any increased costs for prison operations, which would be subject to appropriation, would not be significant.

The CBO staff contacts for this estimate are Megan Carroll (for federal costs), and Annie Bartsch (for revenues). This estimate was approved by Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

COST ESTIMATE FOR H.R. 4601

HON. JAMES V. HANSEN

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 2002

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I request that the attached cost estimate for H.R. 4601 be submitted for the RECORD under General Leave.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, October 17, 2002.

Hon. JAMES V. HANSEN,
Chairman, Committee on Resources, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 4601, a bill to provide for the conveyance of a small parcel of Bureau of Land Management land in Douglas County, Oregon, to the county to improve management of and recreational access to the Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area, and for other purposes.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contacts are Megan Carroll (for federal costs), and Marjorie Miller (for the state and local impact).

Sincerely,

BARRY B. ANDERSON,
(For Dan L. Crippen, Director).

Enclosure.

H.R. 4601—A bill to provide for the conveyance of a small parcel of Bureau of Land Management land in Douglas County, Oregon, to the county to improve management of and recreational access to the Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area, and for other purposes.

CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 4601 would not significantly affect the federal budget. The bill would direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey, without consider-

ation, 68.8 acres of federal land to Douglas County, Oregon. The county would use that land for recreational purposes. According to the Bureau of Land Management, the parcel to be conveyed currently generates no significant receipts and is not expected to do so over the next 10 years. Hence, we estimate that enacting H.R. 4601 would not significantly affect direct spending or revenues. We also estimate that the agency's administrative costs to complete the proposed conveyance would be negligible.

H.R. 4601 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments. This conveyance would be voluntary on the part of Douglas County, as would any costs incurred by the county to comply with the conditions established by the bill.

The CBO staff contacts for this estimate are Megan Carroll (for federal costs), and Marjorie Miller (for the state and local impact). This estimate was approved by Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

COST ESTIMATE FOR H.R. 635

HON. JAMES V. HANSEN

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 2002

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I request that the attached cost estimate for H.R. 635 be submitted for the RECORD under General Leave.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, October 10, 2002.

Hon. JAMES V. HANSEN,
Chairman, Committee on Resources, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 635, the Homestead Steel Works National Historic Site Act.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Deborah Reis.

Sincerely,

BARRY B. ANDERSON
(For Dan L. Crippen, Director).

Enclosure.

H.R. 635—Homestead Steel Works National Historic Site Act

Summary: H.R. 635 would establish the Homestead Steel Works National Historic Site (NHS) in Pennsylvania as a unit of the National Park System. The federal budgetary impact of enacting this legislation is uncertain and would depend on unknown factors such as the condition of property that may be acquired by the National Park Service (NPS), the need for mitigating environmental or other safety hazards, and the extent of nonfederal participation in the project. Depending on the level of restoration, stabilization, and development for visitor use that is undertaken, CBO estimates that initial costs to establish and operate the new NHS would be between \$60 million and \$120 million over the five years following enactment. Some of these costs could be borne by state, local, or nonprofit entities, but the legislation would not require cost-sharing. All federal spending to implement the project, including operating expenses of

about \$1 million annually, would be subject to appropriation. Enacting the legislation would not affect direct spending or revenues.

The bill contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

Major provisions: The Homestead Steel Works National Historic Site would consist of three or more separate properties in southwestern Pennsylvania—the Battle of Homestead site (between 3 acres and 5 acres and related structures), the 35-acre Carrie Furnace complex (including blast furnaces, an ore yard, and related buildings), the hot metal bridge over the Monongahela River, and possibly up to 10 acres of nearby land that may be acquired by the NPS for visitor and administrative facilities. H.R. 635 would authorize the NPS to accept donation of all of these sites as well as any related personal property. In addition to managing the NHS, the NPS could provide technical and financial assistance to local parties for their preservation and management efforts. The agency also would prepare a general management plan for the site within three years of the bill's enactment.

Estimated cost to the Federal Government: CBO estimates that one-time planning, restoration, and development costs to establish the Homestead Steel NHS would be between \$50 million to \$115 million over the first five years following the bill's enactment. Of this amount, an estimated \$6 million to \$14 million would be used to build administrative and visitor facilities and develop an interpretive program. Planning (including the preparation of a general management plan, historic structures report, environmental assessments, and other requisite studies) would cost \$1 million over the first three years. The balance of one-time costs would be used to restore historic structures, stabilize or rehabilitate industrial property such as blast furnaces and the hot metal bridge, and mitigate hazardous conditions and environmental contamination.

We estimate that managing the new NHS would increase NPS operating costs by a total of \$5 million through 2007. After 2007, estimated ongoing costs would be about \$1.5 million a year. Annual costs would include routine NPS operating expenses, services to secure and maintain special property such as the bridge and blast furnaces, and technical assistance to nonfederal participant organizations.

