Alabama, and HUNTER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. WELCH, CAPUANO, SHERMAN, HOYER, and Mrs. CAPPS changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 475, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 210, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 476]

YEAS—217

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boehner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—210

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—6

Davis, Danny
Engel
Herrera Beutler
McCarthy (NY)
Polis
Rush

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1807

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

RESTORING HEALTHY FORESTS FOR HEALTHY COMMUNITIES ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 1526.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 351 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1526.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1814

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1526) to restore employment and educational opportunities in, and improve the economic stability of, counties containing National Forest System land, while also reducing Forest Service management costs, by ensuring that such counties have a dependable source of revenue from National Forest System land, to provide a temporary extension of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes, with Mr. WOODALL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

□ 1815

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Over the last few months, deadly wildfires, especially in California, Arizona, and Colorado, and wildfires in

other western States, have highlighted the growing problem with our current Federal forest management plans.

Like all public lands, our national forests should, unless otherwise designated, be open for multiple use, for everything from recreation to job-creating economic activities; but instead, Federal regulations and lawsuits have effectively shut down our national forests. Timber harvests have dropped by 80 percent over the last 30 years in our national forests.

While the Forest Service once received $2 for every $1 spent, it now spends $2 for every $1 it produces. Our Federal forests are being badly managed, and there have been devastating consequences to that management.

First, rural communities are struggling to survive and no longer have stable funding to pay for vital services. The Federal Government made a promise over a century ago to actively manage our forests for the benefit of rural schools and communities. Under a Federal law passed in 1908, the U.S. Forest Service has historically shared 25 percent of all timber revenues with rural counties containing national forestland. Since the Federal Government doesn't pay local taxes, those counties depended on this revenue to help fund essential needs like schools and local infrastructure.

But as timber sales declined, Mr. Chairman, so did the revenue to those counties. Counties struggled to find the resources needed to keep teachers in the classroom and police on the streets. Congress provided a short-term solution in 2000 by passing the Secure Rural Schools Act, which continued to provide funding as timber sales declined. SRS was created to provide ''transition payments'' over a 6-year period while these counties diversified their economies. But the fact is, Mr. Chairman, their economies are built on natural resources—in this case, timber.

With a national debt measuring in the trillions of dollars, it is becoming increasingly difficult to finance this program that costs several hundred million dollars annually, especially when it fails to address the fundamental problem of declining forest management. A new approach is needed now.

The Federal Government's lack of forest management has cost tens of thousands of American jobs. These forests are the backbone of these communities' economy. From the logging to the mill work to the truck drivers, our forests put thousands of people to work. I should say had put thousands of people to work.

Additionally, as I have mentioned, the lack of active forest management has caused a significant degradation of forest health and made them increasingly susceptible to bug infestations and catastrophic wildfires.

Mr. Chairman, this is an interesting statistic. Last year—just last year—9.3 million acres of national forests burned in wildfires. By comparison, only 200,000 acres were harvested by the U.S. Forest Service. That means that 44 times more acres burned compared to those acres that were responsibly harvested. We cannot continue to sit idly by while wildfires rage, homes are destroyed, and lives are lost.

H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, is a long-term solution to put Americans back to work to restore our forest health and help prevent catastrophic wildfires by renewing our Federal Government's commitment to actively manage our national forests.

The bill requires responsible timber production on at least half of our Federal Forest Service's commercial timberlands. These lands, by the way, Mr. Chairman, were specifically identified by the Forest Service for timber harvest.

By helping to restore active forest management, this bill is estimated to create over 200,000 direct jobs and would provide nearly $400 million in savings over 10 years.

As required by law in 1908, H.R. 1526 would again share 25 percent of the revenue from the timber sales with the counties containing this national forestland.

The bill will also allow us a short-term extension of the Secure Rural School payments to provide funding to counties as the Forest Service transitions back into active management.

H.R. 1526 would also help prevent deadly and catastrophic wildfires by focusing on hazardous fuels reduction and empowering States to take a more active role in reducing those wildlife risks.

Finally, this bill recognizes that States and counties are often better at managing forestlands than the Federal Government. States have shown that they are able to produce more revenue from timberlands than the Federal Government.

Let me give you an example in my home State of Washington. Washington State is able to harvest seven times more timber and generate 200 times more revenue on one-fourth of the land compared to what the Forest Service has. They do that by better management.

This bill would allow counties to actively manage portions of national forestland through the creation of Community Forest Demonstration Areas.

H.R. 1526 has broad support. Over 140 local and national organizations, including 68 counties in 17 different States, have endorsed this vital, commonsense legislation to restore active forest management that will protect American jobs and livelihoods. These communities, their families, and their businesses deserve better than the status quo and the current failure of our forest management plans today.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As someone who represents rural, forested communities that depend on our national forests, this is an issue I care deeply about. I know my colleagues on the other side care deeply about this, too. We have many common concerns in terms of forest health, in terms of fuel reduction, in terms of dealing with bug infestations and other things.

There is, I think, a common interest in finding solutions to better manage our Federal forests. Millions of acres are in need of restoration to address disease, bugs, climate change, and fire, which was made painfully clear again this summer.

We need a long-term plan to provide for our rural forested counties. Right now, many of these counties are struggling to stay afloat. Counties in my district, for example, are near bankruptcy. Critical county services like public health, education, roads, and, most importantly, law enforcement have been slashed to the point where some counties have no rural sheriff's patrols and prisoners have been let out of jail, prisoners who should not be let out of jail.

The Federal Government made a commitment to these counties 100 years ago. Congress should honor that commitment. I think there are bipartisan ways to honor that commitment.

The inclusion of 1 year of county payments at fiscal year 2010 levels—substantially more than those proposed in recent legislation in the Senate—will provide a lifeline to more than 600 forested counties in 41 States.

I want to thank the chairman for his hard work on this provision in the bill. Any long-term solution on forest management will require bridge payments to counties. This bill provides a bridge payment.

This bill includes an extension of stewardship contracting authority and allows our Federal agencies to offer contracts up to 20 years. Stewardship contracts can help reduce the cost of restoration to our Federal agencies—and, thus, the U.S. taxpayer—to help treat large landscapes to prevent catastrophic wildfires we saw in the West this summer and provide predictability to local businesses and industry that incentivizes investment and creates jobs.

I met with a gentleman who is going to open a 2.5 megawatt biomass plant in Colorado in November. He is doing that with a 10-year stewardship contract on dead bug kill in the vicinity of his plant. It was done through a collaborative process. The result is the Forest Service will be able to do fuel reduction on twice as much acreage as if they had to appropriate taxpayer money to do it. He told me if that was extended to 20 years, which this bill does, that the cost would come down even more. So we would create electricity and make these forests more healthy by utilizing that biomass.

I particularly want to thank the chairman for working with Representative WALDEN, Representative SCHRADER, and myself to include our balanced, bipartisan solution for the statutorily unique O&C lands. These lands exist nowhere else in the country. They are historically, statutorily, and geographically unique.

The solution we came up with for these unique lands would not be appropriate for other land included in the larger bill. I spent many hours with Representative WALDEN and Representative SCHRADER and with you, Mr. Chairman, to work out a reasonable and fair solution to an incredibly complex and longstanding controversy in western Oregon. I admit it's not a perfect solution. There are things I would change. There are things that Representative WALDEN would change. There are things that Representative SCHRADER would change, and, Mr. Chairman, I'm certain there are things that you would have done differently. But that's the legislative process at its best. We did the best we could do and came up with a strong proposal. It's an Oregon solution to an Oregon problem, and I am pleased to see it included in this legislation.

That doesn't mean that I don't have strong concerns about other provisions in the underlying bill. I do. Members should know that H.R. 1526 would dramatically alter the way we manage our national forest system and would threaten the multiuse mission on our public lands.

The bill would establish ''timber production zones'' in every national forest and more than double timber harvest levels nationwide. In order to meet these targets, Federal forest managers would be required to allow logging and road building in current roadless areas and sharply curtail public review of proposed logging projects.

The bill would close the courthouse door to citizens concerned about their communities and quality of life in the neighboring forests by requiring plaintiffs to post bonds, a new precedent, in order to challenge Federal management decisions.

I have had communities in my district litigate against the Forest Service over timber projects that they felt threaten their drinking water supply. I have had the timber industry litigate, as we have had environmental groups. It doesn't mean it is not frustrating, but we can work on streamlining that process without shutting the door to the courthouse, as we did in the HFRA legislation, a bipartisan bill a number of years ago.

This bill would also devolve national forest management currently under the stewardship of the Forest Service to State boards and exempt these areas from major national environmental laws.

The practical impact would be to reverse 100 years of national forest precedent and undermine—or in some cases, eliminate—multiple use of the national forests over substantial parts of our forest, harming recreation, hunting, fishing, and tourism.

□ 1830

H.R. 1526 represents the largest proposed change to the modern Forest Service since it was created by Gifford Pinchot and Theodore Roosevelt in 1905.

I want to reiterate that the Democrats stand ready to work with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle on forest management. There is common ground. There is bipartisan agreement on some issues. Hopefully, this bill is the beginning of that conversation, not the end, as we attempt to have a real legislative process with the Senate on these issues.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

WASCO COUNTY,
BOARD OF COUNTY, COMMISSIONERS,
The Dalles, Oregon, September 4, 2013.

Congressman DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman Natural Resources Committee, Washington, DC.

Congressman PETER DEFAZIO,
Ranking Member, Natural Resources Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HASTINGS AND RANKING MEMBER DEFAZIO: In America's national forests money and jobs do grow on trees. A failed Federal Forest management system has led to the loss of *thousands* of family wage jobs and has left our rural forested counties with a host of preventable social and economic problems that need to be addressed; action is long overdue. For most Oregon counties the only solution is to return to a sustainable harvest level that provides reliable family-wage jobs and provides a solid tax base to support crucial services.

There are three main recurring themes choking sustainable forest management:

1. Litigation that stalls or prevents much of the harvest necessary for responsible, sustainable forest management.

2. Funding to prepare sales.

3. The environmental analysis and review time for management activities.

An increase in sustainable forest management is essential if we are to ever create and support the healthy forests envisioned by President Theodore Roosevelt. The Forest mortality we are facing destroys wildlife habitat and creates a platform for catastrophic wildfires that leave millions of forest acres bare and susceptible to erosion and extensive insect infestation.

H.R. 1526 provides a common sense approach for returning to sustainable forest management where planned harvests occur at a reasonable pace. While we appreciate legislation that allows for a temporary extension of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act, the long term social and financial health of rural forested communities depends on family-wage jobs that stem from a healthy forest products industry. Wasco County fully supports H.R. 1526 and will contact our House members to speak in support of and vote for the bill.

ROD RUNYON,
Chair.
SCOTT HEGE,
County Commissioner.
STEVE KRAMER,
County Commissioner.

IN THE COUNTY COURT OF THE STATE OF OREGON
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF GRANT

RESOLUTION 13–41

IN THE MATTER OF SUPPORTING H.R. 1526 RESTORING HEALTHY FORESTS FOR COMMUNITIES ACT

This being the 18th day of September, 2013, and a regular meeting of the County Court of Grant County and there being present County Judge Scott W. Myers and County Commissioners Boyd Britton and Chris Labhart; and

Whereas, the Grant County Court recognizes that Oregonians in our forested communities are facing extreme poverty, systemic unemployment, and thousands of children on free and reduced lunch; and

Whereas, Grant County, Oregon currently faces 12.20% unemployment; and

Whereas, 51.6% of school children in Grant County are eligible for free or reduced lunch programs; and

Whereas, Grant County's poverty rate is 15.8%; and

Whereas, these negative economic conditions can be attributed to the reduction in timber harvests in our National forests (93.78% reduction over the past 30 years) and corresponding mill closures; and

Whereas, Grant County cannot afford for any more mills to close and desire to recover our lost mill capacity; and

Whereas, H.R. 1526 is a bipartisan effort that aims to put people back to work in the woods, reduce litigation, provide certainty for counties so that they can provide essential services, lift families out of poverty, and prevent catastrophic wildfires that we have been experiencing,

Now therefore, be it Resolved, the Grant County Court hereby resolves to support H.R. 1526, Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, and urge all member of the U.S. House of Representatives to support the passage and implementation of this important legislation.

Done and dated this 18th day of September, 2013.

SCOTT W. MYERS,
County Judge.
CHRIS B. LABHART,
County Commissioner.
BOYD BRITTON,
County Commissioner.

GILLIAM COUNTY,
COUNTY COURT,
Condon, Oregon.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WALDEN: I am writing this letter in support of HR1526. HR1526 aims to put people back to work in the woods, reduce litigation, and provide certainty for counties so that they can provide essential services, lift families out of poverty, and prevent catastrophic wildfires that we have been experiencing. Last year, 10 times as many Forest Service acres burned as were harvested. 2.8 million acres—a size equivalent to all of Grant County.

One thing is clear. The status quo in our federal forest policy is not working for our forests, and it is certainly not working for the families in our rural communities.

Even though we are a county without any Federal Forest Service Land, we recognize the benefits that can be realized here by the success of our neighbors Wheeler and Morrow Counties.

Sincerely,

STEVE SHAFFER,
Gilliam County Judge.

CURRY COUNTY,
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
Gold Beach, Oregon, September 16, 2013.

DEAR MEMBERS OF OREGON'S HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: We are writing to request your support for HR 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, and ask that you vote in favor of this bill when the opportunity arises. HR 1526 would renew the commitment to manage federal forests for the benefit of counties impacted by federal forestland, improve forest health and help prevent catastrophic wildfires.

Oregon continues to lose infrastructure and jobs due to federal policies that have strangled sustainable management of a renewable resource. We are harvesting less than five percent of the annual growth in federal forests, resulting in overstocked stands and conditions ripe for wildfire. HR 1526 would permit responsible, limited timber production on Forest Service lands, would allow significant state and local involvement, and would separately address management of the unique O&C Lands by incorporating the bipartisan solution crafted by Representatives DeFazio, Schrader and Walden. The bill also would allow cooperative state and federal fire mitigation projects in areas that cross ownership boundaries.

The expiration of the Secure Rural Schools (SRS) program in 2012 has resulted in drastic budget shortfalls in our Counties. HR 1526 provides one year of bridge funding at the SRS 2010 level, allowing transition to more active forest management and a return to shared revenues from forest management. These revenues would provide schools with substantial funding and support public safety, road maintenance, and social service programs. Improved management and restoration of the nation's forests will generate tremendous environmental and social benefits and create desperately needed jobs and revenue for rural economies.

Thank you for your support of Oregon counties and schools and for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

DAVID ITZEN,
Commissioner.
EVERETT DIAL,
District Attorney.
JOHN BISHOP,
Sheriff.

DOUGLAS COUNTY,
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
Roseburg, Oregon, September 11, 2013.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,
Hon. GREG WALDEN,
Hon. EARL BLUMENAUER,
Hon. KURT SCHRADER,
Hon. SUZANNE BONAMICI.

DEAR MEMBERS OF OREGON'S HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: We are writing to request your support for HR 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, and ask that you vote in favor of this bill when the opportunity arises. HR 1526 would renew the commitment to manage federal forests for the benefit of counties impacted by federal forestland, improve forest health and help prevent catastrophic wildfires.

Oregon continues to lose infrastructure and jobs due to federal policies that have strangled sustainable management of a renewable resource. We are harvesting less than five percent of the annual growth in federal forests, resulting in overstocked stands and conditions ripe for wildfire. HR 1526 would permit responsible, limited timber production on Forest Service lands, would allow significant state and local involvement, and would separately address management of the unique O&C Lands by incorporating the bipartisan solution crafted by Representatives DeFazio, Schrader and Walden. The bill also would allow cooperative state and federal fire mitigation projects in areas that cross ownership boundaries.

The expiration of the Secure Rural Schools (SRS) program in 2012 has resulted in drastic budget shortfalls in our Counties. HR 1526 provides one year of bridge funding at the SRS 2010 level, allowing transition to more active forest management and a return to shared revenues from forest management. These revenues would provide schools with substantial funding and support public safety, road maintenance, and social service programs. Improved management and restoration of the nation's forests will generate tremendous environmental and social benefits and create desperately needed jobs and revenue for rural economies.

Thank you for your support of Oregon counties and schools and for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

DOUG ROBERTSON,
Douglas County Commissioner, Chair.
JOHN HANLIN,
Douglas County Sheriff.
RICK WESENBERG,
Douglas County District Attorney.
SUSAN ACREE,
Douglas County Assessor.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), who, as noted, has worked with his two colleagues from Oregon on the uniqueness of the Oregon forests.

Mr. WALDEN. I thank the chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee, DOC HASTINGS, who has been an extraordinary leader, not only on our forestry issues, but on allowing us to access America's great energy resources in a responsible way that will create jobs, generate revenue for our country, and be good stewards of our land and water all at the same time.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your work and that of your committee on the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act.

Just 2 days ago, Doug Decker, who is the State forester for the State of Oregon, declared that this has been the worst fire season for Oregon since 1951. The State of Oregon alone has already spent $120 million on fire suppression on over 1,000 different fires—and fire season is not over. According to the National Interagency Fire Center, this situation is the same across our forested States and communities. Last year, more than 9 million acres burned, and the Federal Government spent $2 billion in fighting fires. That's ''billion'' with a ''b.''

While these Federal forests surrounding our rural communities are burning, rural families are sentenced to live in poverty as the mills close and the jobs disappear, all because we can't access our great natural resources on Federal land.

Of the 20 counties that I represent in eastern and southern Oregon, nine face double-digit unemployment today; 16 have over 14 percent of their populations living in poverty; and 14 have over half of their schoolchildren eligible for free and reduced lunch programs.

Things are so bad in southern Oregon that Josephine County, which is bigger than Rhode Island, lost their last mill a few years ago, and with the closure of that mill, they lost 86 good-paying, family-waged jobs. A lack of timber revenue has left the county with only one patrol deputy. Burglary has gone up 49.7 percent; thefts have gone up 25 percent; and disorderly conduct has gone up 17 percent in 1 year. At a recent roundtable I held in Grants Pass, the sheriff, Gil Gilbertson, told me: ''I've seen better law enforcement in Third World countries than we have in Josephine County.'' Remember, the sheriff spent time in law enforcement in Bosnia. He knows that of which he speaks.

It's so bad that, just a year ago, a woman called 911 because her ex-boyfriend was breaking into her home, and he had assaulted her the week before. She was told several times by dispatch that there were no deputies available, and then was told: ''If he comes inside the residence and assaults you, can you ask him to go away?'' The woman was then assaulted and raped.

These are real issues for our rural communities today. It's clear the status quo is not working for families in our rural communities. This broken system has to change.

Among many positive provisions in this legislation that will lead to healthier forests, this bill would require foresters to look at the sustainable yield a forest could provide and then harvest just half of that and only on land that is suitable for timber harvest. It also limits costly and complex paperwork, and it requires that it be completed in a timely manner. This bill also contains long overdue provisions for expedited cleanup and salvage. Just like we clean up after floods, tornadoes, and hurricanes, isn't it time that we cleaned up and replanted and restored after forest fires?

This bill also includes legislation that I wrote with my colleagues from Oregon, Representatives PETER DEFAZIO and KURT SCHRADER, on Oregon's unique O&C lands. We have worked through our differences and have forged a balanced, commonsense plan that would create or save thousands of forest jobs in Oregon. We would ensure the health of these lands for future generations and provide long-term funding certainty for Oregon's rural schools, roads, and law enforcement agencies that lie within these counties, and it would end the status quo of endless litigation.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. WALDEN. This plan has broad support in Oregon—from local officials

to sheriffs and DAs to business groups and labor unions to newspaper editorial boards. I have here the letters of support and resolutions from 24 counties across Oregon that, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have entered into the RECORD.

The Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act will create prosperous communities and healthy forests. It will provide certainty for teachers and law enforcement officers. It will provide tools to our professional forest stewards to better manage our forests, and it is our opportunity to make Federal forest policy work for Oregonians and all Americans. I urge its passage.

KLAMATH COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
September 16, 2013.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,
Hon. GREG WALDEN,
Hon. EARL BLUMENAUER,
Hon. KURT SCHRADER,
Hon. SUZANNE BONAMICI.

DEAR MEMBERS OF OREGON'S HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: We are writing to request your support for HR 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, and ask that you vote in favor of this bill when the opportunity arises. HR 1526 would renew the commitment to manage federal forests for the benefit of counties impacted by federal forestland, improve forest health and help prevent catastrophic wildfires.

Oregon continues to lose infrastructure and jobs due to federal policies that have strangled sustainable management of a renewable resource. We are harvesting less than five percent of the annual growth in federal forests, resulting in overstocked stands and conditions ripe for wildfire. HR 1526 would permit responsible, limited timber production on Forest Service lands, would allow significant state and local involvement, and would separately address management of the unique O&C Lands by incorporating the bipartisan solution crafted by Representatives DeFazio, Schrader and Walden. The bill also would allow cooperative state and federal fire mitigation projects in areas that cross ownership boundaries.

The expiration of the Secure Rural Schools (SRS) program in 2012 has resulted in drastic budget shortfalls in our Counties. HR 1526 provides one year of bridge funding at the SRS 2010 level, allowing transition to more active forest management and a return to shared revenues from forest management. These revenues would provide schools with substantial funding and support public safety, road maintenance, and social service programs. Improved management and restoration of the nation's forests will generate tremendous environmental and social benefits and create desperately needed jobs and revenue for rural economies.

Thank you for your support of Oregon counties and schools and for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

DENNIS LINTHICUM,
Klamath County Commissioner.
FRANK SKRAH,
Sheriff by M. Rowley, Chief Deputy.
GREG THEDE,
Klamath County Superintendent.

DESCHUTES COUNTY,
BOARD OF OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
September 18, 2013.

Re H.R. 1526.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
House Natural Resources Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WALDEN: The Deschutes County Board of Commissioners wishes to express support for H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act. This proposal renews the federal government's commitment to manage federal forests, improve forest health and prevent catastrophic wildfires.

Deschutes County applauds the commitment to addressing job creation and enhancement of rural forest economies. The management provisions in H.R. 1526 will provide a long term solution to ensuring sustainable revenue sharing with forested counties.

Deschutes County, Oregon supports the preservation of healthy forests. We support HR 1526 and its aim to put people back to work in the woods, reduce litigation, and provide certainty for counties so that we can provide services to our citizens. We also support the management of the forests to prevent catastrophic wildfires and believe that there are forested lands that are suitable for timber harvest and management to be resilient against fire.

For these reasons, we support the passage of H.R. 1526.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY DEBONE,
Commissioner.
For the Deschutes County Board of Commissioners.

CROOK COUNTY,
September 19, 2013.

Re Forestry Legislation HR 1526.

Committee on Natural Resources,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. GREG WALDEN,
Washington, DC.
Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES WALDEN AND DEFAZIO: This letter is written by the Crook County Court in support of Oregon 'Timber Bill (HR 1526). HR 1526 includes a plan that would transfer approximately 1.5 million acres from federal to state management. Crook County agrees with the position taken by the Association of Oregon Counties (AOC) that HR 1526 provides a means for reviving Oregon economies and sagging county revenues of timber reliant counties.

The Crook County Court recognizes that Oregonians in forested communities are facing extreme poverty, systematic unemployment, and thousands of children on free and reduced lunch programs. These negative economic conditions can be attributed to the reduction in timber harvest in our national forests and corresponding mill closures.

HR 1526 is a bipartisan effort that aims to put people back to work in the woods, reduce litigation, provide certainty for counties so that they can provide essential services, and lift families out of poverty.

A lack of management on our federal forest lands has caused shortfalls for our communities, forcing counties to reduce essential services and putting our forests at risk of catastrophic fire. This Bill provides Oregon the opportunity to manage forest land and to provide certainty of active and healthy forest management.

Crook County Court supports HR 1526, restoring healthy forests for Health Communities Act, and urges all members of Congress to support the passage and implementation of this important legislation.

DATED this 19th day of September 2013.

MIKE MCCABE,
Crook County Judge.
KEN FAHLGREN,
County Commissioner.
SETH CRAWFORD,
County Commissioner.

To: Committee on Natural Resources
From: Baker County Commissioners
Subject: The urgent need to pass H.R. 1526: Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act

Baker County, like so many other counties in Oregon, are facing the same hardship—high unemployment rates, high poverty levels and poor infrastructure. These negative economic conditions can be attributed to the reduction in timber harvests in our National Forests (80% reduction over the past 30 years) and subsequent mill closures. With an unemployment rate of 9.4% and a poverty rate of 20%, Baker County is in dire need of economic relief.

The majority of the land in Baker County is owned by the federal government. We are reliant on Forest Receipts and PILT funding to maintain our infrastructure and provide the services needed in our County. The lack of management on our federal lands has resulted in catastrophic wildfires and loss of services. With the-movement to high mileage vehicles and dwindling forest receipts, our infrastructure and economy are in jeopardy.

H.R. 1526 is a bipartisan effort that aims to put people back to work in the woods, reduce litigation, provide certainty for counties so that we can provide essential services, lift families out of poverty and prevent catastrophic wildfires that we have been experiencing. The Baker County Commissioners strongly urge all members of the U.S. House of Representatives to support the passage and implementation of this important legislation.

MARK E. BENNETT,
Commissioner.

IN THE MATTER OF A RESOLUTION SUPPORTING H.R. 1526, RESTORING HEALTHY FORESTS FOR HEALTHY COMMUNITIES ACT, RESOLUTION 13–09–17

Now, the Lake County Board of Commissioners recognize that Oregonians in our forested communities are facing extreme poverty, systemic high unemployment, and hundreds of children on free and reduced lunch.

Whereas, Lake County currently faces 11.9% unemployment; and

Whereas, 55% of school children in Lake County are eligible for Free or Reduced lunch programs; and

Whereas, Lake County's poverty rate is 18.7% and

Whereas, these negative economic conditions can be attributed to the reduction in timber harvests in our National Forests (80% reduction over the past 30 years) and corresponding mill closures; and

Whereas, Lake County cannot afford for any more mills to close and desire to recover our lost mill capacity; and

Whereas H.R. 1526 is a bipartisan effort that aims to put people back to work in the woods, reduce litigation, provide certainty for counties so that they can provide essential services, lift families out of poverty, and prevent catastrophic wildfires that we have been experiencing.

Now therefore the Lake County Board of Commissioners

Hereby Resolve to support H.R. 1526, Restoring Healthy Forests For Healthy Communities Act, and urge all members of the U.S. House of Representatives to support the passage and implementation of this important legislation.

Dated this 17th day of September, 2013.

KEN KESTNER,
Chairman.
DAN SHOUN,
Commissioner.

JOSEPHINE COUNTY, OREGON,
September 16, 2013.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,
Hon. GREG WALDEN,
Hon. EARL BLEMENAUER,
Hon. KURT SCHRADER,
Hon. SUZANNE BONAMICI.

DEAR MEMBERS OF OREGON'S HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: We are writing to request your support for HR 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, and ask that you vote in favor of this bill when the opportunity arises. HR 1526 would renew the commitment to manage federal forests for the benefit of counties impacted by federal forestland, improve forest health, and help prevent catastrophic wildfires.

Oregon continues to lose infrastructure and jobs due to federal policies that have strangled sustainable management of a renewable resource. We are harvesting less than five percent of the annual growth in federal forests, resulting in overstocked stands and conditions ripe for wildfire. HR 1526 would permit responsible, limited timber production on Forest Service lands, would allow significant state and local involvement, and would separately address management of the unique O&C Lands by incorporating the bipartisan solution crafted by Representatives DeFazio, Schrader, and Walden. The bill also would allow cooperative state and federal fire mitigation projects in areas that cross ownership boundaries.

The expiration of the Secure Rural Schools (SRS) program in 2012 has resulted in drastic budget shortfalls in our Counties. HR 1526 provides one year of bridge funding at the SRS 2010 level, allowing transition to more active forest management and a return to shared revenues from forest management. These revenues would provide schools with substantial funding and support public safety, road maintenance, and social service programs. Improved management and restoration of the nation's forests will generate tremendous environmental and social benefits and create desperately needed jobs and revenue for rural economies.

Thank you for your support of Oregon counties and schools and for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

SIMON G. HAIR,
Commissioner.
STEPHEN CAMPBELL,
District Attorney.
CONNIE ROACH,
Assessor.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to my colleague from Oregon, Representative SCHRADER.

Mr. SCHRADER. I would like to thank the chairman and ranking member for bringing a bipartisan and actual job-creating piece of legislation to the Chamber in these highly divisive times. This is the type of legislation we should be talking about.

Mr. Chairman, rural counties across America, not just in my home State of Oregon, are dying. Unemployment is still in the double digits as you've heard. Schools are closing. Infrastructure is deteriorating, and crime is increasing. There is really no recovery in rural America. The dwindling amount of county funding from our national forests and Secure Rural Schools system has left local governments unable to afford even the basic services that every American should have. They are making our communities unhealthy and unsafe. In Oregon, we currently have two counties going bankrupt while we stand idly by. The status quo is no longer acceptable. Moreover, due to the lack of proper active management, our forests are diseased, dying, and overstocked, leaving them susceptible to the catastrophic wildfires we have been seeing on TV every night this past summer and fall.

In this year alone, the U.S. Forest Service has spent over $1 billion in fighting forest fires. These wildfires not only burn millions of acres of public and private forests every year, but they cause serious harm to the environment—water, air quality—and to our public health. The Biscuit Fire in Oregon in 2002 alone produced as much as one-third of all the carbon released through fossil fuel burning in Oregon annually. That cannot continue.

Title III of H.R. 1526 is a bipartisan solution to a unique set of Oregon forestlands that was drafted by me and my colleagues, Congressmen DEFAZIO and WALDEN. The Oregon and California Railroad lands, commonly known as the O&C lands, have a unique mandate which differs from other BLM and Forest Service lands. It requires them to generate revenue for 18 Oregon counties from sustainable timber harvest. However, due to tedious and continued litigation, harvest levels are now 90 percent below what they were in the nineties. No one is asking to go back to the seventies or eighties, folks. That's not the issue despite what you'll hear. These are lands that are meant to produce timber in a sustainable way. The Federal law requires it, actually, and the legislation we wrote does it in an environmentally sound manner.

Along with a reliable amount of timber and revenue for our counties, I would like to remind everyone that title III also designates 90,000 acres of new wilderness protections and 150 miles of Wild and Scenic Rivers. The bill places over 1 million acres of old growth into protection and creates a conservation fund to help take care of it. The underlying bill also extends a lot of the popular forestry programs like stewardship, contracting, and good neighbor authority.

You're going to hear a lot of misinformation about this bill and outright falsehoods. Contrary to what our opponents claim, title III guarantees ESA and clean water protections, which have worked for decades on Oregon's State and private forestlands. It has extensive riparian protections, and it restricts pesticide use. Most importantly, it protects our most green and renewable natural resource for generations to come, and it puts certainty back into the woods for our rural communities and job creators.

Title III of this bill would create over 15,000 direct and indirect jobs by itself. The underlying bill would create over 200,000 jobs nationwide. When folks are still struggling to find jobs and to put food on the table, we cannot deny them this opportunity to work. The families and their communities depend on it.

I am also very encouraged to know that Senator WYDEN, the chairman of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, is also working on a parallel plan to help fix our broken rural economies and revive our unhealthy forests. We plan to work in a bicameral and a bipartisan fashion to come to a final solution that will provide revenue for our counties, clean up our unhealthy forests, and get people back to work in the woods.

COLUMBIA COUNTY
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
St. Helens, OR, September 16, 2013.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO.
Hon. GREG WALDEN.
Hon. EARL BLUMENAUER.
Hon. KURT SCHRADER.
Hon. SUZANNE BONAMICI.

DEAR MEMBERS OF OREGON'S HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: We are writing to request your support for HR 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, and ask that you vote in favor of this bill when the opportunity arises. HR 1526 would renew the commitment to manage federal forests for the benefit of counties impacted by federal forestland, improve forest health and help prevent catastrophic wildfires.

Oregon continues to lose infrastructure and jobs due to federal policies that have strangled sustainable management of a renewable resource. We are harvesting less than five percent of the annual growth in federal forests, resulting in overstocked stands and conditions ripe for wildfire. HR 1526 would permit responsible, limited timber production on Forest Service lands, would allow significant state and local involvement, and would separately address management of the unique O&C Lands by incorporating the bipartisan solution crafted by Representatives DeFazio, Schrader and Walden. The bill also would allow cooperative state and federal fire mitigation projects in areas that cross ownership boundaries.

The expiration of the Secure Rural Schools (SRS) program in 2012 has resulted in drastic budget shortfalls in our Counties. HR 1526 provides one year of bridge funding at the SRS 2010 level, allowing transition to more active forest management and a return to shared revenues from forest management. These revenues would provide schools with substantial funding and support public safety, road maintenance, and social service programs. Improved management and restoration of the nation's forests will generate tremendous environmental and social benefits and create desperately needed jobs and revenue for rural economies.

Thank you for your support of Oregon counties and schools and for your consideration of this request.

HENRY HEIMULLER,
Chair.
ANTHONY HYDE,
Commissioner.
EARL FISHER,
Commissioner.
JEFF DICKERSON,
Sheriff.
STEVE ATCHINSON,
District Attorney.

POLK COUNTY
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
Dallas, OR, September 16, 2013.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO.
Hon. GREG WALDEN.
Hon. EARL BLUMENAUER.
Hon. KURT SCHRADER.
Hon. SUZANNE BONAMICI.

DEAR MEMBERS OF OREGON'S HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: We are writing to request your support for H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, and ask that you vote in favor of this bill when the opportunity arises. H.R. 1526 would renew the commitment to manage federal forests for the benefit of counties impacted by federal forestland, improve forest health and help prevent catastrophic wildfires.

Oregon continues to lose infrastructure and jobs due to federal policies that have strangled sustainable management of a renewable resource. We are harvesting less than five percent of the annual growth in federal forests, resulting in overstocked stands and conditions ripe for wildfire. H.R. 1526 would permit responsible, limited timber production on Forest Service lands, would allow significant state and local involvement, and would separately address management of the unique O&C Lands by incorporating the bipartisan solution crafted by Representatives DeFazio, Schrader and Walden. The bill also would allow cooperative state and federal fire mitigation projects in areas that cross ownership boundaries.

The expiration of the Secure Rural Schools (SRS) program in 2012 has resulted in drastic budget shortfalls in our Counties. H.R. 1526 provides one year of bridge funding at the SRS 2010 level, allowing transition to more active forest management and a return to shared revenues from forest management. These revenues would provide schools with substantial funding and support public safety, road maintenance, and social service programs. Improved management and restoration of the nation's forests will generate tremendous environmental and social benefits and create desperately needed jobs and revenue for rural economies.

Thank you for your support of Oregon counties and schools and for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

CRAIG POPE,
Commissioner.
AARON FELTON,
District Attorney.
ROBERT WOLFE,
Sheriff.
DOUG SCHMIDT,
Assessor.

TILLAMOOK COUNTY
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
Tillamook, OR, August 28, 2013.

Re Support H.R. 1526.

Congressman DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman, Natural Resources Committee, Washington DC.
Congressman PETER DEFAZIO,
Ranking Member, Natural Resources Committee, Washington DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HASTINGS AND RANKING MEMBER DEFAZIO: A phrase such as ''money does not grow on trees'' is quite often overused. However in America's national forests, money and jobs do grow on trees. Unfortunately, a failed Federal Forest management system has led to the loss of thousands of family wage jobs and has left out rural forested counties with a myriad of social and economic problems we do not deserve and that need to be addressed. For most of our counties, that can only be done by returning to a sustainable harvest level that absolutely will provide family wage jobs and allow for a solid tax base to support badly needed services.

From our perspective there are at least three reoccurring themes hindering sustainable forest management; first is funding to prepare sales, second is the environmental analysis and review time for management activities, and third is litigation that stalls or totally stops much of the harvest that badly needs to be done.

An increase in sustainable forest management is essential if we are to ever provide the healthy forests envisioned by President Theodore Roosevelt. The forest mortality we are facing now is destroying habitat for wildlife, creating catastrophic wildfires that destroy everything in their path and leaving millions of acres of forests susceptible to massive bug and insect infestation.

H.R 1526 addresses all of these issues. It provides a common sense approach for returning to sustainable forest management where the planned harvest can occur in a reasonable amount of time. We do appreciate that the legislation allows for a temporary extension of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act.

However, for long term social and financial health of rural forested communities we must have the family wage jobs that are provided by a healthy forest products industry.

We know you are fully supporting H.R. 1526 and do appreciate your work and vote on this bill.

Sincerely,

MARK LABHART,
Chairperson.
BILL BAERTLEIN,
Vice Chairperson.
TIM JOSI,
Commissioner.

CLACKAMAS COUNTY
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
Oregon City, OR, August 27, 2013.

Hon. DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources, House of Representatives.
Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,
Ranking Member, Committee on Natural Resources, House of Representatives.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES HASTINGS AND DEFAZIO: The Clackamas County Board of Commissioners wishes to express our support for the Secure Rural Schools and the Oregon and California (O&C) Lands provisions contained within H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act. We believe these provisions are a common sense and balanced approach to federal forest management that will support family wage jobs and provide counties with certain and predictable revenue streams for critical county services.

Clackamas County is a western Oregon county with considerable urban and rural populations spread across a diverse landscape of more than 1.2 million acres. Approximately 52% of this land is federally owned and managed by the U.S. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management, with roughly 75,000 acres designated as O&C Lands. The responsible management of these federal forestlands is critical to providing predictable, long-term revenue for the county road and general funds that enhances the quality of life of county residents. Responsible federal management also would greatly enhance the economic wellbeing of our local wood products industry.

Regrettably, the impasse to meet federal forest management and timber sale volume goals, as prescribed by the Northwest Forest Plan and the O&C Act of 1937, has substantially reduced timber revenue and forced the County to reduce vital services for public safety, education, health, and other programs. At the same time, we have seen devastating economic losses in our rural communities and wood products industry—going from 12 operating mills in the County to just two. In light of this fiscal crisis, we urgently require a new approach to federal forest management that creates jobs, stabilizes Oregon's rural communities, and restores forest function and health. Absent a long-term solution, vital county services and our vast natural resource systems will be severely impacted or disappear altogether.

From our perspective, three major themes hinder sustainable forest management—funding to prepare timber sales, environmental analysis and review time for management activities, and litigation that stalls or completely stops harvest. H.R. 1526 correctly addresses these issues by allowing planned harvests to occur on forestlands prescribed for timber production, with reasonable time for environmental review and protection from unreasonable litigation. The bill also temporarily extends the Secure Rural Schools Act, which will help to sustain vital county services until the law begins to generate new revenues.

Thank you for your work on this critical issue. We support your continued efforts to bring this important legislation to the House floor for a vote.

Sincerely,

JOHN LUDLOW,
Chair.
JIM BERNARD,
Commissioner.
PAUL SAVAS,
Commissioner.
MARTHA SCHRADER,
Commissioner.
TOOTIE SMITH,
Commissioner.

MARION COUNTY
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
September 16, 2013.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO.
Hon. GREG WALDEN.
Hon. EARL BLUMENAUER.
Hon. KURT SCHRADER.
Hon. SUZANNE BONAMICI.

DEAR MEMBERS OF OREGON'S HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: We are writing to request your support for HR 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, and ask that you vote in favor of this bill when the opportunity arises. HR 1526 would renew the commitment to manage federal forests for the benefit of counties impacted by federal forestland, improve forest health and help prevent catastrophic wildfires.

Oregon continues to lose infrastructure and jobs due to federal policies that have strangled sustainable management of a renewable resource. We are harvesting less than five percent of the annual growth in federal forests, resulting in overstocked stands and conditions ripe for wildfire. HR 1526 would permit responsible, limited timber production on Forest Service lands, would allow significant state and local involvement, and would separately address management of the unique O&C Lands by incorporating the bipartisan solution crafted by Representatives DeFazio, Schrader and Walden. The bill also would allow cooperative state and federal fire mitigation projects in areas that cross ownership boundaries.

The expiration of the Secure Rural Schools (SRS) program in 2012 has resulted in drastic budget shortfalls in our Counties. HR 1526 provides one year of bridge funding at the SRS 2010 level, allowing transition to more active forest management and a return to shared revenues from forest management. These revenues would provide schools with

substantial funding and support public safety, road maintenance, and social service programs. Improved management and restoration of the nation's forests will generate tremendous environmental and social benefits and create desperately needed jobs and revenue for rural economies.

Thank you for your support of Oregon counties and schools and for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

JANET CARLSON,
Chair, Commissioner.
SAMUEL A. BRENTANO,
Vice Chair, Commissioner.
PATRICIA MILNE,
Commissioner.
JASON MYERS,
Sheriff.
WALT BEGLAU,
District Attorney.
TOM ROHLFING,
Assessor.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman HASTINGS for the time, for his leadership on our committee, and for including my bipartisan wildfire legislation—the Catastrophic Wildfire Prevention Act—in this forest health package.

Mr. Chairman, we have a forest health crisis in this country, and this bill will go a long way toward restoring the environment, improving public safety, and putting thousands of people back to work.

Due to redistricting, I have represented nearly all of rural Arizona in Congress—nearly 48,000 square miles of U.S. Forest Service land. These areas have been some of the communities most devastated by recent wildfire. In my first year, the Wallow Fire, now the largest fire in Arizona's State history, ravaged half a million acres of our treasured Ponderosa Pine Country in just a few weeks; and this year, our State was struck by the recent loss of 19 firefighters in the Yarnell Hill Fire. That fire was one of many to burn over 103,000 acres this year.

We must come together, change the status quo, and facilitate conditions that minimize the chance that fires start, and we must reduce their size and intensity once they burn. The bill before us today does a few important things to achieve that goal:

First, it prioritizes responsible timber production, and it ensures a reliable revenue stream for local governments. The Feds made a promise to our forest communities, and it must uphold that promise. Secure Rural School dollars ensure our counties can provide essential services, such as public safety and education to our constituents. H.R. 1526 would not only provide certainty in the program, but it would increase timber revenues threefold;

Secondly, it implements my bill, the Catastrophic Wildfire Prevention Act. These provisions, parts of title II and title V of the act, reduce red tape and provide the land management agencies a variety of tools, specifically stewardship contracting and good neighbor authority, to conduct smaller projects in high-risk areas that need immediate attention.

While long-term, active forest management will protect our communities in the long run, we have to protect our people and our assets today. These provide an expedited arrangement to streamline thinning and grazing projects needed in immediate, at-risk areas like our forest communities, critical water delivery and electrical infrastructures, and our schools.

The solutions in our bill are supported by nearly every county in my rural district, in particular Yavapai and Gila Counties, and many affected stakeholders, including the Cattlemen, the Natural Resources Conservation Districts, and the Farm Bureau. This bill has commonsense solutions to our forest health crisis that should garner the entire support of this body.

You may look at this bill and think it's not perfect, but it will do a lot to prevent the suffering that communities like the ones I represent have been experiencing. I would welcome any Member of this body to come down to my district and meet with the families who have lost their homes, their fathers, their mothers, their husbands and wives, their kids, and their livelihoods. I think you will see why we have to act.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I inquire of the gentleman how many speakers he has remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. More than the gentleman, apparently. I do have several speakers remaining.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), another member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. TIPTON. Thank you, Chairman HASTINGS. I appreciate the opportunity to address emergencies in our forests in the West.

Mr. Chairman, over the past decade, we've seen an increase in the number of catastrophic wildfires burning in the western U.S., resulting in a tragic loss of life, significant property damage, the loss of critical habitats, and the pollution of vital watersheds.

According to the National Interagency Fire Center, there have been over 38,119 different fires in the United States in 2013 alone. The Black Forest fire, which ravaged Colorado in June of this year, is believed to be the most destructive fire in Colorado's history, destroying more than 486 homes and with an estimated cost in excess of $85 million. The West Fork Complex fire burned approximately 110,000 acres in southwest Colorado this summer, and the incident commanders in charge of the suppression efforts on the fire told me that the behavior of the fire was unprecedented. Because of all the beetle-killed timber, unnaturally dense forest, and dry conditions, the fire has acted in a way that defied computer models.

□ 1845

Unfortunately this news was made worse last week in my home State, as Colorado was struck with another natural disaster in what many believe was the worst flood in Colorado history. Parts of at least 18 different cities and towns in my home State were severely flooded, and damage to roads, bridges, homes, and other infrastructure is already estimated to exceed a billion dollars. While little could be done to prepare for the staggering rainfall the State received over such a widespread area, in parts of Colorado where fires in recent years stripped the landscape of vegetation, the severity of the flood damage was worsened by intense runoff, erosion, and mud slides.

Threats to wildlife and property resulting from the wildfires are becoming increasingly costly, and by 2030 the number of acres of forest in Colorado that contain residential housing and commercial development is expected to exceed 2 million acres, representing an enormous potential hazard if fuel reduction projects and other proactive managements are not initiated.

Instead of ramping up forest management efforts and addressing hazardous conditions of the Western forests, the Interior Department has proposed a 48 percent cut agency-wide for hazardous fuels reduction for 2014, and the Forest Service has proposed reducing this proactive management by 24 percent. In 2012, the Forest Service spent only $296 million on hazardous fuels treatment nationwide, while spending close to $2 billion on wildfire suppression during that same time.

It is far more efficient and cost effective to proactively manage our forests. I've said it before, but the old adage of ''an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure'' rings especially true when we're talking about reducing the occurrence and severity of wildfires in our forests. Despite this, we've seen a decrease in timber harvesting of 80 percent over the past three decades. It is no coincidence that during this time the severity of fires and the number of acres burned has increased steadily. From 2000 to 2012, over 90 million acres burned in the U.S., nearly as many as the previous three decades combined.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the time and your support for this, and I urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), another member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the communities of the Sierra Nevada, I want to thank Chairman HASTINGS for this long overdue legislation. If anyone doubts the necessity of this bill, let them come to my district where the Yosemite Rim fire has just incinerated 400 square miles of our precious forests.

For years, foresters have been screaming this warning at us, that the excess timber is going to come out of the forest one way or another. It will either be carried out or it will be burned out, but it will come out. In the days when we carried it out, we had healthier forests and a thriving economy.

But Federal regulations have driven our timber harvests down 80 percent nationally—more like 90 percent in the Sierras—and now the timber that we once carried out is being burned out, and there's nothing subtle about the numbers. As the board feet harvested out of these forests has declined, the acreage incinerated by forest fires has increased proportionately and contemporaneously. The human cost has been devastating: dozens of mills closed, thousands of families out of work, local tax bases eviscerated.

Some of the mountain communities in my district now suffer Detroit-levels of unemployment, and the environmental cost has been just as devastating: overcrowded forests, overdrawn watersheds, and now catastrophic fires. There is nothing more environmentally devastating to a forest than a forest fire.

This measure restores the sound forest management practices that we foolishly abandoned to the detriment of our environment and our economy. This bill marks, at long last, a return to common sense for the management of our national forests.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to spend a little bit of time directly addressing the concerns and questions of some constituents back in Oregon regarding the O&C plan in this bill. As Representative SCHRADER said, there is an extraordinary amount of disinformation and obfuscation out there.

This is the bottom plan. It provides everyone at the table with something that they don't currently have. For failing counties in western Oregon—and Representative SCHRADER did a great job talking about that, as did Representative WALDEN—it means $1 billion over 10 years to help pay for basic government services like law enforcement, public health, and education. It means putting sheriffs back on the roads, keeping violent criminals behind bars, having better public health, and rebuilding our infrastructure. All of those things are good jobs, necessary jobs, and things that enhance the quality of life for Oregonians and all Americans.

For forested communities and local economies, this plan means sustaining or creating thousands of good-paying jobs. I have counties that have chronic unemployment in the double digits. I've taken to telling some people I represent the new Appalachia. When you go and visit these depressed communities, when the last mill closes in one of my counties, I talk to the owners of the mill and they said, If your bill had passed, we'd be hiring 100 people, instead of firing 100 people, in a community where 100 would be the largest employer. This means keeping those mills open, or maybe adding shifts. This plan will keep the raw logs here at home, rather than exporting our timber to places like China.

For the environmental community, many of whom have totally disregarded or created propaganda about this bill, it means the first-ever legislative protection for mature and old growth forests in western Oregon. They are not legislatively protected now. In fact, if the Clinton forest plan, the Northwest forest plan, is ordered fully implemented, in pending litigation in a court here in D.C., that old growth will be some of the first to be harvested. Since I've come to Congress, I've been attempting to preserve the old growth. This would do it. There would be 1.2 million acres of old growth preserved, habitat that is fabulous. It is a carbon sink. It has the best areas to recreate.

The bill also increases wilderness protection on the O&C lands by 250 percent, doubling the size of the Rouge Wilderness, adding Devil's Staircase, and it also will add 130 miles of wild and scenic designation. There will be more river protection on the O&C lands in one plan than in the previous 50 years combined, and we will quadruple the watershed protection compared with Oregon State standards. They keep saying this is just the way Oregon private forestry is done. No. We're going to have four times the riparian protection, and in terms of herbicides and pesticides, we're going to require the development of an integrated pest-management plan through a public process for these lands. This is not Oregon forest practices as we know it, and as they are picturing in ads. If they have concerns about Oregon forest practices, they ought to go to their Governor and State legislature, because this bill is not that.

Of the 2.8 million acres, 1.2 million acres of old growth will be preserved. That is 300,000 acres of additional riparian reserve to protect our water quality for consumption and for fisheries and other values. There will be 1.3 million—less than half—that will be managed. Areas that have been previously managed, many of which need thinning and they need restoration work, half of those 1.3 million managed will be managed on a rotation of over 100 years, providing, again, tremendous environmental benefits.

Here's what the plan doesn't do. It doesn't privatize or sell any Federal lands. In fact, these lands will remain in Federal ownership, and we will pay the Federal Government $10 million a year to manage these lands, and the Federal Government will save tens of millions of dollars every year because of the management being done by a board, which would be appointed by our Governor and would actually govern these forests and manage these forests through an open public process under the Oregon open-meetings law.

It will not return to the unsustainable levels that occurred during the watch of my predecessor. There were 1.6 million board feet the year I ran for Congress on these lands. That was not sustainable, and they would tell people we're going back to that. No, we're not. I ran against that, and we're not going back there. It looks like the best estimates are we would probably get to about one-third of that level on these lands with a environmentally responsible plan. It does not eliminate national environmental laws. They would still apply.

This plan is about trying to restore balance and predictability to western Oregon. I was pretty surprised at the statement, better known as a SAP, that claimed this proposal would create more legal uncertainty. I don't know how it's possible to create more legal uncertainty on the O&C lands. The BLM is in the current of a multiyear, multimillion dollar process to rewrite the management plan for these lands. The new plan is intended to replace the old plan, which resulted from a lawsuit. The old plan was litigated and withdrawn. Their new plan was withdrawn by this administration because they said they couldn't defend it in a lawsuit. Now they're developing yet another new plan at the cost of tens of millions of dollars, which will certainly be litigated. And just recently, a decision in Federal court has confirmed that the O&C Act means what it says, ''permanent, sustainable timber production.'' This decision throws the status quo further into an uncertain area.

Now the BLM is required to offer for sale the allowable sale quantity every year. It hasn't been doing that. There's another lawsuit that would make this decision retroactive. That would be over a billion board feet of timber. Yet, another lawsuit pending seeks to return the O&C logging levels back to the 1970s and 1980s. This says nothing of the pending lawsuits on individual timber sales. That's not certainty; that's chaos. I'm pushing a balanced O&C plan that does three things: provides predictable payments to failing counties; creates jobs and sustains the existing infrastructure; and legislatively protects the environment and public health.

This is the first beginning, on either side of Capitol Hill, of a long legislative process, the first step toward getting a bipartisan bill finally negotiated and sent to the President hopefully not too distant from now.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS), another member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the act because it will save forests in Wyoming and the West. These are fabulous natural resources enjoyed by people and wildlife, but across the West they are burning or

dying after decades of Federal mismanagement.

This photograph is from the Black Hills National Forest. Right here, you see a very lush green area in the forest. Adjacent to that, you have brown areas with dead or dying trees that have been ravaged by the mountain pine beetle. Where you find that healthy wildlife habitat, that healthy soil that's resistant to erosion, the healthy rivers and streams, the safe area to camp and hike and recreate, is because you have a healthy forest that was actively managed.

This green area was logged. It was thinned. The thinning is selective, it's measured, and designed to maintain a healthy and strong mix of trees. The brown area wasn't thinned. Bureaucratic delays, litigation, and endless appeals prevented conservation logging in this area. When you don't manage a forest, the entire ecosystem suffers from the trees down to the wildlife, the soil, and the streams. It's dangerous to camp or hike in the brown area because of the dead or falling trees. The dead trees are now fuel for fires, and we've seen them all over the West in the last 3 years, including this summer. This picture is replicated throughout the West, dead or burning Federal forests right next to healthy State or tribal forests, because the State and tribal forests are actively managed.

Our forests don't have to look like this. They can look like this. This act will get the Forest Service back to work on conservation logging, create jobs in the forest-products industry, create revenue for Federal and local governments, and prevent the astronomical costs of responding to wildfires and infestations.

□ 1900

It also gives State and local government a voice in forest management within their borders. Through good neighbor authority and community forest demonstration areas, we're involving the people who actually live near those forests who depend on that beautiful place to live.

Mr. Chair, this is one of the most commonsense bills I've had the privilege of helping with. I urge its passage.

BEFORE THE COUNTY COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF OREGON FOR THE COUNTY OF JEFFERSON

RESOLUTION NO. R-015-13

In The Matter of a Resolution Supporting H.R. 1526, Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act

Now, the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners recognize that Oregonians in our forested communities are facing extreme poverty, systemic unemployment, and thousands of children on free and reduced lunch.

Whereas, Jefferson County currently faces 10.8% unemployment; and

Whereas, 81.3% of school children in Jefferson County are eligible for Free or Reduced lunch programs; and

Whereas, Jefferson County's poverty rate is 20.2%; and

Whereas, these negative economic conditions can be attributed to the reduction in timber harvests in our National Forests (80% reduction over the past 30 years) and corresponding mill closures; and

Whereas, Jefferson County cannot afford for any more mills to close and desire to recover our lost mill capacity; and

Whereas, H.R. 1526 is a bipartisan effort that aims to put people back to work in the woods, reduce litigation, provide certainty for counties so that they can provide essential services, lift families out of poverty, and prevent catastrophic wildfires that we have been experiencing; Now therefore be it

Resolved that the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners hereby support H.R. 1526, Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, and urge all members of the U.S. House of Representatives to support the passage and implementation of this important legislation.

Dated this 25th day of September, 2013.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS:
WAYNE FORDING, *Chair*.
JOHN HATFIELD, *Commissioner*.
MIKE AHERN, *Commissioner*.

THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF UMATILLA COUNTY STATE OF OREGON

ORDER NO. BCC2013–077

In the matter of Support for Restoring Forest for Healthy Communities Act (H.R. 1526)

Whereas, the Umatilla County Board of Commissioners recognize that Oregonians in our forested communities are facing extreme poverty, systemic unemployment, and thousands of children on free and reduced lunch;

Whereas Umatilla County's poverty rate is 14.8%; and

Whereas Umatilla County currently faces 8.4% unemployment; and

Whereas 59.5% of school children in Umatilla County are eligible for Free or Reduced lunch programs; and

Whereas these negative economic conditions can be attributed in part to the reduction in timber harvests in our National Forests (79% reduction over the past 30 years) and corresponding mill closure; and

Whereas Umatilla County cannot afford for any more mills to close and desires to recover our lost mill capacity; and

Whereas H.R. 1526 is a bipartisan effort that aims to put people back to work in the woods, reduce litigation, provide certainty for counties so that they can provide essential services, lift families out of poverty, and prevent catastrophic wildfires that we have been experiencing; Now therefore, the Umatilla County Board of Commissioners adds its support to H.R. 1526, Restoring Healthy Forests For Healthy Communities Act, and urges all members of the U.S. House of Representatives to support the passage and the implementation of this important legislation.

Dated this 18th day of September, 2013.

Umatilla County Board of Commissioners:
W. LAWRENCE GIVENS, *Chair*.
WILLIAM J. ELFERING, *Commissioner*.
GEORGE L. MURDOCK, *Commissioner*.
Attest: Office of County Records:
BETTY LESKO, *Records Officer*.