This estimate is based on information provided by the nonprofit Steel Industry Heritage Corporation, the NPS, and other federal, state, and local agencies. For this estimate, CBO assumes that any property acquired for the proposed NHS would be donated to the NPS at no significant cost to the federal government. CBO further assumes that any significant contamination or other safety hazards located on donated property would be corrected before or soon after federal acquisition. (If the agency acquired contaminated or unsafe property, the federal government could be liable for future third-party damages, but CBO has no basis for estimating the likelihood or amount of such costs.)

Intergovernmental and private-sector impact: The bill contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

Estimate prepared by: Federal costs: Deborah Reis; impact on state, local, and tribal governments: Marjorie Miller; impact on the private sector: Lauren Marks.

Estimate approved by: Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

COST ESTIMATE FOR H.R. 5399

HON. JAMES V. HANSEN

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 2002

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I request that the attached cost estimate for H.R. 5399 be submitted for the RECORD under General Leave.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, October 23, 2002.

Hon. JAMES V. HANSEN,
Chairman, Committee on Resources, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 5399, the Carpinteria and Montecito Water Distribution Systems Conveyance Act of 2002.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Julie Middleton.

Sincerely,

BARRY B. ANDERSON
(For Dan L. Crippen, Director).

Enclosure.

H.R. 5399—Carpinteria and Montecito Water Distribution Systems Conveyance Act of 2002

CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 5399 would have no significant impact on the federal budget. This bill would direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey all right, title, and interest of the federal government in the Carpinteria Distribution System to the Carpinteria Valley Water District, and in the Montecito Water Distribution System to the Montecito Water District. Both of these water distribution systems are part of the Cacha Project in Santa Barbara County, California.

The Carpinteria Valley Water District has made all required payments on its contract with the Bureau of Reclamation for construction of the Carpinteria Distribution System. The Montecito Water District still owes about \$9,000 for construction of the Montecito Water Distribution System and would be required to pay that sum as a condition of conveyance. Currently, the bureau spends less than \$5,000 every three years to inspect these water distribution systems. Once these systems are conveyed, all operations and maintenance, including inspections, would be the responsibility of the districts.

Enacting H.R. 5399 would not affect direct spending or revenues. This legislation contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Julie Middleton. This estimate was approved by Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

COST ESTIMATE FOR H.R. 5319

HON. JAMES V. HANSEN

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 2002

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I request that the attached cost estimate for H.R. 5319 be submitted for the RECORD under General Leave.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, October 16, 2002.

Hon. JAMES V. HANSEN,
Chairman, Committee on Resources, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 5319, the Healthy Forests and Wildfire Risk Reduction Act of 2002.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contacts are Deborah Reis and Megan Carroll.

Sincerely,

BARRY B. ANDERSON,
(For Dan L. Crippen, Director).

Enclosure.

H.R. 5319—Healthy Forests and Wildfire Risk Reduction Act of 2002

Summary: H.R. 5319 would establish procedures to be followed by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture in carrying out certain hazardous fuels reduction projects. These are projects undertaken to reduce the risks from catastrophic wildfires through controlled burning or other methods. The bill also would authorize the appropriation of whatever amounts are necessary to implement the bill's new procedures and to plan and conduct the projects to reduce wildfire risks.

Assuming appropriation of the amounts necessary to carry out the hazardous fuels reduction program, CBO estimates that implementing the bill would cost about \$80 million in fiscal year 2003 and nearly \$1.3 billion over the 2003–2007 period. Enacting this legislation could reduce offsetting receipts (a credit against direct spending), but CBO estimates that any such changes would be less than \$500,000 a year.

The bill contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

Major provisions: H.R. 5319 would authorize expedited procedures for planning and conducting projects to reduce the risk of wildfires on certain high-priority federal lands managed by the Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). These procedures, which would limit some environmental assessment requirements and shorten administrative and judicial appeals, would apply to projects necessary to reduce risks to human life, property, water supplies, and wildlife. The expedited procedures authorized by the legislation would expire after September 30, 2005.

The legislation also would authorize the Forest Service and BLM to carry out the hazardous fuels reduction projects by entering into stewardship contracts or other agreements similar to those currently used by the Forest Service. The two agencies would be allowed to enter into a total of 41 new multiyear contracts through September 30, 2005.

Estimated cost to the Federal Government: The estimated budgetary impact of H.R. 5319 is shown in the following table. The costs of this legislation fall within budget function 300 (natural resources and environment).

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—				
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
CHANGES IN SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION					
Hazardous fuels reduction projects: ¹					
Estimated authorization level ...	410	420	430	450	460
Estimated outlays	80	170	250	340	430

¹ In 2002, \$395 million was appropriated for similar activities.

Basis of estimate: For this estimate, CBO assumes that H.R. 5319 will be enacted early