BEFORE THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WALLOWA IN AND OF THE STATE OF OREGON

RESOLUTION 2013–005

In the matter of a Resolution Supporting H.R. 1526, Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act

Now; The Wallowa County Board of Commissioners recognize that Oregonians in our forested communities are facing extreme poverty, systemic unemployment, and thousands of children on free and reduced lunch programs.

Whereas; Wallowa County currently faces a seasonal unemployment rate of 14%; and

Whereas; 54.8% of school children in Wallowa County are eligible for free or reduced lunch programs; and

Whereas; Wallowa County's youth poverty rate is 26%; and

Whereas; these negative economic conditions can be attributed to the reduction in timber harvests in our National Forests (80% reduction over the past 30 years) and corresponding mill closures; and

Whereas: Wallowa County cannot afford for any more businesses to close and desire to recover our lost mill capacity; and.

Whereas; H.R. 1526 is a bipartisan effort that aims to put people back to work in the woods, reduce litigation, provide certainty for counties so that they can provide essential services, lift families out of poverty, and prevent catastrophic wildfires that we have been experiencing; Now Therefore; the Wallowa County Board of Commissioners hereby

Resolve to support H.R. 1526, Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, and urge our representatives in Washington D.C. to support its passage and implementation.

Dated this 16th day of September, 2013.

Wallowa County Board of Commissioners:
CHAIRMAN MIKE HAYWARD.
COMMISSIONER PAUL CASTILLEJA.
COMMISSIONER SUSAN ROBERTS.
Attest:
SANDY LATHROP, *Exec. Assistant*.

In Said County and State, when were present: The Honorable Mark D. Davidson, Chairman; Steve McClure, Commissioner; William D. Rosholt, Commissioner.

When, on Wednesday the 18th day of September 2013, among others the following proceedings were had to wit:

RESOLUTION 2013–11

In The Matter of a Resolution Supporting H.R. 1526, Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act

Now, the Union County Board of Commissioners recognize that Oregonians in our forested communities are facing extreme poverty, systemic unemployment, and thousands of children on free and reduced lunch.

Whereas, Union County currently faces 8.3% unemployment; and

Whereas, 53% of school children in Union County are eligible for Free or Reduced lunch programs; and

Whereas, Union County's poverty rate is 16.6%; and

Whereas, these negative economic conditions can be attributed to the reduction in timber harvests in our National Forests (80% reduction over the past 30 years) and corresponding mill closures; and

Whereas, Union County cannot afford for any more mills to close and desire to recover our lost mill capacity; and

Whereas H.R. 1526 is a bipartisan effort that aims to put people back to work in the woods, reduce litigation, provide certainty for counties so that they can provide essential services, lift families out of poverty, and prevent catastrophic wildfires that we have been experiencing, Now therefore the Union County Board of Commissioners Hereby Resolve to support H.R. 1526, Restoring Healthy Forests For Healthy Communities Act, and urge all members of the U.S. House of Representatives to support the passage and implementation of this important legislation.

Dated this 18th day of September, 2013.

MARK D. DAVIDSON, *Chairman*.
STEVE MCCLURE, *Commissioner*.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR), another member of the Natural Resources Committee

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1526. I want to thank Chairman HASTINGS and the ranking member for all of the work that they have done on this bill. And today I specifically rise in support of title IV of H.R. 1526, which I originally introduced as H.R. 1294, the Self-Sufficient Community Lands Act. I thank Chairman HASTINGS for recognizing the importance of this issue and including it in the bill.

In Idaho and much of the West, the economies of rural communities once relied upon the timber industry for job creation and tax revenues. Over the last several decades, extreme environmentalists have hindered the ability to develop timber from our public lands through litigation. In fact, timber harvests have declined more than 80 percent over the last 30 years. Counties that were once dependent on timber receipts to fund schools, roads, and daily operations find themselves desolate and broke.

In 2000, when the Federal Government operated with a budget surplus, and in order to compensate for the decline in timber receipts, as everybody knows, Congress passed the Secure Rural Schools and Communities Self-Determination Act. These payments were supposed to be phased out over time to allow counties to diversify their local economies. However, last year alone, 35 of Idaho's 44 counties received SRS payments totaling over $26 million. While Congress has continually reauthorized this funding, we are still fighting the same issues about multiple use on public land while leaving our counties in limbo.

To solve this problem, I introduced H.R. 1294. This legislation empowers counties to generate much needed revenue by turning over management of Federal forests to local and State officials who are best equipped to make these important management decisions rather than bureaucrats in Washington.

It is time to permanently provide our counties with a solution which would create jobs, generate tax receipts for the counties, and improve forest health. In a time of record deficits, it is time that we stopped kicking the can down the road and started working toward a solution.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Chairman, our country continues to spend billions of dollars on this program instead of fixing the program.

Traditional rural timber communities have been operating in an environment of uncertainty for decades, and many public lands in Western States have been inaccessible due to Federal policies and litigation. It is time we find a long-term solution to help our counties. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1526.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE), a valued former member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this bipartisan bill that brings commonsense management back to our forests.

Since Tom Tidwell took over the Forest Service, he said that he would like to reintroduce fire into the wild. Well, he's done that. This year, almost 10 million acres, more than twice the size of New Jersey. In the years since 2009 when he took over, larger than Ohio, 27 million acres have burned in our national forests.

Instead, this bill creates jobs—jobs in places like Cibola County in New Mexico where Matt Allen used to have a thriving mill but now survives on cutting one-by-four timber, one-by-four boards out of the logs he is able to take out of the forest.

Our streams are choked with mud. Habitat is devastated. A 75-foot deep lake near Ruidoso, New Mexico, that provides drinking water to the city of Alamogordo has 50 feet of fill in that 70-foot lake. Our fish are dead. Our streams are dead, choked with mud because the head of the U.S. Forest Service says, Let it burn instead of cut it. Common sense says cut it. This bill ensures that.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I will advise my friend that I have no further requests for time, and I am prepared to close if the gentleman is prepared to close.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As I stated earlier, this is an imperfect vehicle. I have major concerns about three of the titles in this bill, but this is the beginning of a legislative process. It's almost become pretty rare here in Washington, D.C. We put something forward. We send it to the Senate. The Senate takes up that or a similar legislation. We go to a conference committee. We work things out. And we solve problems. It was that for most of the first 25 years I was here. That's a rare thing these days.

This holds promise to enter into the real legislative process, a real beginning. Now, if we fail to act, we just reinforce the status quo; and I've got to tell you, the status quo is totally unacceptable. There are some who would prefer that. They think they win with the current paralysis. Well, if you want permanent protection of our old growth, if you want additional wilderness on the Rogue River, if you want the Devil's Staircase wilderness, and if you want better forest health, the status quo won't get you there. If that's what you really care about, it won't get you there.

Now, my counties can't wait. The status quo, I have two counties who are experimenting, essentially, with how does a county go bankrupt. It's something that's never happened before and isn't provided for in Oregon statute. And I have others who are not too far behind.

My rural communities are in desperate need of real jobs. They can't wait either. So we cannot fail to act. We move forward tonight or tomorrow with a vote, and then it will be time for the Senate to come up with its version. Then we can go to a conference committee. We can work out final legislation and take it to the President.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. How much time do I have, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself the balance of my time.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman LUCAS of the Agriculture Committee for his cooperation in expediting this bill to the floor. We have immortalized our agreement in an exchange of letters.

And I want to thank the ranking member because I think in his closing remarks, he made exactly the right statement, and that is that we in the House will have our position. The Senate is obligated to do the same, and it may be entirely different, and that's fine. But we work out the differences. And I also want to thank the ranking member and his two colleagues from Oregon because I understand the uniqueness of what they are looking for and, frankly, their approach to their unique—this was very similar to what I and others were thinking should be applied elsewhere. So that's what is embodied in this bill.

But I want to just make one point here because sometimes we lose sight of this fact. What is multiple use in timber, when we talk about timber? Multiple use means, from a commercial standpoint, of thinning and harvesting the timber. Where we get caught up in the differences, we look at timber entirely different from any other crop.

I represent a very diversified agricultural area in central Washington, and the crops are on a yearly basis. It's as diverse as apples to wheat. But when farmers plant these crops, then they use various chemicals at various times of year in order to manage whatever may happen so that they can harvest a good crop at the end of the year.

Well, timber is exactly the same, except depending on the type of timber, the harvest period is from 30 to 40 years. But if you have a problem with pine beetles, as we've had throughout the West, and this is a crop in a multiple-use area, you ought to manage that. You manage that by using the chemicals that are available.

So the only difference when we talk about managing timber from a 1-year management of yearly crops is the time span. But it should be managed in a responsible way in that regard, and that's what we provide for in this bill, to set targets and properly manage.

So I think this is a good bill. I certainly hope that my colleagues will support this when we have the vote tomorrow so that we can continue the process of negotiating with the Senate when they, hopefully, pass a bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONER,
WASHINGTON COUNTY OREGON,
Hillsboro, OR.

Senator RON WYDEN,
Senator JEFF MERKLEY,
U.S. Senate.
Congressman PETER DEFAZIO,
Congressman EARL BLUMENAUER,
Congressman GREG WALDEN,
Congressman KURT SCHRADER,
Congresswoman SUZANNE BONAMICI,
House of Representatives.

DEAR OREGON CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION: As Chair of Washington County Board of County Commissioners I am writing to offer my support for H.R. 1526. This legislation provides a real solution to timber dependent counties in Oregon that have suffered from a history of lost opportunities.

H.R. 1526 creates an important template for restoring a promise made over a century ago to actively manage federal forests. I believe had federal agencies actively managed public lands over the last twenty years we would not be seeing the loss of resources and lives from a horrible summer of wildfires throughout the western U.S.

Washington County has been fortunate to see economic growth throughout the recession. That growth however, did not occur by luck, but was instead the result of decisions made by local governments, communities and business over the last fifty years. My colleagues in more rural Oregon counties don't have the same ability to make decisions because of the federal government dominance in landownership. H.R. 1526 provides an important role for local decision making.

It is important to maintain a proper balance of resource protection so water quality, critical habitat, and recreational opportunities are addressed in a future forest plan. I believe H.R. 1526 creates a pathway to achieve this balance.

H.R 1526 provides a common sense approach for returning to sustainable forest management where the planned harvest is stable, resources are protected and communities start the rebuilding process. For long term social and financial health of rural communities it is important to re-establish a healthy forest products industry and create a healthy forest environment.

Sincerely,

ANDY DUYCK,
Chair,
Washington County Board of Commissioners.

IN THE COUNTY COURT FOR THE STATE OF OREGON FOR THE COUNTY OF HARNEY

RESOLUTION 2013–24

In the Matter of a Resolution Supporting H.R. 1526, Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act

Now, the Harney County Court recognizes that Oregonians in our forested communities are facing extreme poverty, systemic unemployment, and thousands of children on free and reduced lunch; and,

Whereas, Harney County currently faces 12.9% unemployment; and

Whereas, 66% of school children in Harney County are eligible for Free or Reduced lunch programs; and

Whereas, these negative economic conditions can be attributed to the reduction in timber harvests in our National Forests (80% reduction over the past 30 years) and corresponding mill closures; and

Whereas, Harney County cannot afford for any more mills to close and desire to recover our lost mill capacity; and

Whereas H.R. 1526 is a bipartisan effort that aims to put people back to work in the woods, reduce litigation, provide certainty for counties so that they can provide essential services, lift families out of poverty, and prevent catastrophic wildfires that we have been experiencing.

Now therefore, the Harney County Court hereby

Resolves to support H.R. 1526, Restoring Healthy Forests For Healthy Communities Act, and urge all members of the U.S. House of Representatives to support the passage and implementation of this important legislation.

Dated this 18th day of September, 2013.

Harney County Court:
STEVEN E. GRASTY,
Judge.

DAN NICHOLS,
Commissioner.

PETE RUNNELS,
Commissioner.

IN THE COUNTY COURT OF THE STATE OF OREGON IN AND FOR WHEELER COUNTY

RESOLUTION 2013–19

In the Matter of a Resolution Supporting H.R. 1526, Restoring Healthy Forests For Healthy Communities Act

Now, the Wheeler County Court recognizes that Oregonians in our forested communities are facing extreme poverty, systemic unemployment, and thousands of children on free and reduced lunch.

Whereas, Wheeler County faces 6.4% unemployment; and

Whereas, 67% of school children in Wheeler County are eligible for Free or Reduced lunch programs; and

Whereas, Wheeler County's poverty rate is 12.6%; and

Whereas, the funding for maintenance of county road infrastructure is imperative to public safety, access for school busses, and to support access to federal forest lands and national monument visitor sites; and

Whereas, these negative economic conditions can be attributed to the reduction in timber harvests in our National Forests (80% reduction over the past 30 years) and corresponding mill closures; and

Whereas, H.R. 1526 is a bipartisan effort that aims to put people back to work in the woods, reduce litigation, provide certainty for counties so that they can provide essential services, lift families out of poverty, and prevent catastrophic wildfires that we have been experiencing;

Now, therefore, the Wheeler County Court hereby

Resolves to support H.R. 1526, Restoring Healthy Forests For Healthy Communities Act, and urges all members of the U.S. House of Representatives to support the passage and implementation of this important legislation.

Dated this 18 day of September, 2013.

PATRICK C. PERRY,
Wheeler County Judge.

ROBERT L. ORDWAY,
County Commissioner.

ANNE C. MITCHELL,
County Commissioner.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
JACKSON COUNTY OREGON,
Medford, OR, September 16, 2013.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,
Hon. GREG WALDEN,
Hon. EARL BLUMENAUER,
Hon. KURT SCHRADER,
Hon. SUZANNE BONAMICI.

DEAR MEMBERS OF OREGON'S HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: I am writing to request your support for H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, and ask that you vote in favor of this bill when the opportunity arises. H.R. 1526 would renew the commitment to manage federal forests for the benefit of counties impacted by federal forestland, improve forest health and help prevent catastrophic wildfires.

Oregon continues to lose infrastructure and jobs due to federal policies that have strangled sustainable management of a renewable resource. We are harvesting less than five percent of the annual growth in federal forests, resulting in overstocked stands and conditions ripe for wildfire. H.R. 1526 would permit responsible, limited timber production on Forest Service lands, would allow significant state and local involvement, and would separately address management of the unique O&C Lands by incorporating the bipartisan solution crafted by Representatives DeFazio, Schrader and Walden. The bill also would allow cooperative state and federal fire mitigation projects in areas that cross ownership boundaries.

The expiration of the Secure Rural Schools (SRS) program in 2012 has resulted in drastic budget shortfalls in our Counties. H.R. 1526 provides one year of bridge funding at the SRS 2010 level, allowing transition to more active forest management and a return to shared revenues from forest management. These revenues would provide schools with substantial funding and support public safety, road maintenance, and social service programs. Improved management and restoration of the nation's forests will generate tremendous environmental and social benefits and create desperately needed jobs and revenue for rural economies.

Thank you for your support of Oregon counties and schools and for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

JOHN RACHOR,
County Commissioner.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, September 10, 2013.

Hon. DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HASTINGS: Thank you for the opportunity to review the relevant provisions of the text of H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act. 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. 1526 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,

FRANK D. LUCAS,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, September 11, 2013.

Hon. FRANK D. LUCAS,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act. As you know, the Committee on Natural Resources ordered reported the bill, as amended, on July 31, 2013. I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Agriculture will forego action on the bill.

The Committee on Natural Resources concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1526 at this time, the Committee on Agriculture does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Agriculture represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include your letter and this response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Natural Resources, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–21, modified by the amendment printed in part B of House Report 113–215, is adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1526

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—RESTORING THE COMMITMENT TO RURAL COUNTIES AND SCHOOLS

Sec. 101. Purposes.
Sec. 102. Definitions.
Sec. 103. Establishment of Forest Reserve Revenue Areas and annual volume requirements.
Sec. 104. Management of Forest Reserve Revenue Areas.
Sec. 105. Distribution of forest reserve revenues.

TITLE II—HEALTHY FOREST MANAGEMENT AND CATASTROPHIC WILDFIRE PREVENTION

Sec. 201. Purposes.
Sec. 202. Definitions.
Sec. 203. Hazardous fuel reduction projects and forest health projects in at-risk forests.
Sec. 204. Environmental analysis.
Sec. 205. State designation of high-risk areas of National Forest System and public lands.
Sec. 206. Use of hazardous fuels reduction or forest health projects for high-risk areas.

TITLE III—OREGON AND CALIFORNIA RAILROAD GRANT LANDS TRUST, CONSERVATION, AND JOBS

Sec. 301. Short title.
Sec. 302. Definitions.

Subtitle A—Trust, Conservation, and Jobs

CHAPTER 1—CREATION AND TERMS OF O&C TRUST

Sec. 311. Creation of O&C Trust and designation of O&C Trust lands.
Sec. 312. Legal effect of O&C Trust and judicial review.
Sec. 313. Board of Trustees.
Sec. 314. Management of O&C Trust lands.
Sec. 315. Distribution of revenues from O&C Trust lands.
Sec. 316. Land exchange authority.
Sec. 317. Payments to the United States Treasury.

CHAPTER 2—TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS TO FOREST SERVICE

Sec. 321. Transfer of certain Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands to Forest Service.
Sec. 322. Management of transferred lands by Forest Service.
Sec. 323. Management efficiencies and expedited land exchanges.
Sec. 324. Review panel and old growth protection.
Sec. 325. Uniqueness of old growth protection on Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands.

CHAPTER 3—TRANSITION

Sec. 331. Transition period and operations.
Sec. 332. O&C Trust management capitalization.
Sec. 333. Existing Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service contracts.
Sec. 334. Protection of valid existing rights and access to non-Federal land.
Sec. 335. Repeal of superseded law relating to Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands.

Subtitle B—Coos Bay Wagon Roads

Sec. 341. Transfer of management authority over certain Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant lands to Coos County, Oregon.
Sec. 342. Transfer of certain Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant lands to Forest Service.
Sec. 343. Land exchange authority.

Subtitle C—Oregon Treasures

CHAPTER 1—WILDERNESS AREAS

Sec. 351. Designation of Devil's Staircase Wilderness.
Sec. 352. Expansion of Wild Rogue Wilderness Area.

CHAPTER 2—WILD AND SCENIC RIVER DESIGNATED AND RELATED PROTECTIONS

Sec. 361. Wild and scenic river designations, Molalla River.
Sec. 362. Wild and Scenic Rivers Act technical corrections related to Chetco River.
Sec. 363. Wild and scenic river designations, Wasson Creek and Franklin Creek.
Sec. 364. Wild and scenic river designations, Rogue River area.
Sec. 365. Additional protections for Rogue River tributaries.

CHAPTER 3—ADDITIONAL PROTECTIONS

Sec. 371. Limitations on land acquisition.
Sec. 372. Overflights.
Sec. 373. Buffer zones.
Sec. 374. Prevention of wildfires.
Sec. 375. Limitation on designation of certain lands in Oregon.

CHAPTER 4—EFFECTIVE DATE

Sec. 381. Effective date.

Subtitle D—Tribal Trust Lands

PART 1—COUNCIL CREEK LAND CONVEYANCE

Sec. 391. Definitions.
Sec. 392. Conveyance.
Sec. 393. Map and legal description.
Sec. 394. Administration.

PART 2—OREGON COASTAL LAND CONVEYANCE

Sec. 395. Definitions.
Sec. 396. Conveyance.
Sec. 397. Map and legal description.
Sec. 398. Administration.

TITLE IV—COMMUNITY FOREST MANAGEMENT DEMONSTRATION

Sec. 401. Purpose and definitions.
Sec. 402. Establishment of community forest demonstration areas.
Sec. 403. Advisory committee.
Sec. 404. Management of community forest demonstration areas.
Sec. 405. Distribution of funds from community forest demonstration area.
Sec. 406. Initial funding authority.
Sec. 407. Payments to United States Treasury.
Sec. 408. Termination of community forest demonstration area.

TITLE V—REAUTHORIZATION AND AMENDMENT OF EXISTING AUTHORITIES AND OTHER MATTERS

Sec. 501. Extension of Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 pending full operation of Forest Reserve Revenue Areas.
Sec. 502. Restoring original calculation method for 25-percent payments.
Sec. 503. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management good-neighbor cooperation with States to reduce wildfire risks.
Sec. 504. Stewardship end result contracting project authority.
Sec. 505. Clarification of National Forest Management Act of 1976 authority.
Sec. 506. Treatment as supplemental funding.
Sec. 507. Exception of certain forest projects and activities from Appeals Reform Act and other review.

TITLE I—RESTORING THE COMMITMENT TO RURAL COUNTIES AND SCHOOLS

SEC. 101. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are as follows:

(1) To restore employment and educational opportunities in, and improve the economic stability of, counties containing National Forest System land.

(2) To ensure that such counties have a dependable source of revenue from National Forest System land.

(3) To reduce Forest Service management costs while also ensuring the protection of United States forests resources.

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) ANNUAL VOLUME REQUIREMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''annual volume requirement'', with respect to a Forest Reserve Revenue Area, means a volume of national forest materials no less than 50 percent of the sustained yield of the Forest Reserve Revenue Area.

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—In determining the volume of national forest materials or the sustained yield of a Forest Reserve Revenue Area, the Secretary may not include non-commercial post and pole sales and personal use firewood.

(2) BENEFICIARY COUNTY.—The term ''beneficiary county'' means a political subdivision of a State that, on account of containing National Forest System land, was eligible to receive payments through the State under title I of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7111 et seq.).

(3) CATASTROPHIC EVENT.—The term ''catastrophic event'' means an event (including severe fire, insect or disease infestations, windthrow, or other extreme weather or natural disaster) that the Secretary determines will cause or has caused substantial damage to National Forest System land or natural resources on National Forest System land.

(4) COVERED FOREST RESERVE PROJECT.—The terms ''covered forest reserve project'' and ''covered project'' mean a project involving the management or sale of national forest materials within a Forest Reserve Revenue Area to generate forest reserve revenues and achieve the annual volume requirement for the Forest Reserve Revenue Area.

(5) FOREST RESERVE REVENUE AREA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''Forest Reserve Revenue Area'' means National Forest System land in a unit of the National Forest System designated for sustainable forest management for the production of national forest materials and forest reserve revenues.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—Subject to subparagraph (C), but otherwise notwithstanding any other provision of law, including executive orders and regulations, the Secretary shall include in Forest Reserve Revenue Areas not less than 50 percent of the National Forest System lands identified as commercial forest land capable of producing twenty cubic feet of timber per acre.

(C) EXCLUSIONS.—A Forest Reserve Revenue Area may not include National Forest System land—

(i) that is a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System;

(ii) on which the removal of vegetation is specifically prohibited by Federal statute; or

(iii) that is within a National Monument as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(6) FOREST RESERVE REVENUES.—The term ''forest reserve revenues'' means revenues derived from the sale of national forest materials in a Forest Reserve Revenue Area.

(7) NATIONAL FOREST MATERIALS.—The term ''national forest materials'' has the meaning given that term in section 14(e)(1) of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a(e)(1)).

(8) NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM.—The term ''National Forest System'' has the meaning given that term in section 11(a) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1609(a)), except that the term does not include the National Grasslands and land utilization projects designated as National Grasslands administered pursuant to the Act of July 22, 1937 (7 U.S.C. 1010–1012).

(9) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(10) SUSTAINED YIELD.—The term ''sustained yield'' means the maximum annual growth potential of the forest calculated on the basis of the culmination of mean annual increment using cubic measurement.

(11) STATE.—The term ''State'' includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(12) 25-PERCENT PAYMENT.—The term ''25-percent payment'' means the payment to States required by the sixth paragraph under the heading of ''FOREST SERVICE'' in the Act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260; 16 U.S.C. 500), and section 13 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 963; 16 U.S.C. 500).

SEC. 103. ESTABLISHMENT OF FOREST RESERVE REVENUE AREAS AND ANNUAL VOLUME REQUIREMENTS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF FOREST RESERVE REVENUE AREAS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall establish one or more Forest Reserve Revenue Areas within each unit of the National Forest System.

(b) DEADLINE FOR ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall complete establishment of the Forest Reserve Revenue Areas not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act,

(c) PURPOSE.—The purpose of a Forest Reserve Revenue Area is to provide a dependable source of 25-percent payments and economic activity through sustainable forest management for each beneficiary county containing National Forest System land.

(d) FIDUCIARY RESPONSIBILITY.—The Secretary shall have a fiduciary responsibility to beneficiary counties to manage Forest Reserve Revenue Areas to satisfy the annual volume requirement.

(e) DETERMINATION OF ANNUAL VOLUME REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the establishment of a Forest Reserve Revenue Area, the Secretary shall determine the annual volume requirement for that Forest Reserve Revenue Area.

(f) LIMITATION ON REDUCTION OF FOREST RESERVE REVENUE AREAS.—Once a Forest Reserve Revenue Area is established under subsection (a), the Secretary may not reduce the number of acres of National Forest System land included in that Forest Reserve Revenue Area.

(g) MAP.—The Secretary shall provide a map of all Forest Reserve Revenue Areas established under subsection (a) for each unit of the National Forest System—

(1) to the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

(2) to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(h) RECOGNITION OF VALID AND EXISTING RIGHTS.—Neither the establishment of Forest Reserve Revenue Areas under subsection (a) nor any other provision of this title shall be construed to limit or restrict—

(1) access to National Forest System land for hunting, fishing, recreation, and other related purposes; or

(2) valid and existing rights regarding National Forest System land, including rights of any federally recognized Indian tribe.

SEC. 104. MANAGEMENT OF FOREST RESERVE REVENUE AREAS.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO ACHIEVE ANNUAL VOLUME REQUIREMENT.—Immediately upon the establishment of a Forest Reserve Revenue Area, the Secretary shall manage the Forest Reserve Revenue Area in the manner necessary to achieve the annual volume requirement for the Forest Reserve Revenue Area. The Secretary is authorized and encouraged to commence covered forest reserve projects as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act to begin generating forest reserve revenues.

(b) STANDARDS FOR PROJECTS WITHIN FOREST RESERVE REVENUE AREAS.—The Secretary shall conduct covered forest reserve projects within Forest Reserve Revenue Areas in accordance with this section, which shall serve as the sole means by which the Secretary will comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4331 et seq.) and other laws applicable to the covered projects.

(c) ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS PROCESS FOR PROJECTS IN FOREST RESERVE REVENUE AREAS.—

(1) ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary shall give published notice and complete an environmental assessment pursuant to section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)) for a covered forest reserve project proposed to be conducted within a Forest Reserve Revenue Area, except that the Secretary is not required to study, develop, or describe any alternative to the proposed agency action.

(2) CUMULATIVE EFFECTS.—The Secretary shall consider cumulative effects solely by evaluating the impacts of a proposed covered forest reserve project combined with the impacts of any other projects that were approved with a Decision Notice or Record of Decision before the date on which the Secretary published notice of the proposed covered project. The cumulative effects of past projects may be considered in the environmental assessment by using a description of the current environmental conditions.

(3) LENGTH.—The environmental assessment prepared for a proposed covered forest reserve project shall not exceed 100 pages in length. The Secretary may incorporate in the environmental assessment, by reference, any documents that the Secretary determines, in the sole discretion of the Secretary, are relevant to the assessment of the environmental effects of the covered project.

(4) DEADLINE FOR COMPLETION.—The Secretary shall complete the environmental assessment for a covered forest reserve project within 180 days after the date on which the Secretary published notice of the proposed covered project.

(5) TREATMENT OF DECISION NOTICE.— The decision notice for a covered forest reserve project shall be considered a final agency action and no additional analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4331 et seq.) shall be required to implement any portion of the covered project.

(6) CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION.—A covered forest reserve project that is proposed in response to a catastrophic event, that covers an area of 10,000 acres or less, or an eligible hazardous fuel reduction or forest health project proposed under title II that involves the removal of insect-infected trees, dead or dying trees, trees presenting a threat to public safety, or other hazardous fuels within 500 feet of utility or telephone infrastructure, campgrounds, roadsides, heritage sites, recreation sites, schools, or other infrastructure, shall be categorically excluded from the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4331 et seq.).

(d) APPLICATION OF LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The Secretary may modify the standards and guidelines contained in the land and resource management plan for the unit of the National Forest System in which the covered forest reserve project will be carried out as necessary to achieve the requirements of this Act. Section 6(g)(3)(E)(iv) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604(g)(3)(E)(iv)) shall not apply to a covered forest reserve project.

(e) COMPLIANCE WITH ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT.—

(1) NON-JEOPARDY ASSESSMENT.—If the Secretary determines that a proposed covered forest reserve project may affect the continued existence of any species listed as endangered or threatened under section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533), the Secretary shall issue a determination explaining the view of the Secretary that the proposed covered project is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the species.

(2) SUBMISSION, REVIEW, AND RESPONSE.—

(A) SUBMISSION.—The Secretary shall submit a determination issued by the Secretary under paragraph (1) to the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Commerce, as appropriate.

(B) REVIEW AND RESPONSE.—Within 30 days after receiving a determination under subparagraph (A), the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Commerce, as appropriate, shall provide a written response to the Secretary concurring in or rejecting the Secretary's determination. If the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Commerce rejects the determination, the written response shall include recommendations for measures that—

(i) will avoid the likelihood of jeopardy to an endangered or threatened species;

(ii) can be implemented in a manner consistent with the intended purpose of the covered forest reserve project;

(iii) can be implemented consistent with the scope of the Secretary's legal authority and jurisdiction; and

(iv) are economically and technologically feasible.

(3) FORMAL CONSULTATION.—If the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Commerce rejects a determination issued by the Secretary under paragraph (1), the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Commerce also is required to engage in formal consultation with the Secretary. The Secretaries shall complete such consultation pursuant to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536) within 90 days after the submission of the written response under paragraph (2).

(f) ADMINISTRATIVE AND JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

(1) ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.—Administrative review of a covered forest reserve project shall occur only in accordance with the special administrative review process established under section 105 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6515).

(2) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Judicial review of a covered forest reserve project shall occur in accordance with section 106 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6516).

(B) BOND REQUIRED.—A plaintiff challenging a covered forest reserve project shall be required to post a bond or other security acceptable to the court for the reasonably estimated costs, expenses, and attorneys fees of the Secretary as defendant. All proceedings in the action shall be stayed until the security is given. If the plaintiff has not complied with the order to post such bond or other security within 90 days after the date of service of the order, then the action shall be dismissed with prejudice.

(C) RECOVERY.—If the Secretary prevails in the case, the Secretary shall submit to the court a motion for payment of all litigation expenses.

(g) USE OF ALL-TERRAIN VEHICLES FOR MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary may allow the use of all-terrain vehicles within the Forest Reserve Revenue Areas for the purpose of activities associated with the sale of national forest materials in a Forest Reserve Revenue Area.

SEC. 105. DISTRIBUTION OF FOREST RESERVE REVENUES.

(a) 25-PERCENT PAYMENTS.—The Secretary shall use forest reserve revenues generated by a covered forest reserve project to make 25-percent payments to States for the benefit of beneficiary counties.

(b) DEPOSIT IN KNUTSON-VANDENBERG AND SALVAGE SALE FUNDS.—After compliance with subsection (a), the Secretary shall use forest reserve revenues to make deposits into the fund established under section 3 of the Act of June 9, 1930 (16 U.S.C. 576b; commonly known as the Knutson-Vandenberg Fund) and the fund established under section 14(h) of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a(h); commonly known as the salvage sale fund) in contributions equal to the monies otherwise collected under those Acts for projects conducted on National Forest System land.

(c) DEPOSIT IN GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY.—After compliance with subsections (a) and (b), the Secretary shall deposit remaining forest reserve revenues into the general fund of the Treasury.

TITLE II—HEALTHY FOREST MANAGEMENT AND CATASTROPHIC WILDFIRE PREVENTION

SEC. 201. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are as follows:

(1) To provide the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior with the tools necessary to reduce the potential for wildfires.

(2) To expedite wildfire prevention projects to reduce the chances of wildfire on certain high-risk Federal lands.

(3) To protect communities and forest habitat from uncharacteristic wildfires.

(4) To enhance aquatic conditions and terrestrial wildlife habitat.

(5) To restore diverse and resilient landscapes through improved forest conditions.

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) AT-RISK COMMUNITY.—The term ''at-risk community'' has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6511).

(2) AT-RISK FOREST.—The term ''at-risk forest'' means—

(A) Federal land in condition class II or III, as those classes were developed by the Forest Service Rocky Mountain Research Station in the general technical report titled ''Development of Coarse-Scale Spatial Data for Wildland Fire and Fuel Management'' (RMRS-87) and dated April 2000 or any subsequent revision of the report; or

(B) Federal land where there exists a high risk of losing an at-risk community, key ecosystem, water supply, wildlife, or wildlife habitat to wildfire, including catastrophic wildfire and post-fire disturbances, as designated by the Secretary concerned.

(3) FEDERAL LAND.—

(A) COVERED LAND.—The term ''Federal land'' means—

(i) land of the National Forest System (as defined in section 11(a) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1609(a))); or

(ii) public lands (as defined in section 103 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702)).

(B) EXCLUDED LAND.—The term does not include land—

(i) that is a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System;

(ii) on which the removal of vegetation is specifically prohibited by Federal statute; or

(iii) that is within a National Monument as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(4) HIGH-RISK AREA.—The term ''high-risk area'' means an area of Federal land identified under section 205 as an area suffering from the bark beetle epidemic, drought, or deteriorating forest health conditions, with the resulting imminent risk of devastating wildfires, or otherwise at high risk for bark beetle infestation, drought, or wildfire.

(5) SECRETARY CONCERNED.—The term ''Secretary concerned'' means—

(A) the Secretary of Agriculture, in the case of National Forest System land; and

(B) the Secretary of the Interior, in the case of public lands.

(6) ELIGIBLE HAZARDOUS FUEL REDUCTION AND FOREST HEALTH PROJECTS.—The terms ''hazardous fuel reduction project'' or ''forest health project'' mean the measures and methods developed for a project to be carried out on Federal land—

(A) in an at-risk forest under section 203 for hazardous fuels reduction, forest health, forest restoration, or watershed restoration, using ecological restoration principles consistent with the forest type where such project will occur; or

(B) in a high-risk area under section 206.

SEC. 203. HAZARDOUS FUEL REDUCTION PROJECTS AND FOREST HEALTH PROJECTS IN AT-RISK FORESTS.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary concerned is authorized to implement a hazardous fuel reduction project or a forest health project in at-risk forests in a manner that focuses on surface, ladder, and canopy fuels reduction activities using ecological restoration principles consistent with the forest type in the location where such project will occur.

(b) AUTHORIZED PRACTICES.—

(1) INCLUSION OF LIVESTOCK GRAZING AND TIMBER HARVESTING.—A hazardous fuel reduction project or a forest health project may include livestock grazing and timber harvest projects carried out for the purposes of hazardous fuels reduction, forest health, forest restoration, watershed restoration, or threatened and endangered species habitat protection or improvement, if the management action is consistent with achieving long-term ecological restoration of the forest type in the location where such project will occur.

(2) GRAZING.—Domestic livestock grazing may be used in a hazardous fuel reduction project or a forest health project to reduce surface fuel loads and to recover burned areas. Utilization standards shall not apply when domestic livestock grazing is used in such a project.

(3) TIMBER HARVESTING AND THINNING.—Timber harvesting and thinning, where the ecological restoration principles are consistent with the forest type in the location where such project will occur, may be used in a hazardous fuel reduction project or a forest health project to reduce ladder and canopy fuel loads to prevent unnatural fire.

(c) PRIORITY.—The Secretary concerned shall give priority to hazardous fuel reduction projects and forest health projects submitted by the Governor of a State as provided in section 206(c) and to projects submitted under the Tribal Forest Protection Act of 2004 (25 U.S.C. 3115a).

SEC. 204. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS.

Subsections (b) through (f) of section 104 shall apply to the implementation of a hazardous fuel reduction project or a forest health project under this title.

SEC. 205. STATE DESIGNATION OF HIGH-RISK AREAS OF NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM AND PUBLIC LANDS.

(a) DESIGNATION AUTHORITY.—The Governor of a State may designate high-risk areas of Federal land in the State for the purposes of addressing—

(1) deteriorating forest health conditions in existence as of the date of the enactment of this Act due to the bark beetle epidemic or drought, with the resulting imminent risk of devastating wildfires; and

(2) the future risk of insect infestations or disease outbreaks through preventative treatments to improve forest health conditions.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In designating high-risk areas, the Governor of a State shall consult with county government from affected counties and with affected Indian tribes.

(c) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN AREAS.—The following Federal land may not be designated as a high-risk area:

(1) A component of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

(2) Federal land on which the removal of vegetation is specifically prohibited by Federal statute.

(3) Federal land within a National Monument as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) STANDARDS FOR DESIGNATION.—Designation of high-risk areas shall be consistent with standards and guidelines contained in the land and resource management plan or land use plan for the unit of Federal land for which the designation is being made, except that the Secretary concerned may modify such standards and guidelines to correspond with a specific high-risk area designation.

(e) TIME FOR INITIAL DESIGNATIONS.—The first high-risk areas should be designated not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, but high-risk areas may be designated at any time consistent with subsection (a).

(f) DURATION OF DESIGNATION.—The designation of a high-risk area in a State shall expire 20 years after the date of the designation, unless earlier terminated by the Governor of the State.

(g) REDESIGNATION.—The expiration of the 20-year period specified in subsection (f) does not prohibit the Governor from redesignating an area of Federal land as a high-risk area under this section if the Governor determines that the Federal land continues to be subject to the terms of this section.

(h) RECOGNITION OF VALID AND EXISTING RIGHTS.—The designation of a high-risk area shall not be construed to limit or restrict—

(1) access to Federal land included in the area for hunting, fishing, and other related purposes; or

(2) valid and existing rights regarding the Federal land.

SEC. 206. USE OF HAZARDOUS FUELS REDUCTION OR FOREST HEALTH PROJECTS FOR HIGH-RISK AREAS.

(a) PROJECT PROPOSALS.—

(1) PROPOSALS AUTHORIZED.—Upon designation of a high-risk area in a State, the Governor of the State may provide for the development of proposed hazardous fuel reduction projects or forest health projects for the high-risk area.

(2) PROJECT CRITERIA.—In preparing a proposed hazardous fuel reduction project or a forest health project, the Governor of a State and the Secretary concerned shall—

(A) take into account managing for rights of way, protection of watersheds, protection of wildlife and endangered species habitat, safeguarding water resources, and protecting at-risk communities from wildfires; and

(B) emphasize activities that thin the forest to provide the greatest health and longevity of the forest.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In preparing a proposed hazardous fuel reduction project or a forest health project, the Governor of a State shall consult with county government from affected counties, and with affected Indian tribes.

(c) SUBMISSION AND IMPLEMENTATION.—The Governor of a State shall submit proposed emergency hazardous fuel reduction projects and forest health projects to the Secretary concerned for implementation as provided in section 203.

TITLE III—OREGON AND CALIFORNIA RAILROAD GRANT LANDS TRUST, CONSERVATION, AND JOBS

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''O&C Trust, Conservation, and Jobs Act''.

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) AFFILIATES.—The term ''Affiliates'' has the meaning given such term in part 121 of title 13, Code of Federal Regulations.

(2) BOARD OF TRUSTEES.—The term ''Board of Trustees'' means the Board of Trustees for the Oregon and California Railroad Grant Lands Trust appointed under section 313.

(3) COOS BAY WAGON ROAD GRANT LANDS.—The term ''Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant lands'' means the lands reconveyed to the United States pursuant to the first section of the Act of February 26, 1919 (40 Stat. 1179).

(4) FISCAL YEAR.—The term ''fiscal year'' means the Federal fiscal year, October 1 through the next September 30.

(5) GOVERNOR.—The term ''Governor'' means the Governor of the State of Oregon.

(6) O&C REGION PUBLIC DOMAIN LANDS.—The term ''O&C Region Public Domain lands'' means all the land managed by the Bureau of Land Management in the Salem District, Eugene District, Roseburg District, Coos Bay District, and Medford District in the State of Oregon, excluding the Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands and the Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant lands.

(7) O&C TRUST.—The terms ''Oregon and California Railroad Grant Lands Trust'' and ''O&C Trust'' mean the trust created by section 311, which has fiduciary responsibilities to act for the benefit of the O&C Trust counties in the management of O&C Trust lands.

(8) O&C TRUST COUNTY.—The term ''O&C Trust county'' means each of the 18 counties in the State of Oregon that contained a portion of the Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands as of January 1, 2013, each of which are beneficiaries of the O&C Trust.

(9) O&C TRUST LANDS.—The term ''O&C Trust lands'' means the surface estate of the lands over which management authority is transferred to the O&C Trust pursuant to section 311(c)(1). The term does not include any of the lands excluded from the O&C Trust pursuant to section 311(c)(2), transferred to the Forest Service under section 321, or Tribal lands transferred under subtitle D.

(10) OREGON AND CALIFORNIA RAILROAD GRANT LANDS.—The term ''Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands'' means the following lands:

(A) All lands in the State of Oregon revested in the United States under the Act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. 218), regardless of whether the lands are—

(i) administered by the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Land Management, pursuant to the first section of the Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181a); or

(ii) administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as part of the National Forest System pursuant to the first section of the Act of June 24, 1954 (43 U.S.C. 1181g).

(B) All lands in the State obtained by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the land exchanges authorized and directed by section 2 of the Act of June 24, 1954 (43 U.S.C. 1181h).

(C) All lands in the State acquired by the United States at any time and made subject to the provisions of title II of the Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181f).

(11) RESERVE FUND.—The term ''Reserve Fund'' means the reserve fund created by the Board of Trustees under section 315(b).

(12) SECRETARY CONCERNED.—The term ''Secretary concerned'' means—

(A) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands that are transferred to the management authority of the O&C Trust and, immediately before such transfer, were managed by the Bureau of Land Management; and

(B) the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands that—

(i) are transferred to the management authority of the O&C Trust and, immediately before such transfer, were part of the National Forest System; or

(ii) are transferred to the Forest Service under section 321.

(13) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of Oregon.

(14) TRANSITION PERIOD.—The term ''transition period'' means the three fiscal-year period specified in section 331 following the appointment of the Board of Trustees during which—

(A) the O&C Trust is created; and

(B) interim funding of the O&C Trust is secured.

(15) TRIBAL LANDS.—The term ''Tribal lands'' means any of the lands transferred to the Cow Creek Band of the Umpqua Tribe of Indians or the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians under subtitle D.

Subtitle A—Trust, Conservation, and Jobs

CHAPTER 1—CREATION AND TERMS OF O&C TRUST

SEC. 311. CREATION OF O&C TRUST AND DESIGNATION OF O&C TRUST LANDS.

(a) CREATION.—The Oregon and California Railroad Grant Lands Trust is established effective on October 1 of the first fiscal year beginning after the appointment of the Board of Trustees. As management authority over the surface of estate of the O&C Trust lands is transferred to the O&C Trust during the transition period pursuant to section 331, the transferred lands shall be held in trust for the benefit of the O&C Trust counties.

(b) TRUST PURPOSE.—The purpose of the O&C Trust is to produce annual maximum sustained revenues in perpetuity for O&C Trust counties by managing the timber resources on O&C Trust lands on a sustained-yield basis subject to the management requirements of section 314.

(c) DESIGNATION OF O&C TRUST LANDS.—

(1) LANDS INCLUDED.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the O&C Trust lands shall include all of the lands containing the stands of timber described in subsection (d) that are located, as of January 1, 2013, on Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands and O&C Region Public Domain lands.

(2) LANDS EXCLUDED.—O&C Trust lands shall not include any of the following Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands and O&C Region Public Domain lands (even if the lands are otherwise described in subsection (d)):

(A) Federal lands within the National Landscape Conservation System as of January 1, 2013.

(B) Federal lands designated as Areas of Critical Environmental Concern as of January 1, 2013.

(C) Federal lands that were in the National Wilderness Preservation System as of January 1, 2013.

(D) Federal lands included in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System of January 1, 2013.

(E) Federal lands within the boundaries of a national monument, park, or other developed recreation area as of January 1, 2013.

(F) Oregon treasures addressed in subtitle C, any portion of which, as of January 1, 2013, consists of Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands or O&C Region Public Domain lands.

(G) Tribal lands addressed in subtitle D.

(d) COVERED STANDS OF TIMBER.—

(1) DESCRIPTION.—The O&C Trust lands consist of stands of timber that have previously been managed for timber production or that have been materially altered by natural disturbances since 1886. Most of these stands of timber are 80 years old or less, and all of such stands can be classified as having a predominant stand age of 125 years or less.

(2) DELINEATION OF BOUNDARIES BY BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT.—The Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands and O&C Region Public Domain lands that, immediately before transfer to the O&C Trust, were managed by the Bureau of Land Management are timber stands that have predominant birth date attributes of 1886 or later, with boundaries that are defined by polygon spatial data layer in and electronic data compilation filed by the Bureau of Land Management pursuant to paragraph (4). Except as provided in paragraph (5), the boundaries of all timber stands constituting the O&C Trust lands are finally and conclusively determined for all purposes by coordinates in or derived by reference to the polygon spatial data layer prepared by the Bureau of Land Management and filed pursuant to paragraph (4), notwithstanding anomalies that might later be discovered on the ground. The boundary coordinates are locatable on the ground by use of global positioning system signals. In cases where the location of the stand boundary is disputed or is inconsistent with paragraph (1), the location of boundary coordinates on the ground shall be, except as otherwise provided in paragraph (5), finally and conclusively determined for all purposes by the direct or indirect use of global positioning system equipment with accuracy specification of one meter or less.

(3) DELINEATION OF BOUNDARIES BY FOREST SERVICE.—The O&C Trust lands that, immediately before transfer to the O&C Trust, were managed by the Forest Service are timber stands that can be classified as having predominant stand ages of 125 years old or less. Within 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall commence identification of the boundaries of such stands, and the boundaries of all such stands shall be identified and made available to the Board of Trustees not later than 180 days following the creation of the O&C Trust pursuant to subsection (a). In identifying the stand boundaries, the Secretary may use geographic information system data, satellite imagery, cadastral survey coordinates, or any other means available within the time allowed. The boundaries shall be provided to the Board of Trustees within the time allowed in the form of a spatial data layer from which coordinates can be derived that are locatable on the ground by use of global positioning system signals. Except as provided in paragraph (5), the boundaries of all timber stands constituting the O&C Trust lands are finally and conclusively determined for all purposes by coordinates in or derived by reference to the data provided by the Secretary within the time provided by this paragraph, notwithstanding anomalies that might later be discovered on the ground. In cases where the location of the stand boundary is disputed or inconsistent with paragraph (1), the location of boundary coordinates on the ground shall be, except as otherwise provided in paragraph (5), finally and conclusively determined for all purposes by the boundary coordinates provided by the Secretary as they are located on the ground by the direct or indirect use of global positioning system equipment with accuracy specifications of one meter or less. All actions taken by the Secretary under this paragraph shall be deemed to not involve Federal agency action or Federal discretionary involvement or control.

(4) DATA AND MAPS.—Copies of the data containing boundary coordinates for the stands included in the O&C Trust lands, or from which such coordinates are derived, and maps generally depicting the stand locations shall be filed with the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, and the office of the Secretary concerned. The maps and data shall be filed—

(A) not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, in the case of the lands identified pursuant to paragraph (2); and

(B) not later than 180 days following the creation of the O&C Trust pursuant to subsection (a), in the case of lands identified pursuant to paragraph (3).

(5) ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY AND LIMITATIONS.—

(A) NO IMPACT ON DETERMINING TITLE OR PROPERTY OWNERSHIP BOUNDARIES.—Stand boundaries identified under paragraph (2) or (3) shall not be relied upon for purposes of determining title or property ownership boundaries. If the boundary of a stand identified under paragraph (2) or (3) extends beyond the property ownership boundaries of Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands or O&C Region Public Domain lands, as such property boundaries exist on the date of enactment of this Act, then that stand boundary is deemed adjusted by this subparagraph to coincide with the property ownership boundary.

(B) EFFECT OF DATA ERRORS OR INCONSISTENCIES.—Data errors or inconsistencies may result in parcels of land along property ownership boundaries that are unintentionally omitted from the O&C Trust lands that are identified under paragraph (2) or (3). In order to correct such errors, any parcel of land that satisfies all of the following criteria is hereby deemed to be O&C Trust land:

(i) The parcel is within the ownership boundaries of Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands or O&C Region Public Domain lands on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(ii) The parcel satisfies the description in paragraph (1) on the date of enactment of this Act.

(iii) The parcel is not excluded from the O&C Trust lands pursuant to subsection (c)(2).

(C) NO IMPACT ON LAND EXCHANGE AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this subsection is intended to limit the authority of the Trust and the Forest Service to engage in land exchanges between themselves or with owners of non-Federal land as provided elsewhere in this title.

SEC. 312. LEGAL EFFECT OF O&C TRUST AND JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) LEGAL STATUS OF TRUST LANDS.—Subject to the other provisions of this section, all right, title, and interest in and to the O&C Trust lands remain in the United States, except that—

(1) the Board of Trustees shall have all authority to manage the surface estate of the O&C Trust lands and the resources found thereon;

(2) actions on the O&C Trust lands shall be deemed to involve no Federal agency action or Federal discretionary involvement or control and the laws of the State shall apply to the surface estate of the O&C Trust lands in the manner applicable to privately owned timberlands in the State; and

(3) the O&C Trust shall be treated as the beneficial owner of the surface estate of the O&C Trust lands for purposes of all legal proceedings involving the O&C Trust lands.

(b) MINERALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Mineral and other subsurface rights in the O&C Trust lands are retained by the United States or other owner of such rights as of the date on which management authority over the surface estate of the lands are transferred to the O&C Trust.

(2) ROCK AND GRAVEL.—

(A) USE AUTHORIZED; PURPOSE.—For maintenance or construction on the road system under the control of the O&C Trust or for non-Federal lands intermingled with O&C Trust lands, the Board of Trustees may—

(i) utilize rock or gravel found within quarries in existence immediately before the date of the enactment of this Act on any Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands and O&C Region Public Domain lands, excluding those lands designated under subtitle C or transferred under subtitle D; and

(ii) construct new quarries on O&C Trust lands, except that any quarry so constructed may not exceed 5 acres.

(B) EXCEPTION.—The Board of Trustees shall not construct new quarries on any of the lands transferred to the Forest Service under section 321 or lands designated under subtitle D.

(c) ROADS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Board of Trustees shall assume authority and responsibility over, and have authority to use, all roads and the road system specified in the following subparagraphs:

(A) All roads and road systems on the Oregon and California Railroad and Grant lands and O&C Region Public Domain lands owned or administered by the Bureau of Land Management immediately before the date of the enactment of this Act, except that the Secretary of Agriculture shall assume the Secretary of Interior's obligations for pro-rata maintenance expense and road use fees under reciprocal right-of-way agreements for those lands transferred to the Forest Service under section 321. All of the lands transferred to the Forest Service under section 321 shall be considered as part of the tributary area used to calculate pro-rata maintenance expense and road use fees.

(B) All roads and road systems owned or administered by the Forest Service immediately before the date of the enactment of this Act and subsequently included within the boundaries of the O&C Trust lands.

(C) All roads later added to the road system for management of the O&C Trust lands.

(2) LANDS TRANSFERRED TO FOREST SERVICE.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall assume the obligations of the Secretary of Interior for pro-rata maintenance expense and road use fees under reciprocal rights-of-way agreements for those Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands or O&C Region Public Domain lands transferred to the Forest Service under section 321.

(3) COMPLIANCE WITH CLEAN WATER ACT.—All roads used, constructed, or reconstructed under the jurisdiction of the O&C Trust must comply with requirements of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) applicable to private lands through the use of Best Management Practices under the Oregon Forest Practices Act.

(d) PUBLIC ACCESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), public access to O&C Trust lands shall be preserved consistent with the policies of the Secretary concerned applicable to the O&C Trust lands as of the date on which management authority over the surface estate of the lands is transferred to the O&C Trust.

(2) RESTRICTIONS.—The Board of Trustees may limit or control public access for reasons of public safety or to protect the resources on the O&C Trust lands.

(e) LIMITATIONS.—The assets of the O&C Trust shall not be subject to the creditors of an O&C Trust county, or otherwise be distributed in an unprotected manner or be subject to anticipation, encumbrance, or expenditure other than for a purpose for which the O&C Trust was created.

(f) REMEDY.—An O&C Trust county shall have all of the rights and remedies that would normally accrue to a beneficiary of a trust. An O&C Trust county shall provide the Board of Trustees, the Secretary concerned,

and the Attorney General with not less than 60 days notice of an intent to sue to enforce the O&C Trust county's rights under the O&C Trust.

(g) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), judicial review of any provision of this title shall be sought in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. Parties seeking judicial review of the validity of any provision of this title must file suit within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and no preliminary injunctive relief or stays pending appeal will be permitted. If multiple cases are filed under this paragraph, the Court shall consolidate the cases. The Court must rule on any action brought under this paragraph within 180 days.

(2) DECISIONS OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES.—Decisions made by the Board of Trustees shall be subject to judicial review only in an action brought by an O&C County, except that nothing in this title precludes bringing a legal claim against the Board of Trustees that could be brought against a private landowner for the same action.

SEC. 313. BOARD OF TRUSTEES.

(a) APPOINTMENT AUTHORIZATION.—Subject to the conditions on appointment imposed by this section, the Governor is authorized to appoint the Board of Trustees to administer the O&C Trust and O&C Trust lands. Appointments by the Governor shall be made within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) MEMBERS AND ELIGIBILITY.—

(1) NUMBER.—Subject to subsection (c), the Board of Trustees shall consist of seven members.

(2) RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT.—Members of the Board of Trustees must reside within an O&C Trust county.

(3) GEOGRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION.—To the extent practicable, the Governor shall ensure broad geographic representation among the O&C Trust counties in appointing members to the Board of Trustees.

(c) COMPOSITION.—The Board of Trustees shall include the following members:

(1)(A) Two forestry and wood products representatives, consisting of—

(i) one member who represents the commercial timber, wood products, or milling industries and who represents an Oregon-based company with more than 500 employees, taking into account its affiliates, that has submitted a bid for a timber sale on the Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands, O&C Region Public Domain lands, Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant lands, or O&C Trust lands in the preceding five years; and

(ii) one member who represents the commercial wood products or milling industries and who represents an Oregon-based company with 500 or fewer employees, taking into account its affiliates, that has submitted a bid for a timber sale on the Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands, O&C Region Public Domain lands, Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant lands, or O&C Trust lands in the preceding five years.

(B) At least one of the two representatives selected in this paragraph must own commercial forest land that is adjacent to the O&C Trust lands and from which the representative has not exported unprocessed timber in the preceding five years.

(2) One representative of the general public who has professional experience in one or more of the following fields:

(A) Business management.

(B) Law.

(C) Accounting.

(D) Banking.

(E) Labor management.

(F) Transportation.

(G) Engineering.

(H) Public policy.

(3) One representative of the science community who, at a minimum, holds a Doctor of Philosophy degree in wildlife biology, forestry, ecology, or related field and has published peer-reviewed academic articles in the representative's field of expertise.

(4) Three governmental representatives, consisting of—

(A) two members who are serving county commissioners of an O&C Trust county and who are nominated by the governing bodies of a majority of the O&C Trust counties and approved by the Governor, except that the two representatives may not be from the same county; and

(B) one member who holds State-wide elected office (or is a designee of such a person) or who represents a federally recognized Indian tribe or tribes within one or more O&C Trust counties.

(d) TERM, INITIAL APPOINTMENT, VACANCIES.—

(1) TERM.—Except in the case of initial appointments, members of the Board of Trustees shall serve for five-year terms and may be reappointed for one consecutive term.

(2) INITIAL APPOINTMENTS.—In making the first appointments to the Board of Trustees, the Governor shall stagger initial appointment lengths so that two members have three-year terms, two members have four-year terms, and three members have a full five-year term.

(3) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy on the Board of Trustees shall be filled within 45 days by the Governor for the unexpired term of the departing member.

(4) BOARD OF TRUSTEES MANAGEMENT COSTS.—Members of the Board of Trustees may receive annual compensation from the O&C Trust at a rate not to exceed 50 percent of the average annual salary for commissioners of the O&C Trust counties for that year.

(e) CHAIRPERSON AND OPERATIONS.—

(1) CHAIRPERSON.—A majority of the Board of Trustees shall select the chairperson for the Board of Trustees each year.

(2) MEETINGS.—The Board of Trustees shall establish proceedings to carry out its duties. The Board shall meet at least quarterly. Except for meetings substantially involving personnel and contractual decisions, all meetings of the Board shall comply with the public meetings law of the State.

(f) QUORUM AND DECISION-MAKING.—

(1) QUORUM.—A quorum shall consist of five members of the Board of Trustees. The presence of a quorum is required to constitute an official meeting of the board of trustees to satisfy the meeting requirement under subsection (e)(2).

(2) DECISIONS.—All actions and decisions by the Board of Trustees shall require approval by a majority of members.

(g) ANNUAL AUDIT.—Financial statements regarding operation of the O&C Trust shall be independently prepared and audited annually for review by the O&C Trust counties, Congress, and the State.

SEC. 314. MANAGEMENT OF O&C TRUST LANDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this title, the O&C Trust lands will be managed by the Board of Trustees in compliance with all Federal and State laws in the same manner as such laws apply to private forest lands.

(b) TIMBER SALE PLANS.—The Board of Trustees shall approve and periodically update management and sale plans for the O&C Trust lands consistent with the purpose specified in section 311(b). The Board of Trustees may defer sale plans during periods of depressed timber markets if the Board of Trustees, in its discretion, determines that such delay until markets improve is financially prudent and in keeping with its fiduciary obligation to the O&C Trust counties.

(c) STAND ROTATION.—

(1) 100-120 YEAR ROTATION.—The Board of Trustees shall manage not less than 50 percent of the harvestable acres of the O&C Trust lands on a 100-120 year rotation. The acreage subject to 100-120 year management shall be geographically dispersed across the O&C Trust lands in a manner that the Board of Trustees, in its discretion, determines will contribute to aquatic and terrestrial ecosystem values.

(2) BALANCE.—The balance of the harvestable acreage of the O&C Trust lands shall be managed on any rotation age the Board of Trustees, in its discretion and in compliance with applicable State law, determines will best satisfy its fiduciary obligation to provide revenue to the O&C Trust counties.

(3) THINNING.—Nothing in this subsection is intended to limit the ability of the Board of Trustees to decide, in its discretion, to thin stands of timber on O&C Trust lands.

(d) SALE TERMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), the Board of Trustees is authorized to establish the terms for sale contracts of timber or other forest products from O&C Trust lands.

(2) SET ASIDE.—The Board of Trustees shall establish a program consistent with the program of the Bureau of Land Management under a March 10, 1959 Memorandum of Understanding, as amended, regarding calculation of shares and sale of timber set aside for purchase by business entities with 500 or fewer employees and consistent with the regulations in part 121 of title 13, Code of Federal Regulations applicable to timber sale set asides, except that existing shares in effect on the date of enactment of this Act shall apply until the next scheduled recomputation of shares. In implementing its program that is consistent with such Memorandum of Understanding, the Board of Trustees shall utilize the Timber Sale Procedure Handbook and other applicable procedures of the Bureau of Land Management, including the Operating Procedures for Conducting the Five-Year Recomputation of Small Business Share Percentages in effect on January 1, 2013.

(3) COMPETITIVE BIDDING.—The Board of Trustees must sell timber on a competitive bid basis. No less than 50 percent of the total volume of timber sold by the Board of Trustees each year shall be sold by oral bidding consistent with practices of the Bureau of Land Management as of January 1, 2013.

(e) PROHIBITION ON EXPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As a condition on the sale of timber or other forest products from O&C Trust lands, unprocessed timber harvested from O&C Trust lands may not be exported.

(2) VIOLATIONS.—Any person who knowingly exports unprocessed timber harvested from O&C Trust lands, who knowingly provides such unprocessed timber for export by another person, or knowingly sells timber harvested from O&C Trust lands to a person who is disqualified from purchasing timber from such lands pursuant to this section shall be disqualified from purchasing timber or other forest products from O&C Trust lands or from Federal lands administered under this subtitle. Any person who uses unprocessed timber harvested from O&C Trust lands in substitution for exported unprocessed timber originating from private lands shall be disqualified from purchasing timber or other forest products from O&C Trust lands or from Federal lands administered under this subtitle.

(3) UNPROCESSED TIMBER DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''unprocessed timber'' has the meaning given such term in section

493(9) of the Forest Resources Conservation and Shortage Relief Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 620e(9)).

(f) INTEGRATED PEST, DISEASE, AND WEED MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The Board of Trustees shall develop an integrated pest and vegetation management plan to assist forest managers in prioritizing and minimizing the use of pesticides and herbicides approved by the Environmental Protection Agency and used in compliance with the Oregon Forest Practices Act. The plan shall optimize the ability of the O&C Trust to re-establish forest stands after harvest in compliance with the Oregon Forest Practices Act and to create diverse early seral stage forests. The plan shall allow for the eradication, containment and suppression of disease, pests, weeds and noxious plants, and invasive species as found on the State Noxious Weed List and prioritize ground application of herbicides and pesticides to the greatest extent practicable. The plan shall be completed before the start of the second year of the transition period. The planning process shall be open to the public and the Board of Trustees shall hold not less than two public hearings on the proposed plan before final adoption.

(g) ACCESS TO LANDS TRANSFERRED TO FOREST SERVICE.—Persons acting on behalf of the O&C Trust shall have a right of timely access over lands transferred to the Forest Service under section 321 and Tribal lands transferred under subtitle D as is reasonably necessary for the Board of Trustees to carry out its management activities with regard to the O&C Trust lands and the O&C Trust to satisfy its fiduciary duties to O&C counties.

(h) HARVEST AREA TREE AND RETENTION REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The O&C Trust lands shall include harvest area tree and retention requirements consistent with State law.

(2) USE OF OLD GROWTH DEFINITION.—To the greatest extent practicable, and at the discretion of the Board of Trustees, old growth, as defined by the Old Growth Review Panel created by section 324, shall be used to meet the retention requirements applicable under paragraph (1).

(i) RIPARIAN AREA MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The O&C Trust lands shall be managed with timber harvesting limited in riparian areas as follows:

(A) STREAMS.—For all fish bearing streams and all perennial non-fish-bearing streams, there shall be no removal of timber within a distance equal to the height of one site potential tree on both sides of the stream channel. For intermittent, non-fish-bearing streams, there shall be no removal of timber within a distance equal to one-half the height of a site potential tree on both sides of the stream channel. For purposes of this subparagraph, the stream channel boundaries are the lines of ordinary high water.

(B) LARGER LAKES, PONDS AND RESERVOIRS.—For all lakes, ponds, and reservoirs with surface area larger than one quarter of one acre, there shall be no removal of timber within a distance equal to the height of one site potential tree from the line of ordinary high water of the water body.

(C) SMALL PONDS AND NATURAL WETLANDS, SPRINGS AND SEEPS.—For all ponds with surface area one quarter acre or less, and for all natural wetlands, springs and seeps, there shall be no removal of timber within the area dominated by riparian vegetation.

(2) MEASUREMENTS.—For purposes of paragraph (1), all distances shall be measured along slopes, and all site potential tree heights shall be average height at maturity of the dominant species of conifer determined at a scale no finer than the applicable fifth field watershed.

(3) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed—

(A) to prohibit the falling or placement of timber into streams to create large woody debris for the benefit of aquatic ecosystems; or

(B) to prohibit the falling of trees within riparian areas as may be reasonably necessary for safety or operational reasons in areas adjacent to the riparian areas, or for road construction or maintenance pursuant to section 312(c)(3).

(j) FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE.—

(1) RECIPROCAL FIRE PROTECTION AGREEMENTS.—

(A) CONTINUATION OF AGREEMENTS.—Subject to subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D), any reciprocal fire protection agreement between the State or any other entity and the Secretary concerned with regard to Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands and O&C Region Public Domain lands in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act shall remain in place for a period of ten years after such date unless earlier terminated by the State or other entity.

(B) ASSUMPTION OF BLM RIGHTS AND DUTIES.—The Board of Trustees shall exercise the rights and duties of the Bureau of Land Management under the agreements described in subparagraph (A), except as such rights and duties might apply to Tribal lands under subtitle D.

(C) EFFECT OF EXPIRATION OF PERIOD.—Following the expiration of the ten-year period under subparagraph (A), the Board of Trustees shall continue to provide for fire protection of the Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands and O&C Region Public Domain lands, including those transferred to the Forest Service under section 331, through continuation of the reciprocal fire protection agreements, new cooperative agreements, or by any means otherwise permitted by law. The means selected shall be based on the review by the Board of Trustees of whether the reciprocal fire protection agreements were effective in protecting the lands from fire.

(D) EMERGENCY RESPONSE.—Nothing in this paragraph shall prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from an emergency response to a fire on the O&C Trust lands or lands transferred to the Forest Service under section 321.

(2) EMERGENCY RESPONSE TO FIRE.—Subject to paragraph (1), if the Secretary of Agriculture determines that fire on any of the lands transferred under section 321 is burning uncontrolled or the Secretary, the Board of Trustees, or contracted party does not have readily and immediately available personnel and equipment to control or extinguish the fire, the Secretary, or any forest protective association or agency under contract or agreement with the Secretary or the Board of Trustees for the protection of forestland against fire, shall summarily and aggressively abate the nuisance thus controlling and extinguishing the fire.

(k) NORTHERN SPOTTED OWL.—So long as the O&C Trust maintains the 100-120 year rotation on 50 percent of the harvestable acres required in subsection (c), the section 321 lands representing the best quality habitat for the owl are transferred to the Forest Service, and the O&C Trust protects currently occupied northern spotted owl nest sites consistent with the forest practices in the Oregon Forest Practices Act, management of the O&C Trust land by the Board of Trustees shall be considered to comply with section 9 of Public Law 93–205 (16 U.S.C. 1538) for the northern spotted owl. A currently occupied northern spotted owl nest site shall be considered abandoned if there are no northern spotted owl responses following three consecutive years of surveys using the Protocol for Surveying Management Activities that May Impact Northern Spotted Owls dated February 2, 2013.

SEC. 315. DISTRIBUTION OF REVENUES FROM O&C TRUST LANDS.

(a) ANNUAL DISTRIBUTION OF REVENUES.—

(1) TIME FOR DISTRIBUTION; USE.—Payments to each O&C Trust county shall be made available to the general fund of the O&C Trust county as soon as practicable following the end of each fiscal year, to be used as are other unrestricted county funds.

(2) AMOUNT.—The amount paid to an O&C Trust county in relation to the total distributed to all O&C Trust counties for a fiscal year shall be based on the proportion that the total assessed value of the Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands in each of the O&C Trust counties for fiscal year 1915 bears to the total assessed value of all of the Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands in the State for that same fiscal year. However, for the purposes of this subsection the portion of the revested Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands in each of the O&C Trust counties that was not assessed for fiscal year 1915 shall be deemed to have been assessed at the average assessed value of the Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands in the county.

(3) LIMITATION.—After the fifth payment made under this subsection, the payment to an O&C Trust county for a fiscal year shall not exceed 110 percent of the previous year's payment to the O&C Trust county, adjusted for inflation based on the consumer price index applicable to the geographic area in which the O&C Trust counties are located.

(b) RESERVE FUND.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF RESERVE FUND.—The Board of Trustees shall generate and maintain a reserve fund.

(2) DEPOSITS TO RESERVE FUND.—Within 10 years after creation of the O&C Trust or as soon thereafter as is practicable, the Board of Trustees shall establish and seek to maintain an annual balance of $125,000,000 in the Reserve Fund, to be derived from revenues generated from management activities involving O&C Trust lands. All annual revenues generated in excess of operating costs and payments to O&C Trust counties required by subsection (a) and payments into the Conservation Fund as provided in subsection (c) shall be deposited in the Reserve Fund.

(3) EXPENDITURES FROM RESERVE FUND.—The Board of Trustees shall use amounts in the Reserve Fund only—

(A) to pay management and administrative expenses or capital improvement costs on O&C Trust lands; and

(B) to make payments to O&C Trust counties when payments to the counties under subsection (a) are projected to be 90 percent or less of the previous year's payments.

(c) O&C TRUST CONSERVATION FUND.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF CONSERVATION FUND.—The Board of Trustees shall use a portion of revenues generated from activity on the O&C Trust lands, consistent with paragraph (2), to establish and maintain a O&C Trust Conservation Fund. The O&C Trust Conservation Fund shall include no Federal appropriations.

(2) REVENUES.—Following the transition period, five percent of the O&C Trust's annual net operating revenue, after deduction of all management costs and expenses, including the payment required under section 317, shall be deposited to the O&C Trust Conservation Fund.

(3) EXPENDITURES FROM CONSERVATION FUND.—The Board of Trustees shall use amounts from the O&C Trust Conservation Fund only—

(A) to fund the voluntary acquisition of conservation easements from willing private landowners in the State;

(B) to fund watershed restoration, remediation and enhancement projects within the State; or

(C) to contribute to balancing values in a land exchange with willing private landowners proposed under section 323(b), if the land exchange will result in a net increase in ecosystem benefits for fish, wildlife, or rare native plants.

SEC. 316. LAND EXCHANGE AUTHORITY.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Subject to approval by the Secretary concerned, the Board of Trustees may negotiate proposals for land exchanges with owners of lands adjacent to O&C Trust lands in order to create larger contiguous blocks of land under management by the O&C Trust to facilitate resource management, to improve conservation value of such lands, or to improve the efficiency of management of such lands.

(b) APPROVAL REQUIRED; CRITERIA.—The Secretary concerned may approve a land exchange proposed by the Board of Trustees administratively if the exchange meets the following criteria:

(1) The non-Federal lands are completely within the State.

(2) The non-Federal lands have high timber production value, or are necessary for more efficient or effective management of adjacent or nearby O&C Trust lands.

(3) The non-Federal lands have equal or greater value to the O&C Trust lands proposed for exchange.

(4) The proposed exchange is reasonably likely to increase the net income to the O&C Trust counties over the next 20 years and not decrease the net income to the O&C Trust counties over the next 10 years.

(c) ACREAGE LIMITATION.—The Secretary concerned shall not approve land exchanges under this section that, taken together with all previous exchanges involving the O&C Trust lands, have the effect of reducing the total acreage of the O&C Trust lands by more than five percent from the total acreage to be designated as O&C Trust land under section 311(c)(1).

(d) INAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN LAWS.—Section 3 of the Oregon Public Lands Transfer and Protection Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–321; 112 Stat. 3022), the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et. seq.), including the amendments made by the Federal Land Exchange Facilitation Act of 1988 (Public Law 100–409; 102 Stat. 1086), the Act of March 20, 1922 (16 U.S.C. 485, 486), and the Act of March 1, 1911 (commonly known as the Weeks Act; 16 U.S.C. 480 et seq.) shall not apply to the land exchange authority provided by this section.

(e) EXCHANGES WITH FOREST SERVICE.—

(1) EXCHANGES AUTHORIZED.—The Board of Trustees is authorized to engage in land exchanges with the Forest Service if approved by the Secretary pursuant to section 323(c).

(2) MANAGEMENT OF EXCHANGED LANDS.—Following completion of a land exchange under paragraph (1), the management requirements applicable to the newly acquired lands by the O&C Trust or the Forest Service shall be the same requirements under this subtitle applicable to the other lands that are managed by the O&C Board or the Forest Service.

SEC. 317. PAYMENTS TO THE UNITED STATES TREASURY.

As soon as practicable after the end of the third fiscal year of the transition period and in each of the subsequent seven fiscal years, the O&C Trust shall submit a payment of $10,000,000 to the United States Treasury.

CHAPTER 2—TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS TO FOREST SERVICE

SEC. 321. TRANSFER OF CERTAIN OREGON AND CALIFORNIA RAILROAD GRANT LANDS TO FOREST SERVICE.

(a) TRANSFER REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Interior shall transfer administrative jurisdiction over all Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands and O&C Region Public Domain lands not designated as O&C Trust lands by subparagraphs (A) through (F) of section 311(c)(1), including those lands excluded by section 311(c)(2), to the Secretary of Agriculture for inclusion in the National Forest System and administration by the Forest Service as provided in section 322.

(b) EXCEPTION.—This section does not apply to Tribal lands transferred under subtitle D.

SEC. 322. MANAGEMENT OF TRANSFERRED LANDS BY FOREST SERVICE.

(a) ASSIGNMENT TO EXISTING NATIONAL FORESTS.—To the greatest extent practicable, management responsibilities for the lands transferred under section 321 shall be assigned to the unit of the National Forest System geographically closest to the transferred lands. The Secretary of Agriculture shall have ultimate decision-making authority, but shall assign the transferred lands to a unit not later than the applicable transfer date provided in the transition period.

(b) APPLICATION OF NORTHWEST FOREST PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the lands transferred under section 321 shall be managed under the Northwest Forest Plan and shall retain Northwest Forest Plan land use designations until or unless changed in the manner provided by Federal laws applicable to the administration and management of the National Forest System.

(2) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN DESIGNATED LANDS.—The lands excluded from the O&C Trust by subparagraphs (A) through (F) of section 311(c)(2) and transferred to the Forest Service under section 321 shall be managed as provided by Federal laws applicable to the lands.

(c) PROTECTION OF OLD GROWTH.—Old growth, as defined by the Old Growth Review Panel pursuant to rulemaking conducted in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, shall not be harvested by the Forest Service on lands transferred under section 321.

(d) EMERGENCY RESPONSE TO FIRE.—Subject to section 314(i), if the Secretary of Agriculture determines that fire on any of the lands transferred under section 321 is burning uncontrolled or the Secretary or contracted party does not have readily and immediately available personnel and equipment to control or extinguish the fire, the Secretary, or any forest protective association or agency under contract or agreement with the Secretary for the protection of forestland against fire, and within whose protection area the fire exists, shall summarily and aggressively abate the nuisance thus controlling and extinguishing the fire.

SEC. 323. MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCIES AND EXPEDITED LAND EXCHANGES.

(a) LAND EXCHANGE AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Agriculture may conduct land exchanges involving lands transferred under section 321, other than the lands excluded from the O&C Trust by subparagraphs (A) through (F) of section 311(c)(2), in order create larger contiguous blocks of land under management of the Secretary to facilitate resource management, to improve conservation value of such lands, or to improve the efficiency of management of such lands.

(b) CRITERIA FOR EXCHANGES WITH NON-FEDERAL OWNERS.—The Secretary of Agriculture may conduct a land exchange administratively under this section with a non-Federal owner (other than the O&C Trust) if the land exchange meets the following criteria:

(1) The non-Federal lands are completely within the State.

(2) The non-Federal lands have high wildlife conservation or recreation value or the exchange is necessary to increase management efficiencies of lands administered by the Forest Service for the purposes of the National Forest System.

(3) The non-Federal lands have equal or greater value to the Federal lands purposed for exchange or a balance of values can be achieved—

(A) with a grant of funds provided by the O&C Trust pursuant to section 315(c); or

(B) from other sources.

(c) CRITERIA FOR EXCHANGES WITH O&C TRUST.—The Secretary of Agriculture may conduct land exchanges with the Board of Trustees administratively under this subsection, and such an exchange shall be deemed to not involve any Federal action or Federal discretionary involvement or control if the land exchange with the O&C Trust meets the following criteria:

(1) The O&C Trust lands to be exchanged have high wildlife value or ecological value or the exchange would facilitate resource management or otherwise contribute to the management efficiency of the lands administered by the Forest Service.

(2) The exchange is requested or approved by the Board of Trustees for the O&C Trust and will not impair the ability of the Board of Trustees to meet its fiduciary responsibilities.

(3) The lands to be exchanged by the Forest Service do not contain stands of timber meeting the definition of old growth established by the Old Growth Review Panel pursuant to section 324.

(4) The lands to be exchanged are equal in acreage.

(d) ACREAGE LIMITATION.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall not approve land exchanges under this section that, taken together with all previous exchanges involving the lands described in subsection (a), have the effect of reducing the total acreage of such lands by more than five percent from the total acreage originally transferred to the Secretary.

(e) INAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN LAWS.—Section 3 of the Oregon Public Lands Transfer and Protection Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–321; 112 Stat. 3022), the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et. seq.), including the amendments made by the Federal Land Exchange Facilitation Act of 1988 (Public Law 100–409; 102 Stat. 1086), the Act of March 20, 1922 (16 U.S.C. 485, 486), and the Act of March 1, 1911 (commonly known as the Weeks Act; 16 U.S.C. 480 et seq.) shall not apply to the land exchange authority provided by this section.

SEC. 324. REVIEW PANEL AND OLD GROWTH PROTECTION.

(a) APPOINTMENT; MEMBERS.—Within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act the Secretary of Agriculture shall appoint an Old Growth Review Panel consisting of five members. At a minimum, the members must hold a Doctor of Philosophy degree in wildlife biology, forestry, ecology, or related field and published peer-reviewed academic articles in their field of expertise.

(b) PURPOSE OF REVIEW.—Members of the Old Growth Review Panel shall review existing, published, peer-reviewed articles in relevant academic journals and establish a definition or definitions of old growth as it applies to the ecologically, geographically and climatologically unique Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands and O&C Region Public Domain lands managed by the O&C Trust or the Forest Service only. The definition or definitions shall bear no legal force, shall not be used as a precedent for, and shall not apply to any lands other than the Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands and O&C Region Public Domain lands managed by the O&C Trust or the Forest Service

in western Oregon. The definition or definitions shall not apply to Tribal lands.

(c) SUBMISSION OF RESULTS.—The definition or definitions for old growth in western Oregon established under subsection (b), if approved by at least four members of the Old Growth Review Panel, shall be submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture within six months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 325. UNIQUENESS OF OLD GROWTH PROTECTION ON OREGON AND CALIFORNIA RAILROAD GRANT LANDS.

All sections of this subtitle referring to the term ''old growth'' are uniquely suited to resolve management issues for the lands covered by this subtitle only, and shall not be construed as precedent for any other situation involving management of other Federal, State, Tribal, or private lands.

CHAPTER 3—TRANSITION

SEC. 331. TRANSITION PERIOD AND OPERATIONS.

(a) TRANSITION PERIOD.—

(1) COMMENCEMENT; DURATION.—Effective on October 1 of the first fiscal year beginning after the appointment of the Board of Trustees under section 313, a transition period of three fiscal years shall commence.

(2) EXCEPTIONS.—Unless specifically stated in the following subsections, any action under this section shall be deemed not to involve Federal agency action or Federal discretionary involvement or control.

(b) YEAR ONE.—

(1) APPLICABILITY.—During the first fiscal year of the transition period, the activities described in this subsection shall occur.

(2) BOARD OF TRUSTEES ACTIVITIES.—The Board of Trustees shall employ sufficient staff or contractors to prepare for beginning management of O&C Trust lands and O&C Region Public Domain lands in the second fiscal year of the transition period, including preparation of management plans and a harvest schedule for the lands over which management authority is transferred to the O&C Trust in the second fiscal year.

(3) FOREST SERVICE ACTIVITIES.—The Forest Service shall begin preparing to assume management authority of all Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands and O&C Region Public Domain lands transferred under section 321 in the second fiscal year.

(4) SECRETARY CONCERNED ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary concerned shall continue to exercise management authority over all Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands and O&C Region Public Domain lands under all existing Federal laws.

(5) INFORMATION SHARING.—Upon written request from the Board of Trustees, the Secretary of the Interior shall provide copies of any documents or data, however stored or maintained, that includes the requested information concerning O&C Trust lands. The copies shall be provided as soon as practicable and to the greatest extent possible, but in no event later than 30 days following the date of the request.

(6) EXCEPTION.—This subsection does not apply to Tribal lands transferred under subtitle D.

(c) YEAR TWO.—

(1) APPLICABILITY.—During the second fiscal year of the transition period, the activities described in this subsection shall occur.

(2) TRANSFER OF O&C TRUST LANDS.—Effective on October 1 of the second fiscal year of the transition period, management authority over the O&C Trust lands shall be transferred to the O&C Trust.

(3) TRANSFER OF LANDS TO FOREST SERVICE.—The transfers required by section 321 shall occur.

(4) INFORMATION SHARING.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall obtain and manage, as soon as practicable, all documents and data relating to the Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands, O&C Region Public Domain lands, and Coos Bay Wagon Road lands previously managed by the Bureau of Land Management. Upon written request from the Board of Trustees, the Secretary of Agriculture shall provide copies of any documents or data, however stored or maintained, that includes the requested information concerning O&C Trust lands. The copies shall be provided as soon as practicable and to the greatest extent possible, but in no event later than 30 days following the date of the request.

(5) IMPLEMENTATION OF MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The Board of Trustees shall begin implementing its management plan for the O&C Trust lands and revise the plan as necessary. Distribution of revenues generated from all activities on the O&C Trust lands shall be subject to section 315.

(d) YEAR THREE AND SUBSEQUENT YEARS.—

(1) APPLICABILITY.—During the third fiscal year of the transition period and all subsequent fiscal years, the activities described in this subsection shall occur.

(2) BOARD OF TRUSTEES MANAGEMENT.—The Board of Trustees shall manage the O&C Trust lands pursuant to subtitle A.

SEC. 332. O&C TRUST MANAGEMENT CAPITALIZATION.

(a) BORROWING AUTHORITY.—The Board of Trustees is authorized to borrow from any available private sources and non-Federal, public sources in order to provide for the costs of organization, administration, and management of the O&C Trust during the three-year transition period provided in section 331.

(b) SUPPORT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, O&C Trust counties are authorized to loan to the O&C Trust, and the Board of Trustees is authorized to borrow from willing O&C Trust counties, amounts held on account by such counties that are required to be expended in accordance with the Act of May 23,1908 (35. Stat. 260; 16 U.S.C. 500) and section 13 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat.963; 16 U.S.C. 500), except that, upon repayment by the O&C Trust, the obligation of such counties to expend the funds in accordance with such Acts shall continue to apply.

SEC. 333. EXISTING BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND FOREST SERVICE CONTRACTS.

(a) TREATMENT OF EXISTING CONTRACTS.—Any work or timber contracts sold or awarded by the Bureau of Land Management or Forest Service on or with respect to Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands or O&C Region Public Domain lands before the transfer of the lands to the O&C Trust or the Forest Service, or Tribal lands transferred under subtitle D, shall remain binding and effective according to the terms of the contracts after the transfer of the lands. The Board of Trustees and Secretary concerned shall make such accommodations as are necessary to avoid interfering in any way with the performance of the contracts.

(b) TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS UNDER CONTRACTS.—Payments made pursuant to the contracts described in subsection (a), if any, shall be made as provided in those contracts and not made to the O&C Trust.

SEC. 334. PROTECTION OF VALID EXISTING RIGHTS AND ACCESS TO NON-FEDERAL LAND.

(a) VALID RIGHTS.—Nothing in this title, or any amendment made by this title, shall be construed as terminating any valid lease, permit, patent, right-of-way, agreement, or other right of authorization existing on the date of the enactment of this Act with regard to Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands or O&C Region Public Domain lands, including O&C Trust lands over which management authority is transferred to the O&C Trust pursuant to section 311(c)(1), lands transferred to the Forest Service under section 321, and Tribal lands transferred under subtitle D.

(b) ACCESS TO LANDS.—

(1) EXISTING ACCESS RIGHTS.—The Secretary concerned shall preserve all rights of access and use, including (but not limited to) reciprocal right-of-way agreements, tail hold agreements, or other right-of-way or easement obligations existing on the date of the enactment of this Act, and such rights shall remain applicable to lands covered by this subtitle in the same manner and to the same extent as such rights applied before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) NEW ACCESS RIGHTS.—If a current or future landowner of land intermingled with Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands or O&C Region Public Domain lands does not have an existing access agreement related to the lands covered by this subtitle, the Secretary concerned shall enter into an access agreement, including appurtenant lands, to secure the landowner the reasonable use and enjoyment of the landowner's land, including the harvest and hauling of timber.

(c) MANAGEMENT COOPERATION.—The Board of Trustees and the Secretary concerned shall provide current and future landowners of land intermingled with Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands or O&C Region Public Domain lands the permission needed to manage their lands, including to locate tail holds, tramways, and logging wedges, to purchase guylines, and to cost-share property lines surveys to the lands covered by this subtitle, within 30 days after receiving notification of the landowner's plan of operation.

(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Notwithstanding section 312(g)(2), a private landowner may obtain judicial review of a decision of the Board of Trustees to deny—

(1) the landowner the rights provided by subsection (b) regarding access to the landowner's land; or

(2) the landowner the reasonable use and enjoyment of the landowner's land.

SEC. 335. REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED LAW RELATING TO OREGON AND CALIFORNIA RAILROAD GRANT LANDS.

(a) REPEAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181a et seq.) is repealed effective on October 1 of the first fiscal year beginning after the appointment of the Board of Trustees.

(b) EFFECT OF CERTAIN COURT RULINGS.—If, as a result of judicial review authorized by section 312, any provision of this subtitle is held to be invalid and implementation of the provision or any activity conducted under the provision is then enjoined, the Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181a et seq.), as in effect immediately before its repeal by subsection (a), shall be restored to full legal force and effect as if the repeal had not taken effect.

Subtitle B—Coos Bay Wagon Roads

SEC. 341. TRANSFER OF MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY OVER CERTAIN COOS BAY WAGON ROAD GRANT LANDS TO COOS COUNTY, OREGON.

(a) TRANSFER REQUIRED.—Except in the case of the lands described in subsection (b), the Secretary of the Interior shall transfer management authority over the Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant lands reconveyed to the United States pursuant to the first section of the Act of February 26, 1919 (40 Stat. 1179), and the surface resources thereon, to the Coos County government. The transfer shall be completed not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) LANDS EXCLUDED.—The transfer under subsection (a) shall not include any of the following Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant lands:

(1) Federal lands within the National Landscape Conservation System as of January 1, 2013.

(2) Federal lands designated as Areas of Critical Environmental Concern as of January 1, 2013.

(3) Federal lands that were in the National Wilderness Preservation System as of January 1, 2013.

(4) Federal lands included in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System of January 1, 2013.

(5) Federal lands within the boundaries of a national monument, park, or other developed recreation area as of January 1, 2013.

(6) All stands of timber generally older than 125 years old, as of January 1, 2011, which shall be conclusively determined by reference to the polygon spatial data layer in the electronic data compilation filed by the Bureau of Land Management based on the predominant birth-date attribute, and the boundaries of such stands shall be conclusively determined for all purposes by the global positioning system coordinates for such stands.

(7) Tribal lands addressed in subtitle D.

(c) MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Coos County shall manage the Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant lands over which management authority is transferred under subsection (a) consistent with section 314, and for purposes of applying such section, ''Board of Trustees'' shall be deemed to mean ''Coos County'' and ''O&C Trust lands'' shall be deemed to mean the transferred lands.

(2) RESPONSIBILITY FOR MANAGEMENT COSTS.—Coos County shall be responsible for all management and administrative costs of the Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant lands over which management authority is transferred under subsection (a).

(3) MANAGEMENT CONTRACTS.—Coos County may contract, if competitively bid, with one or more public, private, or tribal entities, including (but not limited to) the Coquille Indian Tribe, if such entities are substantially based in Coos or Douglas Counties, Oregon, to manage and administer the lands.

(d) TREATMENT OF REVENUES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—All revenues generated from the Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant lands over which management authority is transferred under subsection (a) shall be deposited in the general fund of the Coos County treasury to be used as are other unrestricted county funds.

(2) TREASURY.—As soon as practicable after the end of the third fiscal year of the transition period and in each of the subsequent seven fiscal years, Coos County shall submit a payment of $400,000 to the United States Treasury.

(3) DOUGLAS COUNTY.—Beginning with the first fiscal year for which management of the Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant lands over which management authority is transferred under subsection (a) generates net positive revenues, and for all subsequent fiscal years, Coos County shall transmit a payment to the general fund of the Douglas County treasury from the net revenues generated from the lands. The payment shall be made as soon as practicable following the end of each fiscal year and the amount of the payment shall bear the same proportion to total net revenues for the fiscal year as the proportion of the Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant lands in Douglas County in relation to all Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant lands in Coos and Douglas Counties as of January 1, 2013.

SEC. 342. TRANSFER OF CERTAIN COOS BAY WAGON ROAD GRANT LANDS TO FOREST SERVICE.

The Secretary of the Interior shall transfer administrative jurisdiction over the Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant lands excluded by paragraphs (1) through (6)of section 341(b) to the Secretary of Agriculture for inclusion in the National Forest System and administration by the Forest Service as provided in section 322.

SEC. 343. LAND EXCHANGE AUTHORITY.

Coos County may recommend land exchanges to the Secretary of Agriculture and carry out such land exchanges in the manner provided in section 316.

Subtitle C—Oregon Treasures

CHAPTER 1—WILDERNESS AREAS

SEC. 351. DESIGNATION OF DEVIL'S STAIRCASE WILDERNESS.

(a) DESIGNATION.—In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the Federal land in the State of Oregon administered by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management, comprising approximately 30,520 acres, as generally depicted on the map titled ''Devil's Staircase Wilderness Proposal'', dated October 26, 2009, are designated as a wilderness area for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System and to be known as the ''Devil's Staircase Wilderness''.

(b) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file with the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a map and legal description of wilderness area designated by subsection (a). The map and legal description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary may correct clerical and typographical errors in the map and description. In the case of any discrepancy between the acreage specified in subsection (a) and the map, the map shall control. The map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Chief of the Forest Service.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Devil's Staircase Wilderness Area shall be administered by the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior, in accordance with the Wilderness Act and the Oregon Wilderness Act of 1984, except that, with respect to the wilderness area, any reference in the Wilderness Act to the effective date of that Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) FOREST SERVICE ROADS.—As provided in section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)), the Secretary of Agriculture shall—

(A) decommission any National Forest System road within the wilderness boundaries; and

(B) convert Forest Service Road 4100 within the wilderness boundary to a trail for primitive recreational use.

(d) INCORPORATION OF ACQUIRED LAND AND INTERESTS.—Any land within the boundary of the wilderness area designated by this section that is acquired by the United States shall—

(1) become part of the Devil's Staircase Wilderness Area; and

(2) be managed in accordance with this section and any other applicable law.

(e) FISH AND WILDLIFE.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the State of Oregon with respect to wildlife and fish in the national forests.

(f) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid rights in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal land designated as wilderness area by this section is withdrawn from all forms of—

(1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) disposition under all laws pertaining to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.

(g) PROTECTION OF TRIBAL RIGHTS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to diminish—

(1) the existing rights of any Indian tribe; or

(2) tribal rights regarding access to Federal lands for tribal activities, including spiritual, cultural, and traditional food gathering activities.

SEC. 352. EXPANSION OF WILD ROGUE WILDERNESS AREA.

(a) EXPANSION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), certain Federal land managed by the Bureau of Land Management, comprising approximately 58,100 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ''Wild Rogue'', dated September 16, 2010, are hereby included in the Wild Rogue Wilderness, a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

(b) MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall file a map and a legal description of the wilderness area designated by this section, with—

(A) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(2) FORCE OF LAW.—The maps and legal descriptions filed under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this subtitle, except that the Secretary may correct typographical errors in the maps and legal descriptions.

(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Each map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—Subject to valid existing rights, the area designated as wilderness by this section shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.).

(d) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid rights in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal land designated as wilderness by this section is withdrawn from all forms of—

(1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) disposition under all laws pertaining to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.

CHAPTER 2—WILD AND SCENIC RIVER DESIGNATED AND RELATED PROTECTIONS

SEC. 361. WILD AND SCENIC RIVER DESIGNATIONS, MOLALLA RIVER.

(a) DESIGNATIONS.—Section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(____) MOLALLA RIVER, OREGON.—The following segments in the State of Oregon, to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior as a recreational river:

''(A) The approximately 15.1-mile segment from the southern boundary line of T. 7 S., R. 4 E., sec. 19, downstream to the edge of the Bureau of Land Management boundary in T. 6 S., R. 3 E., sec. 7.

''(B) The approximately 6.2-mile segment from the easternmost Bureau of Land Management boundary line in the NE¼ sec. 4, T. 7 S., R. 4 E., downstream to the confluence with the Molalla River.''.

(b) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—Section 3(a)(102) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)(102)) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking ''SQUAW CREEK'' and inserting ''WHYCHUS CREEK'';

(2) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''McAllister Ditch, including the Soap Fork Squaw Creek, the North Fork, the South Fork, the East and West Forks of Park Creek, and Park Creek Fork'' and inserting ''Plainview Ditch, including the Soap Creek, the North and South Forks of Whychus Creek, the East and West Forks of Park Creek, and Park Creek''; and

(3) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''McAllister Ditch'' and inserting ''Plainview Ditch''.

SEC. 362. WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS RELATED TO CHETCO RIVER.

Section 3(a)(69) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)(69)) is amended—

(1) by inserting before the ''The 44.5-mile'' the following:

''(A) DESIGNATIONS.—'';

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively (and by moving the margins 2 ems to the right);

(3) in clause (i), as redesignated—

(A) by striking ''25.5-mile'' and inserting ''27.5-mile''; and

(B) by striking ''Boulder Creek at the Kalmiopsis Wilderness boundary'' and inserting ''Mislatnah Creek'';

(4) in clause (ii), as redesignated—

(A) by striking ''8'' and inserting ''7.5'';

(B) by striking ''Boulder Creek'' and inserting ''Mislatnah Creek''; and

(C) by striking ''Steel Bridge'' and inserting ''Eagle Creek'';

(5) in clause (iii), as redesignated—

(A) by striking ''11'' and inserting ''9.5''; and

(B) by striking ''Steel Bridge'' and inserting ''Eagle Creek''; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid rights, the Federal land within the boundaries of the river segments designated by subparagraph (A), is withdrawn from all forms of—

''(i) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

''(ii) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

''(iii) disposition under all laws pertaining to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.''.

SEC. 363. WILD AND SCENIC RIVER DESIGNATIONS, WASSON CREEK AND FRANKLIN CREEK.

Section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(____) FRANKLIN CREEK, OREGON.—The 4.5-mile segment from the headwaters to the private land boundary in section 8 to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as a wild river.

''(____) WASSON CREEK, OREGON.—

''(A) The 4.2-mile segment from the eastern edge of section 17 downstream to the boundary of sections 11 and 12 to be administered by the Secretary of Interior as a wild river.

''(B) The 5.9-mile segment downstream from the boundary of sections 11 and 12 to the private land boundary in section 22 to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as a wild river.''.

SEC. 364. WILD AND SCENIC RIVER DESIGNATIONS, ROGUE RIVER AREA.

(a) DESIGNATIONS.—Section 3(a)(5) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)(5)) (relating to the Rogue River, Oregon) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''In addition to the segment described in the previous sentence, the following segments in the Rogue River area are designated:

''(A) KELSEY CREEK.—The approximately 4.8 miles of Kelsey Creek from east section line of T32S, R9W, sec. 34, W.M. to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

''(B) EAST FORK KELSEY CREEK.—The approximately 4.6 miles of East Fork Kelsey Creek from the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in T33S, R8W, sec. 5, W.M. to the confluence with Kelsey Creek as a wild river.

''(C) WHISKY CREEK.—

''(i) The approximately 0.6 miles of Whisky Creek from the confluence of the East Fork and West Fork to 0.1 miles downstream from road 33-8-23 as a recreational river.

''(ii) The approximately 1.9 miles of Whisky Creek from 0.1 miles downstream from road 33-8-23 to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

''(D) EAST FORK WHISKY CREEK.—

''(i) The approximately 2.8 miles of East Fork Whisky Creek from the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in T33S, R8W, sec. 11, W.M. to 0.1 miles downstream of road 33-8-26 crossing as a wild river.

''(ii) The approximately .3 miles of East Fork Whisky Creek from 0.1 miles downstream of road 33-8-26 to the confluence with Whisky Creek as a recreational river.

''(E) WEST FORK WHISKY CREEK.—The approximately 4.8 miles of West Fork Whisky Creek from its headwaters to the confluence with Whisky Creek as a wild river.

''(F) BIG WINDY CREEK.—

''(i) The approximately 1.5 miles of Big Windy Creek from its headwaters to 0.1 miles downstream from road 34-9-17.1 as a scenic river.

''(ii) The approximately 5.8 miles of Big Windy Creek from 0.1 miles downstream from road 34-9-17.1 to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

''(G) EAST FORK BIG WINDY CREEK.—

''(i) The approximately 0.2 miles of East Fork Big Windy Creek from its headwaters to 0.1 miles downstream from road 34-8-36 as a scenic river.

''(ii) The approximately 3.7 miles of East Fork Big Windy Creek from 0.1 miles downstream from road 34-8-36 to the confluence with Big Windy Creek as a wild river.

''(H) LITTLE WINDY CREEK.—The approximately 1.9 miles of Little Windy Creek from 0.1 miles downstream of road 34-8-36 to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

''(I) HOWARD CREEK.—

''(i) The approximately 0.3 miles of Howard Creek from its headwaters to 0.1 miles downstream of road 34-9-34 as a scenic river.

''(ii) The approximately 6.9 miles of Howard Creek from 0.1 miles downstream of road 34-9-34 to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

''(J) MULE CREEK.—The approximately 6.3 miles of Mule Creek from east section line of T32S, R10W, sec. 25, W.M to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

''(K) ANNA CREEK.—The approximately 3.5-mile section of Anna Creek from its headwaters to the confluence with Howard Creek as a wild river.

''(L) MISSOURI CREEK.—The approximately 1.6 miles of Missouri Creek from the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in T33S, R10W, sec. 24, W.M. to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

''(M) JENNY CREEK.—The approximately 1.8 miles of Jenny Creek from the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in T33S, R9W, sec.28, W.M. to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

''(N) RUM CREEK.—The approximately 2.2 miles of Rum Creek from the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in T34S, R8W, sec. 9, W.M. to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

''(O) EAST FORK RUM CREEK.—The approximately 1.5 miles of East Rum Creek from the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in T34S, R8W, sec. 10, W.M. to the confluence with Rum Creek as a wild river.

''(P) WILDCAT CREEK.—The approximately 1.7-mile section of Wildcat Creek from its headwaters downstream to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

''(Q) MONTGOMERY CREEK.—The approximately 1.8-mile section of Montgomery Creek from its headwaters downstream to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

''(R) HEWITT CREEK.—The approximately 1.2 miles of Hewitt Creek from the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in T33S, R9W, sec. 19, W.M. to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

''(S) BUNKER CREEK.—The approximately 6.6 miles of Bunker Creek from its headwaters to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

''(T) DULOG CREEK.—

''(i) The approximately 0.8 miles of Dulog Creek from its headwaters to 0.1 miles downstream of road 34-8-36 as a scenic river.

''(ii) The approximately 1.0 miles of Dulog Creek from 0.1 miles downstream of road 34-8-36 to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

''(U) QUAIL CREEK.—The approximately 1.7 miles of Quail Creek from the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in T33S, R10W, sec. 1, W.M. to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

''(V) MEADOW CREEK.—The approximately 4.1 miles of Meadow Creek from its headwaters to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

''(W) RUSSIAN CREEK.—The approximately 2.5 miles of Russian Creek from the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in T33S, R8W, sec. 20, W.M. to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

''(X) ALDER CREEK.—The approximately 1.2 miles of Alder Creek from its headwaters to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

''(Y) BOOZE CREEK.—The approximately 1.5 miles of Booze Creek from its headwaters to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

''(Z) BRONCO CREEK.—The approximately 1.8 miles of Bronco Creek from its headwaters to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

''(AA) COPSEY CREEK.—The approximately 1.5 miles of Copsey Creek from its headwaters to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

''(BB) CORRAL CREEK.—The approximately 0.5 miles of Corral Creek from its headwaters to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

''(CC) COWLEY CREEK.—The approximately 0.9 miles of Cowley Creek from its headwaters to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

''(DD) DITCH CREEK.—The approximately 1.8 miles of Ditch Creek from the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in T33S, R9W, sec. 5, W.M. to its confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

''(EE) FRANCIS CREEK.—The approximately 0.9 miles of Francis Creek from its headwaters to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

''(FF) LONG GULCH.—The approximately 1.1 miles of Long Gulch from the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in T33S, R10W, sec. 23, W.M. to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

''(GG) BAILEY CREEK.—The approximately 1.7 miles of Bailey Creek from the west section line of T34S, R8W, sec.14, W.M. to the confluence of the Rogue River as a wild river.

''(HH) SHADY CREEK.—The approximately 0.7 miles of Shady Creek from its headwaters

to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.

''(II) SLIDE CREEK.—

''(i) The approximately 0.5-mile section of Slide Creek from its headwaters to 0.1 miles downstream from road 33-9-6 as a scenic river.

''(ii) The approximately 0.7-mile section of Slide Creek from 0.1 miles downstream of road 33-9-6 to the confluence with the Rogue River as a wild river.''.

(b) MANAGEMENT.—All wild, scenic, and recreation classified segments designated by the amendment made by subsection (a) shall be managed as part of the Rogue Wild and Scenic River.

(c) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid rights, the Federal land within the boundaries of the river segments designated by the amendment made by subsection (a) is withdrawn from all forms of—

(1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) disposition under all laws pertaining to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.

SEC. 365. ADDITIONAL PROTECTIONS FOR ROGUE RIVER TRIBUTARIES.

(a) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid rights, the Federal land within a quarter-mile on each side of the streams listed in subsection (b) is withdrawn from all forms of—

(1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) disposition under all laws pertaining to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.

(b) STREAM SEGMENTS.—Subsection (a) applies the following tributaries of the Rogue River:

(1) KELSEY CREEK.—The approximately 4.5 miles of Kelsey Creek from its headwaters to the east section line of 32S 9W sec. 34.

(2) EAST FORK KELSEY CREEK.—The approximately .2 miles of East Fork Kelsey Creek from its headwaters to the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in 33S 8W sec. 5.

(3) EAST FORK WHISKY CREEK.—The approximately .7 miles of East Fork Whisky Creek from its headwaters to the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in 33S 8W section 11.

(4) LITTLE WINDY CREEK.—The approximately 1.2 miles of Little Windy Creek from its headwaters to west section line of 33S 9W sec. 34.

(5) MULE CREEK.—The approximately 5.1 miles of Mule Creek from its headwaters to east section line of 32S 10W sec. 25.

(6) MISSOURI CREEK.—The approximately 3.1 miles of Missouri Creek from its headwaters to the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in 33S 10W sec. 24.

(7) JENNY CREEK.—The approximately 3.1 miles of Jenny Creek from its headwaters to the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in 33S 9W sec. 28.

(8) RUM CREEK.—The approximately 2.2 miles of Rum Creek from its headwaters to the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in 34S 8W sec. 9.

(9) EAST FORK RUM CREEK.—The approximately .5 miles of East Fork Rum Creek from its headwaters to the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in 34S 8W sec. 10.

(10) HEWITT CREEK.—The approximately 1.4 miles of Hewitt Creek from its headwaters to the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in 33S 9W sec. 19.

(11) QUAIL CREEK.—The approximately .8 miles of Quail Creek from its headwaters to the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in 33S 10W sec. 1.

(12) RUSSIAN CREEK.—The approximately .1 miles of Russian Creek from its headwaters to the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in 33S 8W sec. 20.

(13) DITCH CREEK.—The approximately .7 miles of Ditch Creek from its headwaters to the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in 33S 9W sec. 5.

(14) LONG GULCH.—The approximately 1.4 miles of Long Gulch from its headwaters to the Wild Rogue Wilderness boundary in 33S 10W sec. 23.

(15) BAILEY CREEK.—The approximately 1.4 miles of Bailey Creek from its headwaters to west section line of 34S 8W sec. 14.

(16) QUARTZ CREEK.—The approximately 3.3 miles of Quartz Creek from its headwaters to its confluence with the North Fork Galice Creek.

(17) NORTH FORK GALICE CREEK.—The approximately 5.7 miles of the North Fork Galice Creek from its headwaters to its confluence with Galice Creek.

(18) GRAVE CREEK.—The approximately 10.2 mile section of Grave Creek from the confluence of Wolf Creek downstream to the confluence with the Rogue River.

(19) CENTENNIAL GULCH.—The approximately 2.2 miles of Centennial Gulch from its headwaters to its confluence with the Rogue River.

CHAPTER 3—ADDITIONAL PROTECTIONS

SEC. 371. LIMITATIONS ON LAND ACQUISITION.

(a) PROHIBITION ON USE OF CONDEMNATION.—The Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may not acquire by condemnation any land or interest within the boundaries of the river segments or wilderness designated by this subtitle.

(b) LANDOWNER CONSENT REQUIRED.—Private or non-Federal public property shall not be included within the boundaries of the river segments or wilderness designated by this subtitle unless the owner of the property has consented in writing to having that property included in such boundaries.

SEC. 372. OVERFLIGHTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this subtitle or the Wilderness Act shall preclude low-level overflights and operations of military aircraft, helicopters, missiles, or unmanned aerial vehicles over the wilderness designated by this subtitle, including military overflights and operations that can be seen or heard within the wilderness.

(b) SPECIAL USE AIRSPACE AND TRAINING ROUTES.—Nothing in this subtitle or the Wilderness Act shall preclude the designation of new units of special use airspace, the expansion of existing units of special use airspace, or the use or establishment of military training routes over wilderness designated by this subtitle.

SEC. 373. BUFFER ZONES.

Nothing in this subtitle—

(1) establishes or authorizes the establishment of a protective perimeter or buffer zone around the boundaries of the river segments or wilderness designated by this subtitle; or

(2) precludes, limits, or restricts an activity from being conducted outside such boundaries, including an activity that can be seen or heard from within such boundaries.

SEC. 374. PREVENTION OF WILDFIRES.

The designation of a river segment or wilderness by this subtitle or the withdrawal of the Federal land under this subtitle shall not be construed to interfere with the authority of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture to authorize mechanical thinning of trees or underbrush to prevent or control the spread of wildfires, or conditions creating the risk of wildfire that threatens areas outside the boundary of the wilderness, or the use of mechanized equipment for wildfire pre-suppression and suppression.

SEC. 375. LIMITATION ON DESIGNATION OF CERTAIN LANDS IN OREGON.

A national monument designation under the Act of June 8, 1906 (commonly known as the Antiquities Act; 16 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) within or on any portion of the Oregon and California Railroad Grant Lands or the O&C Region Public Domain lands, regardless of whether management authority over the lands are transferred to the O&C Trust pursuant to section 311(c)(1), the lands are excluded from the O&C Trust pursuant to section 311(c)(2), or the lands are transferred to the Forest Service under section 321, shall only be made pursuant to Congressional approval in an Act of Congress.

CHAPTER 4—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 381. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—This subtitle and the amendments made by this subtitle shall take effect on October 1 of the second fiscal year of the transition period.

(b) EXCEPTION.—If, as a result of judicial review authorized by section 312, any provision of subtitle A is held to be invalid and implementation of the provision or any activity conducted under the provision is enjoined, this subtitle and the amendments made by this subtitle shall not take effect, or if the effective date specified in subsection (a) has already occurred, this subtitle shall have no force and effect and the amendments made by this subtitle are repealed.

Subtitle D—Tribal Trust Lands

PART 1—COUNCIL CREEK LAND CONVEYANCE

SEC. 391. DEFINITIONS.

In this part:

(1) COUNCIL CREEK LAND.—The term ''Council Creek land'' means the approximately 17,519 acres of land, as generally depicted on the map entitled ''Canyon Mountain Land Conveyance'' and dated June 27, 2013.

(2) TRIBE.—The term ''Tribe'' means the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians.

SEC. 392. CONVEYANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, including rights-of-way, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Council Creek land, including any improvements located on the land, appurtenances to the land, and minerals on or in the land, including oil and gas, shall be—

(1) held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe; and

(2) part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(b) SURVEY.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall complete a survey of the boundary lines to establish the boundaries of the land taken into trust under subsection (a).

SEC. 393. MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall file a map and legal description of the Council Creek land with—

(1) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(b) FORCE AND EFFECT.—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary of the Interior may correct any clerical or typographical errors in the map or legal description.

(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 394. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Unless expressly provided in this part, nothing in this part affects any

right or claim of the Tribe existing on the date of enactment of this Act to any land or interest in land.

(b) PROHIBITIONS.—

(1) EXPORTS OF UNPROCESSED LOGS.—Federal law (including regulations) relating to the export of unprocessed logs harvested from Federal land shall apply to any unprocessed logs that are harvested from the Council Creek land.

(2) NON-PERMISSIBLE USE OF LAND.—Any real property taken into trust under section 392 shall not be eligible, or used, for any gaming activity carried out under Public Law 100-497 (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

(c) FOREST MANAGEMENT.—Any forest management activity that is carried out on the Council Creek land shall be managed in accordance with all applicable Federal laws.

PART 2—OREGON COASTAL LAND CONVEYANCE

SEC. 395. DEFINITIONS.

In this part:

(1) OREGON COASTAL LAND.—The term ''Oregon Coastal land'' means the approximately 14,804 acres of land, as generally depicted on the map entitled ''Oregon Coastal Land Conveyance'' and dated March 5, 2013.

(2) CONFEDERATED TRIBES.—The term ''Confederated Tribes'' means the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians.

SEC. 396. CONVEYANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, including rights-of-way, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Oregon Coastal land, including any improvements located on the land, appurtenances to the land, and minerals on or in the land, including oil and gas, shall be—

(1) held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Confederated Tribes; and

(2) part of the reservation of the Confederated Tribes.

(b) SURVEY.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall complete a survey of the boundary lines to establish the boundaries of the land taken into trust under subsection (a).

SEC. 397. MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall file a map and legal description of the Oregon Coastal land with—

(1) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(b) FORCE AND EFFECT.—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary of the Interior may correct any clerical or typographical errors in the map or legal description.

(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 398. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Unless expressly provided in this part, nothing in this part affects any right or claim of the Consolidated Tribes existing on the date of enactment of this Act to any land or interest in land.

(b) PROHIBITIONS.—

(1) EXPORTS OF UNPROCESSED LOGS.—Federal law (including regulations) relating to the export of unprocessed logs harvested from Federal land shall apply to any unprocessed logs that are harvested from the Oregon Coastal land.

(2) NON-PERMISSIBLE USE OF LAND.—Any real property taken into trust under section 396 shall not be eligible, or used, for any gaming activity carried out under Public Law 100-497 (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

(c) FOREST MANAGEMENT.—Any forest management activity that is carried out on the Oregon Coastal land shall be managed in accordance with all applicable Federal laws.

TITLE IV—COMMUNITY FOREST MANAGEMENT DEMONSTRATION

SEC. 401. PURPOSE AND DEFINITIONS.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this title is to generate dependable economic activity for counties and local governments by establishing a demonstration program for local, sustainable forest management.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this title:

(1) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The term ''Advisory Committee'' means the Advisory Committee appointed by the Governor of a State for the community forest demonstration area established for the State.

(2) COMMUNITY FOREST DEMONSTRATION AREA.—The term ''community forest demonstration area'' means a community forest demonstration area established for a State under section 402.

(3) NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM.—The term ''National Forest System'' has the meaning given that term in section 11(a) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1609(a)), except that the term does not include the National Grasslands and land utilization projects designated as National Grasslands administered pursuant to the Act of July 22, 1937 (7 U.S.C. 1010–1012).

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Agriculture or the designee of the Secretary of Agriculture.

(5) STATE.—The term ''State'' includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

SEC. 402. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMUNITY FOREST DEMONSTRATION AREAS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT REQUIRED; TIME FOR ESTABLISHMENT.—Subject to subsection (c) and not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall establish a community forest demonstration area at the request of the Advisory Committee appointed to manage community forest demonstration area land in that State.

(b) COVERED LAND.—

(1) INCLUSION OF NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LAND.—The community forest demonstration areas of a State shall consist of the National Forest System land in the State identified for inclusion by the Advisory Committee of that State.

(2) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN LAND.—A community forest demonstration area shall not include National Forest System land—

(A) that is a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System;

(B) on which the removal of vegetation is specifically prohibited by Federal statute;

(C) National Monuments; or

(D) over which administration jurisdiction was first assumed by the Forest Service under title III.

(c) CONDITIONS ON ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) ACREAGE REQUIREMENT.—A community forest demonstration area must include at least 200,000 acres of National Forest System land. If the unit of the National Forest System in which a community forest demonstration area is being established contains more than 5,000,000 acres, the community forest demonstration area may include 900,000 or more acres of National Forest System land.

(2) MANAGEMENT LAW OR BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES REQUIREMENT.—A community forest demonstration area may be established in a State only if the State—

(A) has a forest practices law applicable to State or privately owned forest land in the State; or

(B) has established silvicultural best management practices or other regulations for forest management practices related to clean water, soil quality, wildlife or forest health.

(3) REVENUE SHARING REQUIREMENT.—As a condition of the inclusion in a community forest demonstration area of National Forest System land located in a particular county in a State, the county must enter into an agreement with the Governor of the State that requires that, in utilizing revenues received by the county under section 406(b), the county shall continue to meet any obligations under applicable State law as provided under title I of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7111 et seq.) or as provided in the sixth paragraph under the heading ''FOREST SERVICE'' in the Act of May 23, 1908 (16 U.S.C. 500) and section 13 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U.S.C. 500).

(d) TREATMENT UNDER CERTAIN OTHER LAWS.—National Forest System land included in a community forest demonstration area shall not be considered Federal land for purposes of—

(1) making payments to counties under the sixth paragraph under the heading ''FOREST SERVICE'' in the Act of May 23, 1908 (16 U.S.C. 500) and section 13 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U.S.C. 500); or

(2) title I.

(e) ACREAGE LIMITATION.—Not more than a total of 4,000,000 acres of National Forest System land may be established as community forest demonstration areas.

(f) RECOGNITION OF VALID AND EXISTING RIGHTS.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to limit or restrict—

(1) access to National Forest System land included in a community forest demonstration area for hunting, fishing, and other related purposes; or

(2) valid and existing rights regarding such National Forest System land, including rights of any federally recognized Indian tribe.

SEC. 403. ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) APPOINTMENT.—A community forest demonstration area for a State shall be managed by an Advisory Committee appointed by the Governor of the State.

(b) COMPOSITION.—The Advisory Committee for a community forest demonstration area in a State shall include, but is not limited to, the following members:

(1) One member who holds county or local elected office, appointed from each county or local governmental unit in the State containing community forest demonstration area land.

(2) One member who represents the commercial timber, wood products, or milling industry.

(3) One member who represents persons holding Federal grazing or other land use permits.

(4) One member who represents recreational users of National Forest System land.

(c) TERMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except in the case of certain initial appointments required by paragraph (2), members of an Advisory Committee shall serve for a term of three years.

(2) INITIAL APPOINTMENTS.—In making initial appointments to an Advisory Committee, the Governor making the appointments shall stagger terms so that at least one-third of the members will be replaced every three years.

(d) COMPENSATION.—Members of a Advisory Committee shall serve without pay, but may be reimbursed from the funds made available for the management of a community forest

demonstration area for the actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses incurred by members in the performance of their duties.

SEC. 404. MANAGEMENT OF COMMUNITY FOREST DEMONSTRATION AREAS.

(a) ASSUMPTION OF MANAGEMENT.—

(1) CONFIRMATION.—The Advisory Committee appointed for a community forest demonstration area shall assume all management authority with regard to the community forest demonstration area as soon as the Secretary confirms that—

(A) the National Forest System land to be included in the community forest demonstration area meets the requirements of subsections (b) and (c) of section 402;

(B) the Advisory Committee has been duly appointed under section 403 and is able to conduct business; and

(C) provision has been made for essential management services for the community forest demonstration area.

(2) SCOPE AND TIME FOR CONFIRMATION.—The determination of the Secretary under paragraph (1) is limited to confirming whether the conditions specified in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of such paragraph have been satisfied. The Secretary shall make the determination not later than 60 days after the date of the appointment of the Advisory Committee.

(3) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO CONFIRM.—If the Secretary determines that either or both conditions specified in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) are not satisfied for confirmation of an Advisory Committee, the Secretary shall—

(A) promptly notify the Governor of the affected State and the Advisory Committee of the reasons preventing confirmation; and

(B) make a new determination under paragraph (2) within 60 days after receiving a new request from the Advisory Committee that addresses the reasons that previously prevented confirmation.

(b) MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES.—Upon assumption of management of a community forest demonstration area, the Advisory Committee for the community forest demonstration area shall manage the land and resources of the community forest demonstration area and the occupancy and use thereof in conformity with this title, and to the extent not in conflict with this title, the laws and regulations applicable to management of State or privately-owned forest lands in the State in which the community forest demonstration area is located.

(c) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER FEDERAL LAWS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The administration and management of a community forest demonstration area, including implementing actions, shall not be considered Federal action and shall be subject to the following only to the extent that such laws apply to the State or private administration and management of forest lands in the State in which the community forest demonstration area is located:

(A) The Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 note).

(B) The Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.).

(C) The Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

(D) Federal laws and regulations governing procurement by Federal agencies.

(E) Except as provided in paragraph (2), other Federal laws.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF NATIVE AMERICAN GRAVES PROTECTION AND REPATRIATION ACT.—Notwithstanding the assumption by an Advisory Committee of management of a community forest demonstration area, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) shall continue to apply to the National Forest System land included in the community forest demonstration area.

(d) CONSULTATION.—

(1) WITH INDIAN TRIBES.—The Advisory Committee for a community forest demonstration area shall cooperate and consult with Indian tribes on management policies and practices for the community forest demonstration area that may affect the Indian tribes. The Advisory Committee shall take into consideration the use of lands within the community forest demonstration area for religious and cultural uses by Native Americans.

(2) WITH COLLABORATIVE GROUPS.—The Advisory Committee for a community forest demonstration area shall consult with any applicable forest collaborative group.

(e) RECREATION.—Nothing in this section shall affect public use and recreation within a community forest demonstration area.

(f) FIRE MANAGEMENT.—The Secretary shall provide fire presuppression, suppression, and rehabilitation services on and with respect to a community forest demonstration area to the same extent generally authorized in other units of the National Forest System.

(g) PROHIBITION ON EXPORT.—As a condition on the sale of timber or other forest products from a community forest demonstration area, unprocessed timber harvested from a community forest demonstration area may not be exported in accordance with subpart F of part 223 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 405. DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS FROM COMMUNITY FOREST DEMONSTRATION AREA.

(a) RETENTION OF FUNDS FOR MANAGEMENT.—The Advisory Committee appointed for a community forest demonstration area may retain such sums as the Advisory Committee considers to be necessary from amounts generated from that community forest demonstration area to fund the management, administration, restoration, operation and maintenance, improvement, repair, and related expenses incurred with respect to the community forest demonstration area.

(b) FUNDS TO COUNTIES OR LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL UNITS.—Subject to subsection (a) and section 407, the Advisory Committee for a community forest demonstration area in a State shall distribute funds generated from that community forest demonstration area to each county or local governmental unit in the State in an amount proportional to the funds received by the county or local governmental unit under title I of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7111 et seq.).

SEC. 406. INITIAL FUNDING AUTHORITY.

(a) FUNDING SOURCE.—Counties may use such sum as the counties consider to be necessary from the amounts made available to the counties under section 501 to provide initial funding for the management of community forest demonstration areas.

(b) NO RESTRICTION ON USE OF NON-FEDERAL FUNDS.—Nothing in this title restricts the Advisory Committee of a community forest demonstration area from seeking non-Federal loans or other non-Federal funds for management of the community forest demonstration area.

SEC. 407. PAYMENTS TO UNITED STATES TREASURY.

(a) PAYMENT REQUIREMENT.—As soon as practicable after the end of the fiscal year in which a community forest demonstration area is established and as soon as practicable after the end of each subsequent fiscal year, the Advisory Committee for a community forest demonstration area shall make a payment to the United States Treasury.

(b) PAYMENT AMOUNT.—The payment for a fiscal year under subsection (a) with respect to a community forest demonstration area shall be equal to 75 percent of the quotient obtained by dividing—

(1) the number obtained by multiplying the number of acres of land in the community forest demonstration area by the average annual receipts generated over the preceding 10-fiscal year period from the unit or units of the National Forest System containing that community forest demonstration area; by

(2) the total acres of National Forest System land in that unit or units of the National Forest System.

SEC. 408. TERMINATION OF COMMUNITY FOREST DEMONSTRATION AREA.

(a) TERMINATION AUTHORITY.—Subject to approval by the Governor of the State, the Advisory Committee for a community forest demonstration area may terminate the community forest demonstration area by a unanimous vote.

(b) EFFECT OF TERMINATION.—Upon termination of a community forest demonstration area, the Secretary shall immediately resume management of the National Forest System land that had been included in the community forest demonstration area, and the Advisory Committee shall be dissolved.

(c) TREATMENT OF UNDISTRIBUTED FUNDS.—Any revenues from the terminated area that remain undistributed under section 405 more than 30 days after the date of termination shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury for use by the Forest Service in such amounts as may be provided in advance in appropriation Acts.

TITLE V—REAUTHORIZATION AND AMENDMENT OF EXISTING AUTHORITIES AND OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 501. EXTENSION OF SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT OF 2000 PENDING FULL OPERATION OF FOREST RESERVE REVENUE AREAS.

(a) BENEFICIARY COUNTIES.—No later than February 2014, the Secretary of Agriculture shall distribute to each beneficiary county (as defined in section 102(2)) a payment equal to the amount distributed to the beneficiary county for fiscal year 2010 under section 102(c)(1) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7112(c)(1)).

(b) COUNTIES THAT WERE ELIGIBLE FOR DIRECT COUNTY PAYMENTS.—

(1) TOTAL AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR PAYMENTS.—During the month of February 2015, the Secretary of the Inteiror shall distribute to all counties that received a payment for fiscal year 2010 under subsection (a)(2) of section 102 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7112) payments in a total amount equal to the difference between—

(A) the total amount distributed to all such counties for fiscal year 2010 under subsection (c)(1) of such section; and

(B) $27,000,000.

(2) COUTY SHARE.—From the total amount determined under paragraph (1), each county described in such paragraph shall receive, during the month of February 2015, an amount that bears the same proportion to the total amount made available under such paragraph as that county's payment for fiscal year 2010 under subsection (c)(1) of section 102 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7112) bears to the total amount distributed to all such counties for fiscal year 2010 under such subsection.

(c) EFFECT ON 25-PERCENT AND 50-PERCENT PAYMENTS.—A county that receives a payment made under subsection (a) and (b) may not receive a 25-percent payment or 50-percent payment (as those terms are defined in

section 3 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7102)) for fiscal year 2015.

SEC. 502. RESTORING ORIGINAL CALCULATION METHOD FOR 25-PERCENT PAYMENTS.

(a) AMENDMENT OF ACT OF MAY 23, 1908.—The sixth paragraph under the heading ''FOREST SERVICE'' in the Act of May 23, 1908 (16 U.S.C. 500) is amended in the first sentence—

(1) by striking ''the annual average of 25 percent of all amounts received for the applicable fiscal year and each of the preceding 6 fiscal years'' and inserting ''25 percent of all amounts received for the applicable fiscal year'';

(2) by striking ''said reserve'' both places it appears and inserting ''the national forest''; and

(3) by striking ''forest reserve'' both places it appears and inserting ''national forest''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO WEEKS LAW.—Section 13 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (commonly known as the Weeks Law; 16 U.S.C. 500) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''the annual average of 25 percent of all amounts received for the applicable fiscal year and each of the preceding 6 fiscal years'' and inserting ''25 percent of all amounts received for the applicable fiscal year''.

SEC. 503. FOREST SERVICE AND BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT GOOD-NEIGHBOR COOPERATION WITH STATES TO REDUCE WILDFIRE RISKS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE STATE.—The term ''eligible State'' means a State that contains National Forest System land or land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means—

(A) the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to National Forest System land; or

(B) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.

(3) STATE FORESTER.—The term ''State forester'' means the head of a State agency with jurisdiction over State forestry programs in an eligible State.

(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS AND CONTRACTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement or contract (including a sole source contract) with a State forester to authorize the State forester to provide the forest, rangeland, and watershed restoration, management, and protection services described in subsection (c) on National Forest System land or land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, as applicable, in the eligible State.

(c) AUTHORIZED SERVICES.—The forest, rangeland, and watershed restoration, management, and protection services referred to in subsection (b) include the conduct of—

(1) activities to treat insect infected forests;

(2) activities to reduce hazardous fuels;

(3) activities involving commercial harvesting or other mechanical vegetative treatments; or

(4) any other activities to restore or improve forest, rangeland, and watershed health, including fish and wildlife habitat.

(d) STATE AS AGENT.—Except as provided in subsection (g), a cooperative agreement or contract entered into under subsection (b) may authorize the State forester to serve as the agent for the Secretary in providing the restoration, management, and protection services authorized under subsection (b).

(e) SUBCONTRACTS.—In accordance with applicable contract procedures for the eligible State, a State forester may enter into subcontracts to provide the restoration, management, and protection services authorized under a cooperative agreement or contract entered into under subsection (b).

(f) TIMBER SALES.—Subsections (d) and (g) of section 14 of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a) shall not apply to services performed under a cooperative agreement or contract entered into under subsection (b).

(g) RETENTION OF NEPA RESPONSIBILITIES.—Any decision required to be made under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) with respect to any restoration, management, or protection services to be provided under this section by a State forester on National Forest System land or Bureau of Land Management land, as applicable, shall not be delegated to a State forester or any other officer or employee of the eligible State.

(h) APPLICABLE LAW.—The restoration, management, and protection services to be provided under this section shall be carried out on a project-to-project basis under existing authorities of the Forest Service or Bureau of Land Management, as applicable.

SEC. 504. STEWARDSHIP END RESULT CONTRACTING PROJECT AUTHORITY.

(a) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.—Effective October 1, 2014, section 347(a) of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in section 101(e) of division A of Public Law 105–277; 16 U.S.C. 2104 note) is amended by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2017''.

(b) DURATION OF CONTRACTS.—Section 347(c)(2) of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in section 101(e) of division A of Public Law 105–277; 16 U.S.C. 2104 note) is amended by striking ''10 years'' and inserting ''20 years''.

(c) CANCELLATION CEILING.—Section 347(c) of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in section 101(e) of division A of Public Law 105–277; 16 U.S.C. 2104 note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph (4):

''(4) CANCELLATION CEILING.—

''(A) AUTHORITY.—The Chief of the Forest Service and the Director of the Bureau of Land Management may obligate funds to cover any potential cancellation or termination costs for an agreement or contract under subsection (a) in stages that are economically or programmatically viable.

''(B) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days before entering into a multiyear agreement or contract under subsection (a) that includes a cancellation ceiling in excess of $25,000,000, but does not include proposed funding for the costs of cancelling the agreement or contract up to the cancellation ceiling established in the agreement or contract, the Chief or the Director, as the case may be, shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a written notice that includes—

''(i) the cancellation ceiling amounts proposed for each program year in the agreement or contract and the reasons for such cancellation ceiling amounts;

''(ii) the extent to which the costs of contract cancellation are not included in the budget for the agreement or contract; and

''(iii) an assessment of the financial risk of not including budgeting for the costs of agreement or contract cancellation.

''(C) NOTICE TO OMB.—At least 14 days before the date on which the Chief or Director enters into an agreement or contract under subsection (a), the Chief or Director shall transmit to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget a copy of any written notice submitted under subparagraph (B) with regard to such agreement or contract.''.

(d) FIRE LIABILITY.—Section 347(c) of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in section 101(e) of division A of Public Law 105–277; 16 U.S.C. 2104 note) is amended by inserting after paragraph (4), as added by subsection (c) of this section, the following new paragraph:

''(5) FIRE LIABILITY PROVISIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Chief of the Forest Service and the Director of the Bureau of Land Management shall issue, for use in all contracts and agreements under subsection (a), fire liability provisions that are in substantially the same form as the fire liability provisions contained in—

''(A) integrated resource timber contracts, as described in the Forest Service contract numbered 2400–13, part H, section H.4; and

''(B) timber sale contracts conducted pursuant to section 14 of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a).''.

SEC. 505. CLARIFICATION OF NATIONAL FOREST MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1976 AUTHORITY.

Section 14(g) of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a(g)) is amended by striking ''Designation, marking when necessary,'' and inserting ''Designation, including marking when necessary, or designation by description or by prescription,''.

SEC. 506. TREATMENT AS SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING.

None of the funds made available to a beneficiary county (as defined in section 102(2)) or other political subdivision of a State under this Act shall be used in lieu of or to otherwise offset State funding sources for local schools, facilities, or educational purposes.

SEC. 507. EXCEPTION OF CERTAIN FOREST PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES FROM APPEALS REFORM ACT AND OTHER REVIEW.

Section 322 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993 (Public Law 102–381; 16 U.S.C. 1612 note) and section 428 of Division E of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112–74; 125 Stat. 1046; 16 U.S.C. 6515 note) shall not apply to any project or activity implementing a land and resource management plan developed under section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604) that is categorically excluded from documentation in an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part C of House Report 113–215. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. DAINES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part C of House Report 113–215.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 16, line 7, insert before the period the following: '', except that a court of the United States may not issue a restraining order, preliminary injunction, or injunction pending appeal covering a covered forest reserve project in response to an allegation that the Secretary violated any procedural requirement applicable to how the project was selected, planned, or analyzed''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 351, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Chairman, as a fifth generation Montanan and an avid sportsman, I understand how protecting our beautiful landscapes and unmatched recreational opportunities are important to our way of life in Montana.

As much a part of Montana as our enjoyment of the great outdoors is our timber industry—or at least what used to be one. The timber industry has declined by 90 percent since I was a kid. Since then, the wildfires and beetle kill have worsened. Our loggers play an important role on the front lines of protecting our outdoor heritage, and we must never forget that.

I'm very concerned that many of these special places are being destroyed because the Forest Service does not have the tools necessary to manage these lands responsibly. H.R. 1526 gives the Forest Service the tools to protect and enhance our forests and will allow our timber industry to get back to work. It will cut the red tape that has held up responsible forest management and timber production. It includes comprehensive reforms to discourage and limit the flood of frivolous appeals and litigation. It also requires the Forest Service to increase timber harvests on nonwilderness lands now that it will have much needed latitude to do its work.

This improved management will protect the health of our forests and watersheds, the safety of our communities, jobs in the timber industry, and our cherished access to the outdoors. H.R. 1526 would help create 68,000 jobs and nearly 5,000 jobs in Montana. H.R. 1526 would allow access to marketable timber for our mills in Montana and breathe life back into this dying industry.

This bill keeps the Federal Government's commitment to provide crucial revenue to our forest counties. It extends the Secure Rural Schools program for 1 year as the new timber program stands up. SRS has provided essential stopgap funding for timber counties since 2000, but many of our counties are tired of seeing the funds depend on the whims of Congress.

This bill has the support of the National Association of Forested Counties. This bill also has the support of the National Education Association because they recognize the economic development and revenue that will be generated by our bill will strengthen our rural schools in States like Montana. Importantly, this bill helps to protect healthy forest management from habitual lawsuits brought by fringe groups.

My amendment would strengthen the bill's protections against court-ordered obstruction. Unfortunately, obstructionist tactics too often stop them from going forward. In region one alone, at least 40 percent of timber sales in fiscal '12 and fiscal '13 have been appealed or litigated. A top U.S. Forest Service official recently acknowledged that the abundance of litigation has played a ''huge role'' in blocking responsible timber sales.

In March of this year, the Friends of the Wild Swan, Alliance for the Wild Rockies, and others halted a much needed timber sale called the Colt Summit Project near Seeley Lake in Montana due to a minor technical error by the Forest Service involving the impact on the habitat of a listed species, the Canadian lynx.

□ 1915

Like the Colt Summit Project, oftentimes timber sales are stopped in their tracks by court-issued injunctions that are based solely on alleged procedural violations such as mere paperwork errors. My amendment would prohibit these injunctions that are based on nonsubstantive allegations.

Injunctions on timber sales often turn into permanent delays, leaving dying timber to rot and lose value. My amendment would allow these critical projects to move forward while litigation on the merits of the case is pending. In doing so, it will help ensure that responsible timber sales come to fruition.

My amendment simply allows projects like the Colt Summit Project to move forward while the merits of the case continue to be examined. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of making our forests healthier.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAINES. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I want to tell the gentleman I think this amendment adds a great deal to this legislation, and I will support your amendment.

Mr. DAINES. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of making our forests healthier, and for the adoption of my amendment.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Like many here tonight, I'm frustrated by the seemingly endless appeals and litigation on efforts to responsibly manage our forests, but not all appeals and litigation are frivolous. We know that some zero-cut groups seeking to end all logging in national forests have been successful in nitpicking the Forest Service's submission in Montana. However, this amendment literally tips the scales of justice.

The underlying bill already places extraordinary restrictions on parties—which I mentioned earlier, over which I have concern—on parties seeking to protect public resources. Do we really want to tell people they can't protest a government activity if the Federal Government violates a procedural requirement?

Failing to give notice of a major activity is a procedural requirement. Shouldn't the community be able to appeal an activity that's moving forward if they think it might impact their drinking water and they were never notified about the proposal?

Failing to properly advertise for bids is a procedural requirement. Shouldn't a small business be able to stop a project from being awarded to an out-of-State company if the Forest Service failed to follow proper contracting protocol?

The underlying bill already has numerous provisions that accelerate the approval of the projects and makes litigation much more difficult. We don't need to tip the scales further towards the power of Big Government and away from the public.

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Chairman, I respect the comments made by the gentleman from Oregon; but when we look at the State of Montana and see a 90 percent reduction in forest timber harvest on national forestlands, and when we hear from the Forest Service officials the number 1 issue is litigation, it is time that we put in place measures and reforms this amendment addresses, that addresses that those kind of concerns of procedural nature will not stop an entire forest project.

This is a very real issue in my home State. I saw it literally firsthand when I was visiting the Pyramid sawmill in Seeley Lake, when we saw, because of, literally, a small, little procedural error on one of 14 counts, that stopped an entire timber harvest.

This is getting out in front and saying, let's not let the trial lawyers and the courts control the forests. Let's let the people have control of the forests and restore the jobs that are needed and the revenue back to our schools.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield myself the balance of the time.

We did have a hearing on this and similar issues, and I did find common ground with folks on the other side of the aisle.

We had a vigorous debate over fuel reduction 13 years ago, which ultimately resulted in a law called HFRA,

and I participated in writing that law here on the House side, very much a bipartisan law with myself and Mr. MILLER on the Democratic side and Scott McInnis, John Shadegg, and GREG WALDEN on the other. And we gave this tool to the Forest Service, and they pretty much haven't used it. They've used it in very minor ways.

And at the hearing, I asked the Deputy Chief, What about HFRA? Do we really need to change the laws further or prevent—do these radical things like preventing appeals and litigation?

And he said, Well, no. We're moving ahead with a major, major landscape-scale collaborative process in the Black Hills.

I said, Well, that's great, Mr. Deputy. I said, How about all the rest of the intermountain West? How about central Oregon and other places where we need these sort of landscape-scale projects that can't be nitpicked, you know, acre by acre, but they are developed collaboratively and we move forward? And as I mentioned earlier, we can do them under stewardship contracts, which will attract investors who will utilize the biomass and lower the cost to the Forest Service.

There is a way to better do this. We need to push the Forest Service on these issues. If there are minor changes that need to be made in HFRA, they should let us know.

I believe one is that it doesn't allow for them to go into areas of bug kill, and that is something that should be fixed and was fixed in a bipartisan bill in the Senate, which we recommended, in part, in a Democratic alternative here which was offered in committee but not allowed on the floor because of scoring issues.

So I believe there is a way to move forward here and solve some of these problems, but this is not the proper way.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. DAINES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part C of House Report 113–215.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I, page 17, after line 23, add the following new section:

SEC. 106. ANNUAL REPORT.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 60 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress an annual report specifying the annual volume requirement in effect for that fiscal year for each Forest Reserve Revenue Area, the volume of board feet actually harvested for each Forest Reserve Revenue Area, the average cost of preparation for timber sales, the forest reserve revenues generated from such sales, and the amount of receipts distributed to each beneficiary county.

(b) FORM OF REPORT.—The information required by subsection (a) to be provided with respect to a Forest Reserve Revenue Area shall be presented on a single page. In addition to submitting each report to Congress, the Secretary shall also make the report available on the website of the Forest Service.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 351, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Chairman, nationwide, more than 73 million acres of Forest Service lands and hundreds of millions of acres of other Federal lands are at risk for catastrophic wildfire. As our timber industry has declined by 90 percent in recent decades, however, our National Forest System has lost much of the labor force to sustain our forested ecosystems and to protect our communities.

The Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act addresses both challenges, providing the Forest Service with much-needed latitude to reduce the risk of catastrophic fires while revitalizing our country's dying timber industry.

I'm offering an amendment to hold the Forest Service accountable for doing the work required in this legislation. My amendment would simply require the Secretary of Agriculture to submit to Congress an annual report. In fact, the amendment specifies this annual report is one page in length. Rarely do we see a report here in Washington that is less than about 3 inches thick. This is going to require that it's just a one-page summary, simple, focused on the results for each Forest Service revenue area.

On this report, we would report the annual volume requirements in effect for that fiscal year: the volume of board feet actually harvested, the average cost of preparation of timber sales, the revenues generated from such sales, and the amount of receipts distributed to each beneficiary county. The amendment would also require that the Forest Service place the report on its Web site.

The American people whose lives are often in the paths of catastrophic wildfire, whose jobs rely on access to timber, and whose school systems and public works rely on revenues generated from Federal land within its borders deserve transparency and accountability in our Federal Government's land management, and our country needs results.

My amendment brings all three principles to the Forest Service as the agency implements H.R. 1526.

I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAINES. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment. I think it adds a lot to it because, as we transition to targets in the future, I think something like this would be very beneficial. And so I congratulate the gentleman and I support his amendment.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, the previous amendment was going to limit public access to information. Now we're going to ask the public, the Forest Service, to produce more information. Although, actually, we aren't asking them to produce more information. We're asking them to produce less information than they currently make publicly available.

It would require an annual report to Congress as a result of implementing title I, amendment requiring an annual report, volume of timber, cost of preparing timber sales, revenue from the sales, and how it's distributed to counties on one page.

Well, the Forest Service does prepare these reports on a quarterly basis—it is available online—but no, it's not one page. I guess we could put it on one page. I'm having trouble reading it at this scale, which is 18 pages. This is the 18-page report for the Beaverhead-Deerlodge Forest.

If we look at the report, they offer 3.4 million board feet of timber, the amount of timber delayed, withdrawn from sale, what was successfully bid on, what didn't get any bids. There are also quarterly cut and sold reports, showing the value of these sales. In the first quarter of 2013, the Beaverhead-Deerlodge sold $312,000 worth of timber, nearly all of it Lodgepole pine.

If we limit it to one page, we might lose other things, like the report on Christmas trees—$6,050 value for sales of Christmas trees; mushrooms, $1,500 in the Bitterroot National Forest.

So the Forest Service is already producing this information. They are posting it online. I know it's kind of de rigueur around here to say let's get it all down to one page. Well, we could put it on one page, but you're going to need a microscope to read it, unless you want to leave out a lot of the stuff we're getting. And that's kind of interesting, if you really want to know what's going on in the forest.

If you want to know valid bids, no bids, delayed bids, withdrawn, resold, re-offered, regular sales, cancelled, opted other volume, resold, re-offered, previous fiscal year volume, replacement volume, I mean, how are you going to fit all this stuff on one page?

So we're just going to tell them, ''Don't bother anymore to produce this data. We don't want it. The public doesn't want it''?

So under the guise of asking for information, we're actually going to tell the Forest Service to produce less, which, you know, they might be kind of happy with because they will be less accountable if they produce less information.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAINES. I appreciate the gentleman from Oregon's remarks there.

Let me say this. I spent 28 years in the private sector having managed complex operations. And so what this amendment does, it doesn't preclude the Forest Service from generating all the data in the format that the gentleman from Oregon referenced. What this is asking for here is a one-page summary, a dashboard, if you will, so we can see, kind of cut to the bottom line in terms of the numbers that I pointed out here.

So often in Washington we are drowning in data. We're starving for wisdom. This is a simple dashboard that cuts to the bottom line here of looking for the volume of board feet actually harvested, the cost of the preparation of sales, the revenues generated from the sales, and the amount of receipts distributed to the beneficiary counties. That's the one-page summary.

All the other data can be contained in the other reports for the perusal of Members and others who want to see it, but this just cuts to the chase to give a simple, one-page dashboard of what the bottom-line results are as a result of this bill.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Well, the Forest Service isn't always responsive, but I believe if the committee chairman—in fact, I would be happy to join as the ranking member with the committee chairman and the gentleman from Montana and any other members of the committee interested in a letter to the Forest Service saying, Hey, you produce all this incredible amount of data. Some people think it's too much. So how about a one-page executive summary that covers these points, which would precede the other 18 pages online—they don't have to print them, so there's no cost to the government—I think that might solve this problem.

I don't believe we need to pass a law to get an executive summary. I mean, most Federal agencies provide executive summaries of all sorts of stuff for people who don't have time or interest in knowing things in more detail.

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

Mr. DAINES. I just would say that, as I've been back here, moving from the private sector to the public sector, sometimes you have got to lay out in specificity the need for a one-page summary of what's going on so that Members and anybody else that wants to see can see, can take the 30,000-foot view here in terms of this program being successful or not.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I have the right to close, and I'm prepared to close if the gentleman wants to summarize his previous arguments.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1930

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part C of House Report 113–215.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 23, line 10, add after the period the following new sentence: ''In addition, if the primary purpose of a hazardous fuel reduction project or a forest health project under this title is the salvage of dead, damaged, or down timber resulting from wildfire occurring in 2013, the hazardous fuel reduction project or forest health project, and any decision of the Secretary concerned in connection with the project, shall not be subject to judicial review or to any restraining order or injunction issued by a United States court.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 351, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

An estimated 1 billion board feet of fire-killed timber can still be salvaged out of the forests devastated by the Yosemite Rim fire, but it requires immediate action. As time passes, the value of this dead timber declines until after a year or so, when it becomes unsalvageable.

It has been the practice of radical environmental groups to file lawsuits against such projects, with the objective of delaying salvage until the timber is worthless. This amendment waives judicial review of the salvage plans for the 2013 fires. This is exactly the same approach taken in legislation offered by Tom Daschle a few years ago to allow salvage of beetle-killed timber in the Black Hills National Forest.

Salvaging this timber would throw an economic lifeline to communities already devastated by this fire, as local mills can be brought to full employment for the first time in many years. It would provide a new stream of revenue for the Federal Government as this salvageable timber is auctioned.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment.

Last year, in my home State of Washington, over 300,000 acres burned. And yet the Forest Service has yet to service anything. And I dare say now that whatever value there is to that salvage timber, it probably has gone away.

I think this amendment addresses that issue very, very well, and I support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time a I may consume.

Again, this is an area where we do have some grounds for potential agreement. Part of the problem is the Forest Service budget. Not only are they spending half their budget on fighting fires, they've had a brain drain because of cuts in personnel and staffing, and they really don't have the personnel to go out.

I suggested a number of years ago, the last time we had a salvage rider, that a great alternative would be to have the Forest Service establish a strike team to go out to major fires—in fact, while they're probably still burning—and begin to map out a recovery effort—where it might be appropriate to go in and do some salvage, where there are critical watersheds at risk and there's going to have to be some immediate mitigation with the planting of grass or other efforts to mitigate problems that will come with the rainy season in a few months in California.

I believe there is a better way to get there. But there's a new kind of current trend online. It's called throwback Thursday. To me, this is really throw-back Thursday to one of the most controversial pieces of legislation ever adopted by this body back in the 1990s, which was a massive salvage rider.

I have participated in a much more discrete, individual process when I was first here as a sophomore Member of Congress with Senator Mark Hatfield from Oregon. We sat down with an area that had been burned and we negotiated and legislated a salvage which preserved the areas that needed to be preserved.

There was a potential for 186 million board feet. We ended up legislating somewhere around 70 million board feet. The industry was disappointed. The environmentalists were appalled. But in the end, we got no additional sedimentation, we didn't get any slope slumping, and we did get 70 million board feet of timber out of there. We

didn't build a road into a sensitive, roadless area. We did it with helicopter logging. And the Forest Service still made money.

So there are ways to do this. But this, I don't think, is the best way to go forward. The underlying legislation already allows significant waivers of NEPA. Any project less than 10,000 acres is not required to go through an analysis. But this would allow a project to move forward no matter what the size or where it's located, without judicial review, if the project is salvaged, dead, damaged, or downed timber in an area impacted by fire this year.

We don't really know yet. I don't think a lot of the areas of Rim fire have yet been surveyed. Certainly, the Forest Service doesn't have the assets to do and find out what the impacts were—where the spot burns are, where the through burns are, what the conditions are, what areas would be critical to surviving wildlife, what areas are critical to watersheds and how we will deal with those areas, how we're going to recover the recreation in that area in the future, what would happen with building of roads and logging and salvage logging in those areas.

So I believe that this is a bridge too far in terms of expediting recovery and/or potentially salvage efforts, and I would oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), my neighbor to the north.

Mr. LAMALFA Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, for bringing this measure forward.

The crazy thing about this is each year you have devastating wildfires in California, the West, and other areas of the country. We act like we're reinventing the wheel each time when we need to go out and do the basic salvage work.

You have a narrow window of time that you can get value out of it before the trees there that have value can be salvaged and turned into something useful. You could have participatory people in the industry helping bring that value up. If you lose that window of time, then you have higher costs maybe as areas don't get recovered because nobody can make a living out of this.

So this is a commonsense measure. It's really a no-brainer. It ought to be used to move forward for this 2013 season but to also establish a template long term so that we can have a sensible forest management policy and get in and do these strike teams. Let's get a template so we don't have to reinvent the wheel each time there's a fire, but instead move quickly, get the industry to do it, and have our forests start their restoration and recovery project as soon as possible with that value.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM), my neighbor to the south, also a coauthor of the measure.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the McClintock-McCarthy-LaMalfa-Denham amendment. I'm proud to cosponsor this amendment to speed up the timber salvage project on the acres burned in this catastrophic Yosemite Rim fire.

I'm never surprised by some of the arguments that are made down here. You will hear that we just don't have enough people to go out there and survey. But yet by harvesting this very timber that will be rotted or infested in several months, it would actually pay not only for the Forest Service to go out there and survey and help to pay for the Forest Service salaries, but actually, in a community like ours, help to pay for our schooling and some of our local costs as well.

The timber salvage can go a long way to benefit local economies throughout the State. This timely amendment limits the amount of lawsuits that could be used to slow down and hold up the salvage process.

Under the proposed amendment, wood salvaged from the Yosemite Rim fire could be quickly sent to mills across California, fueling construction projects and benefiting local economies receiving the timber and providing much-needed local jobs and revenues to the impacted counties.

Our communities have suffered untold damage with the historic and catastrophic wildfire that burned over 400 square miles.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. DENHAM. The air quality is worsened, the fertile range land near the fire may have been sterilized by the heat, our water sources will experience degradation from runoff, and our beautiful forest land will remain blackened and sparse for years to come.

I ask your assistance in passing this critical amendment to put people back to work and start cleaning up this catastrophic situation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to close.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I can't put it any plainer than this: without this amendment, 1 billion board feet of timber owned by the people of the United States will be lost forever. We do not have time for endless years of litigation.

Within a year, this timber which can now be salvaged for productive use and can provide jobs for the people of our region and provide a stream of revenues for our ailing U.S. Treasury will be rendered utterly worthless. This is precisely the same approach that was used when Democrat Tom Daschle faced the same problem in his district over beetle-killed timber. We are applying exactly the same policy to salvage this timber.

I would hope that the gentleman from Oregon, in the spirit of bipartisanship, will recognize that the same remedy used in a Democratic region ought now to be used for this district in California.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, actually, this wouldn't apply just to the Rim fire, as I read it. The gentleman can correct me if I'm wrong. I believe it applies to any area that burned in 2013 anywhere in the United States of America, which would certainly include both Democratic and Republican districts. Fires are not very partisan in their destruction.

So that is an incredibly broad brush. That would mean there could be no analysis done by the Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife, or anybody else, before salvage efforts might begin on forests all across America.

If you're bidding on a salvage sale, it isn't your job to care about whether or not the road you're going to build in or the area you're going to access is subject to the slope slumping when the rain starts in a couple of months or the snows come in the inner mountain regions or up in the Northwest.

So this is extraordinarily and overly broad. We've already exempted things up to 10,000 acres. I believe there's a better way to approach this.

The other gentleman from California talked about getting in there and then we would have the money for strike teams. I would say that's just a little bit backwards. These are public assets. This fire is a disaster not only for the people of your district, the people of California, but the people of the Nation, particularly with the proximity to one of the Nation's most loved parks.

If we did have a strike team, we could have areas like that surveyed by spring and plans in place by spring to know where it might be appropriate to salvage and where it isn't appropriate to salvage, and it would still be valuable.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part C of House Report 113–215.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title II (page 26, after line 22), add the following new section:

SEC. 207. MORATORIUM ON USE OF PRESCRIBED FIRE IN MARK TWAIN NATIONAL FOREST, MISSOURI, PENDING REPORT.

(a) MORATORIUM.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Secretary of Agriculture may not conduct any prescribed fire in Mark Twain National Forest, Missouri, under the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Project until the report required by subsection (c) is submitted to Congress.

(b) EXCEPTION FOR WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION.—Subsection (a) does not prohibit the use of prescribed fire as part of wildfire suppression activities.

(c) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to Congress a report containing an evaluation of recent and current Forest Service management practices for Mark Twain National Forest, including lands in the National Forest enrolled, or under consideration for enrollment, in the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Project to convert certain lands into shortleaf pine-oak woodlands, to determine the impact of such management practices on forest health and tree mortality. The report shall specifically address—

(1) the economic costs associated with the failure to utilize hardwoods cut as part of the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Project and the subsequent loss of hardwood production from the treated lands in the long term;

(2) the extent of increased tree mortality due to excessive heat generated by prescribed fires;

(3) the impacts to water quality and rate of water run off due to erosion of the scorched earth left in the aftermath of the prescribed fires; and

(4) a long-term plan for evaluation of the impacts of prescribed fires on lands previously burned within the Eleven Point Ranger District.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 351, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me begin first by saying I fully support increasing the timber harvest on Federal lands, and I'm excited for the opportunity to create jobs and stimulate the economy in my rural Missouri district.

The issue that my amendment deals with, prescribed fires within the Mark Twain National Forest, is a symptom of the larger problem that H.R. 1526 seeks to fix. To put it simply, our national forest system could be better managed. Fifty million board feet of timber, with an estimated value of $4.75 million, dies every year in the Mark Twain National Forest. Only 38 million board feet of timber, with an estimated value of $4.37 million, is harvested. There are individuals ready, willing, and able to harvest the timber, but they are prevented from acting by the Federal Government.

The Forest Service has made the harvest problem even worse by burning whole swaths of harvestable acreage. While prescribed fire has been used in the past as an effective technique to manage and prevent forest fires, in this instance the fires are being used to change the landscape of the area from its current forested state to pine-oak woodlands.

I have personally visited sites where trees that could be harvested for timber are being burned. Folks, it just doesn't make sense to be burning this timber that could be used to bring new jobs and economic prosperity to my district.

The forest products industry in my district is alive and well, and we certainly could make use of these trees that are instead being burned. The wood flooring, the barrel industry, and timber and charcoal industries are major employers in my district that will put people back to work turning these trees into valuable finished products.

□ 1945

My constituents who have evaluated the impacts of the initial prescribed fires are very concerned about the results. The large size of the burns and the failure to utilize cut hardwoods has created a residual forest condition with scorched trees and bare mineral soil.

A number of trees the burns intended to promote were exposed to excessive heat, which has caused these trees to die unnecessarily. The burns have also caused the forest floor to become more susceptible to erosion. As a result of this situation, we need to place a moratorium on these prescribed fires in the Mark Twain National Forest until such time as their effects on the forest can be determined. I wrote a letter to the Forest Service in August, along with five of my colleagues from Missouri, seeking this information and have yet to receive a response.

I ask this body to approve my amendment so that we can get more information from the Forest Service about this situation and that in the meantime more of our valuable Missouri hardwoods will not be indiscriminately burned.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for offering this amendment. I think his amendment takes care of a unique problem, although it may be applicable in other parts. But I think the gentleman has the right approach, and I support his amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I certainly don't know what is best for the Mark Twain Forest. And you had five Members sign your letter, so that would leave 430 who probably don't think they have any clue either about what would be appropriate in your forest.

We do have a committee of jurisdiction. There are times when the Forest Service bureaucracy is doing things that I do not approve of. I don't believe that the committee has done any oversight on this issue. I don't know if the issue was brought to the chairman before it was offered as an amendment here on the floor. This amendment wasn't offered in committee, nor was—I was there, there was no discussion of this in committee.

It's a very, very localized problem. I would suggest again, as we did earlier, that, first off, this bill is not going to become law before they're going to burn this winter—which is when they burn in the Northwest. I assume they do the same thing in your district, when the risk of fire is down because of other vegetation and when the moisture levels are higher.

This isn't going to be law by then—if it ever became law. If you're doing it to get their attention, perhaps you will get their attention if they're listening. But I would suggest that the gentleman initiate a process through the committee. Ask for a meeting with the Forest Service under the auspices of the chair and attempt to get answers to the questions he has. Doing it through this particular amendment is really not going to accomplish those goals in time if indeed there are immediate plans to go forward this winter.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part C of House Report 113–215.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 508. PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN ACTIONS REGARDING FOREST SERVICE ROADS AND TRAILS.

The Forest Service shall not remove or otherwise eliminate or obliterate any legally created road or trail unless there has been a specific decision, which included adequate and appropriate public involvement, to decommission the specific road or trail in question. The fact that any road or trail is not a Forest System road or trail, or does not appear on a Motor Vehicle Use Map, shall not constitute a decision.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 351, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment guarantees that the public has the full opportunity to comment before a forest road is closed or destroyed.

These roads are vital to tourism, and tourism is vital to the economy of these communities. Yet the U.S. Forest Service has become very aggressive in recent years in shutting down these roads, restricting public access to the public lands, and replacing Gifford Pinchot's inclusionary vision for the Forest Service, which he once described as serving ''the greatest good for the greatest number in the long run,'' into an exclusionary vision that can best be described as: look, but don't touch.

The Forest Service has now bypassed Congress and has adopted a rule that effectively allows it to close any road that it deems to be unnecessary or undesirable without environmental review or public consultation or comment. My amendment simply reasserts Congress' authority to protect public access to the public lands and requires that road or trail closures follow the established process of public notification and input.

Under this provision, the Forest Service can still decommission trails or roads that it considers obsolete, but only after ''adequate and appropriate public involvement.'' That's it. Before you decommission or destroy an existing road or trail, you have to ask the public. It codifies one of Pinchot's maxims for what he called ''the behavior of foresters in public office.'' He said: It is more trouble to consult the public than to ignore them, but that is what you are hired for.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment.

If I were to categorize this amendment, it would just simply prohibit the Forest Service from removing or eliminating roads without public involvement.

In my district, in the Naches Ranger District, there was a case where they were in fact using other funds that were used to maintain roads, and they were using them to close roads, but all the time there was no public involvement. I think your amendment addresses that issue, and I support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Again, there are grounds for some agreement here. I agree with the gentleman from California that this very sensitive issue, access to forest lands, is critically important to people who live in, around or near the forest, or people who choose to travel there to recreate.

We recently had a disastrous example in my State. The Proposed Travel Management Plan in the Wallowa-Whitman Forest, which is in Mr. WALDEN's district in northeast Oregon, the plan was developed in 2009, little public input; would have closed a substantial amount of the road network. It became a huge, huge controversy because of the lack of public involvement. I had complaints from my constituents and we're 250 miles away. Although I do recreate sometimes in that forest, but it's not on the road. I access the areas by forest roads. So this is something that was of major concern.

A regional forester who was new said, yeah, you're right, they really screwed this up; let's do it over again. They started all over again in a very collaborative public process.

But this goes a little bit beyond requiring the public to be notified and involved. In fact, it's a little contradictory because major parts of this bill do away with NEPA, which does require meaningful public involvement and response to comments by the public meaningfully by the agency. So I don't know whether we've removed that requirement from the existing law for the removal of roads and that's why we have to have this amendment or not.

But this goes a little further. It says these would be legally created roads. As you know, I mean, we get people down in Nevada and elsewhere arguing with the government or even attempting to take back government property by saying these are legally created and are not the property of the Forest Service.

So first you have to decide which roads are legal, which are covered, which are illegal, not covered. Who is going to decide that? The Forest Service user group who has an informal road that they have established? How will that help with this problem?

It also requires the Forest Service to make a specific decision regarding a road or trail closure, including adequate and appropriate public involvement. Okay. Well, what are those standards as opposed to, say, the NEPA standards which should apply in these cases? So I think that this could actually lead to more confusion and litigation.

I agree with the gentleman that there is a problem. This is a sensitive area. In some areas the Forest Service has not dealt well with it and believe there are other avenues to a solution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could assist the gentleman in his confusion by simply reading the amendment, which is simple, straightforward, and clear:

> The Forest Service shall not remove or otherwise eliminate or obliterate any legally created road or trail unless there has been a specific decision, which included adequate and appropriate public involvement, to decommission the specific road or trail in question. The fact that any road or trail is not a Forest System road or trail, or does not appear on a Motor Vehicle Use Map, shall not constitute a decision.

That is it. That is the alpha and omega of this amendment in its entirety. If you're going to close a public road to the public, you need to ask them first.

I cannot emphasize enough how important this is to the mountain communities of the Sierra Nevada that depend on mountain tourism for their economies. Tourists don't go where they're not welcomed. Tourists don't visit where they can't get to. The public's use of mountain trails and roads is absolutely central to mountain tourism, and removing or closing these trails or roads is not something that should be done behind closed doors by administrative fiat.

I ask for your ''aye'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, that doesn't address the concern about legally created road or trail. Again, I'm not aware that there is a definition elsewhere in the bill, nor in this amendment, for ''legally created.'' And there is tremendous controversy and litigation over the issue of ''legally created.''

It does go on to say:

> The fact that any road or trail is not a Forest System road or trail, or does not appear on a Motor Vehicle Use Map, shall not constitute a decision.

That leaves open the issue of informal-use roads, potentially in sensitive areas, that would have to go through a process before they could be closed. What if it's a newly developed ORV trail through a sensitive meadow? We had someone running doughnuts up in a very sensitive meadow in the Three Sisters Wilderness in an area—on the edge of the Three Sisters Wilderness. I mean, did that become a road or a trail that then would be available to vehicles and we couldn't close that area? And they did, they put in big rocks and other things to close the area off to motor vehicles. Would that have been precluded under this amendment? I don't know.

This opens too many questions to controversy and interpretation. There are times when we do need to act quickly when abuse is taking place. There are other times when the Forest Service has to act more deliberately. I believe the Forest Service can do a better job. I believe in having the public notified, the public fully involved; And the best way to do that on these roads is through NEPA.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part C of House Report 113–215.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 508. LIMITATIONS ON TYPES OF DAMAGES THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MAY SEEK ARISING FROM WILDFIRES.

The Attorney General, acting on behalf of the United States, may not seek intangible damages from a landowner from whose land wildfire escaped to Federal land when such intangible damages are not permitted by the law of the State in which the landowner's land is located.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 351, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAMALFA. I appreciate working with the chairman of the committee, DOC HASTINGS, on the amendments to this legislation.

This amendment seeks to prevent the Department of Justice from seeking excessive, unquantifiable damages from property owners who have fires accidentally escape from their property onto public lands.

We have seen U.S. Attorneys sue landowners for hundreds of millions of dollars above the damage to national forests and the costs of firefighting based on very speculative claims about the value of habitat—claims which appear to be based not on science, not on fact, but only on the desire to generate revenue for the government.

When the Forest Service gains as much revenue from lawsuits as it does from timber receipts from an actual working forest, something is surely wrong with the system. This language would help to end that problem in many Western States. However, I plan to continue working on this issue until we develop a 50–State solution to this problem. So it is for these reasons that I respectfully ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment at this time.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part C of House Report 113–215.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 508. DEFINITION OF FIRE SUPPRESSION TO INCLUDE CERTAIN RELATED ACTIVITIES.

For purposes of utilizing amounts made available to the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior for fire suppression activities, including funds made available from the FLAME Fund, the term ''fire suppression'' includes reforestation, site rehabilitation, salvage operations, and replanting occurring following fire damage on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary concerned or following fire suppression efforts on such lands by the Secretary concerned.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 351, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 2000

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, disasters like the massive Rim fire that impacts my colleague's, Mr. MCCLINTOCK's, district in Yosemite National Park, which many people believe is a national treasure, and I agree, not only threaten residents, homes, and other structures, they also destroy valuable public property: forests that provide jobs in rural communities, revenue for local governments, and recreation for Americans.

Unfortunately, planning and procedural hurdles often prevent the Forest Service from salvaging usable timber and returning the land to a healthy condition.

This amendment enables the Forest Service to rapidly undertake salvage, rehabilitation, and replanting by allowing those activities to be included in fire suppression operational and funding plans.

When wildfires impact private timberland, owners know that salvage and restoration work must be conducted immediately. The window before decay and insects eliminates timber's value can be only weeks. Site rehabilitation must be done before the rainy season to prevent landslides and sediment from clogging waterways. However, the Forest Service's ability to conduct these operations on public lands is so restricted that timber which could generate jobs and revenue literally rots on the ground, even as adjacent private timberland is rapidly rehabilitated.

After the 46,000 Bagley fire in my district last year, private landowners sprang into action and, it is my understanding, that salvage and rehab operations are already complete on nearly all these private lands. These areas have been replanted and rehabilitated and soon will once again be healthy, productive forests. The Forest Service lands, however, lie nearly untouched as the value of the burned timber disappears.

In Trinity County, in northern California, 13 lightning-sparked fires burned over 250,000 acres during the memorable 2008 fire season and caused $150 million in suppression costs. However, the Forest Service conducted salvage and rehabilitation on just a few hundred acres, leaving an area one-third the size of Rhode Island blackened and scarred.

This amendment speeds the salvage and rehabilitation process by allowing the Forest Service to plan this work in conjunction with suppression plans and removes procedural hurdles by defining these activities as part of suppression efforts. The amendment allows, but does not mandate, the use of suppression funds for these efforts. Again, it does not mandate, but allows, the use of suppression funds for these efforts. The CBO has stated this amendment has no impact on overall Federal spending.

Finally, this language will offset firefighting costs by generating revenue for local communities and the Federal Government through salvage operations. Federal agencies spent over $1.9 billion on firefighting in 2012, and every dollar derived from salvaged timber is one less dollar diverted from other programs.

As you may know, I have cosponsored an amendment with Representative MCCLINTOCK streamlining judicial delays that slow salvage operations. This amendment complements that language by accelerating the salvage and rehabilitation planning progress but functions independently.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMALFA. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment.

The issue of salvage is a very important part of proper management in forests, and I think your amendment adds to that.

I support your amendment.

Mr. LAMALFA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I respectfully request your support, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has made the point that it is not mandatory, but the problem would be we already have inadequate funds for firefighting. As the gentleman, I'm certain, well knows, the Forest Service has devastated the remaining funds for fuel reduction, probably restoration activities, and a whole bunch of recreation activities and other things that have all been ripped from this year's budget because they had to spend $1 billion fighting fires, and I believe Congress appropriated less than half that amount.

This is an annual problem, and it's time to get real around here about the problem. One is to adequately invest in fuel reduction and not underinvest in firefighting. Until we do a lot more fuel

reduction across the West, we are going to have big fires. If we have big fires, we need to fight them. But we don't need to make the big fires more prevalent, more common, by cutting the fuel reduction budgets.

We had this discussion a bit in committee and actually found there was some common ground in this discussion. Certainly site rehabilitation and other activities, those are very desirable. But, again, to categorize them under firefighting I think could create major problems.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMALFA Mr. Chairman, in speaking of inadequate funds, if we were actually generating the funds by having actual timber harvest receipts, we wouldn't be looking to the government for the money for the type of fuel reductions that are needed. We would actually be making a living at it by taking adequate marketable timber, as well as operations that go along under a timber harvest plan that requires cleanup and replanting.

So we would be generating the receipts at the same time we would be doing this if we had this type of thinking involved with more of our forest management, not only in the current year where you're gaining those receipts, but in the future as you have a regenerated forest.

I would harken back to Weaverville, in Trinity County, in my area, where there was a fire some years ago that nearly burned the town; but then with no management, with no restoration, the land laid idle with brush, with snags, with all sorts of things growing back and remaining behind from that fire. It burned again just 7, 8, 9 years later and almost devastated the town once again. Whereas, we see on private lands, they're out there. They're salving. They're getting the job going again and restoring the forest, which is better for the habitat, better for siltation, better for the wildlife, better for the economy, better for everybody.

So let's move in the direction of fuel reductions, as my colleague from Oregon was talking about. Let's do the fuel reductions. But we don't have to do it with tax dollars. We can do it with the private sector having marketable timber being taken off and get the job done.

I, again, think this amendment will really help in this regard, so I respectfully, again, seek your support for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Fuel reduction and salvage are two infinitely different categories. Salvage needs to be carefully planned. We already discussed earlier, the Forest Service doesn't have the resources to do that. Yet, if we take and add that onto suppression costs, that will take money away from fuel reduction and other programs of the agency.

I know around here we spend a lot of time talking about sequestration and a lot of people think it doesn't have much real impact or it's just waste coming out of the government. That came out of the fuel suppression budget. Then a bunch of the firefighting money came out of the fuel suppression budget. And now we are going to act like there was enough money in the fuel suppression budget or the firefighting budget that we could spend it on other activities. Yes, we want to do restoration activity, but at some point we have got to suck it up and make the investments we need to make in our resource agencies so they can get the job done right.

We had a discussion of how to properly approach salvage earlier tonight. I'm not going to reiterate that issue. This amendment is not mandatory, but as an addition to an already inadequate account, which is stealing from other accounts, would not be good policy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1526) to restore employment and educational opportunities in, and improve the economic stability of, counties containing National Forest System land, while also reducing Forest Service management costs, by ensuring that such counties have a dependable source of revenue from National Forest System land, to provide a temporary extension of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT) is recognized for 55 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus to repeat and enhance the calls made by our colleagues today to end the disastrous spending cuts known as sequestration, to put a stop to the proposed disastrous cuts to SNAP benefits, and to urge the majority to abandon their plans to force the closure of the government and to default on the national debt.

I want to start with SNAP. Mr. Speaker, while nearly 50 million Americans struggle to put food on their tables, the majority are doubling their cuts to basic food aid, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, also known as SNAP, which primarily helps children, seniors, and the disabled.

Mr. Speaker, 92 percent of the people who are on SNAP are children, the elderly, disabled, or already working. Food stamp recipients currently receive just $1.40 per meal. SNAP is a vital tool to prevent hunger, fight hunger, and help struggling Americans feed their families as they seek new employment, send their children to school, and get themselves back on their feet.

Slashing nearly $40 billion from SNAP, the majority bill takes the food out of the mouths of nearly 4 million Americans next year, particularly harming children, seniors, veterans, and Americans living in urban, rural, and suburban communities with chronically high unemployment. One in five children—that is 16 million children—struggle with hunger, a record high.

Mr. Speaker, here to address the effects of the SNAP cuts that we are talking about today is my valued and esteemed colleague from California, Representative ALAN LOWENTHAL.

Congressman LOWENTHAL was elected to represent the 47th District of California after a long and distinguished career both in city politics and in the California State Assembly in Sacramento. Congressman LOWENTHAL serves on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs as well as with me on the House Committee on Natural Resources. Congressman LOWENTHAL has stood up as a loud voice against cuts to the SNAP program. He has been quoted in the press as saying, ''These cuts literally take the food from the mouths of babes.''

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I appreciate his leadership in holding this vital conversation.

During my two decades in public service, I've heard many stories about how, when the economy slows down and when Americans fall on hard times, the American social safety net has helped our fellow Americans get back on their feet again.

I want to talk a little bit today, my dear friend, about what a constituent told me. I want to talk about his personal food stamp success, a story that really illustrates how SNAP is an investment in the future success of Americans.

□ 2015

This young man, whose name is Stefan, from Long Beach, recently wrote to me. He said:

My parents, after graduating from college in the mid-seventies, had to rely on food stamps for a period. They eventually went on to complete advanced degrees and began to have wonderful and productive jobs in the private sector and in higher education,