



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 27, 2018

No. 108

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 27, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HAROLD ROGERS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 8, 2018, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

MOURNING THE LOSS OF MAJOR GENERAL GEORGE W. KEEFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to mourn the loss of a great American patriot, Major General George W. Keefe, former adjutant general of the Massachusetts National Guard who passed away last week at the age of 79.

A lifelong resident of Northampton, Massachusetts, which I had the honor

of representing for 20 years, General Keefe dedicated his life in service to our country, his community, and protecting the freedoms we all hold so dear.

He was called an airman's airman and wore the uniform with great honor and, indeed, distinction.

I knew General Keefe well and got to see firsthand what an exemplary leader and decent person he was. Beyond his military accomplishments and commendations, he was a loving husband, a dedicated father and grandfather, and, indeed, to many of us, a very good friend.

General Keefe enlisted with the 104th Fighter Wing at Barnes Air National Guard Base as an airman in 1956 at the age of 17. He continued to work his way up the ranks, becoming an officer and eventually serving as the wing's vice commander.

In 1999, General Keefe was asked to serve as adjutant general of the Massachusetts National Guard, the first Air Force officer and western Massachusetts resident to hold that post in more than 200 years of history. He retired in 2005, ending what is deemed a remarkable military career.

The motto in the Air Force is: "Aim High. Fly-Fight-Win." George Keefe did that for nearly a half century. On behalf of the United States of America, I want to thank him for his distinguished service to our Nation.

My thoughts and prayers today are with his sons, Gary, Jim, Patrick, Tim, and their families. May he rest in peace.

CONGRATULATING BISCAYNE ENGINEERING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to congratulate Biscayne

Engineering as it celebrates its 120th anniversary this year.

Located in my congressional district, Biscayne Engineering is one of the oldest, if not the oldest, business in the city of Miami, and the oldest land-surveying firm in south Florida.

Over 100 years ago, two partners, J.S. Frederick and W.E. Brown, established the company just 2 years after the city was incorporated in 1898 and made the first official map of the city of Miami just a few years later.

They were tasked with many important projects that were vital to the community, including laying out the city of Miami's streets and other parts of the greater county. One of its most prominent projects was their role in developing Villa Vizcaya, a north Italian, 16th century-style villa built for James Deering.

Biscayne Engineering's responsibility included building and road design, paving and drainage layouts, and the conservation and preservation of the estate's national foliage. Today, Vizcaya Museum and Gardens serves as a national historic landmark for visitors from all over the world to come and enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, for decades, Biscayne Engineering has had its hands on so many important projects that have helped shape south Florida into the jewel that it is today. It has aided in the development of our U.S. post office building; Federal courthouse; Bayside Marketplace; Fisher Island; Star Island, which is the area's first manmade island; and even assisted with the renovation of many of the historic art deco hotels in Miami Beach, which is located in my congressional district.

Additionally, Biscayne Engineering has been involved with the Miami-Dade Transit Metromover, the Miami-Dade Public Library System, and the Adrienne Arsht Center for the Performing Arts.

Biscayne Engineering has professionally partnered and worked with

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5751

private clients, local municipalities, counties, and State government, and even played a larger role in the surveying and construction of two of my alma maters, the University of Miami—go Canes—and Florida International University—go Panthers. The list goes on and on.

Most importantly, its engineering surveyors, planners, and staff uniformly promote the company's core values of integrity, honor, and leadership in their work and, to this day, still continue the commitment and the tradition of its founders.

So congratulations to Biscayne Engineering on its 120th anniversary. I am always glad to celebrate anything that is older than I.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MAJOR GENERAL GEORGE W. KEEFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a proud servant of the people and Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Major General George W. Keefe, who passed away last Thursday, June 21.

He will be laid to rest tomorrow, June 28, in Northampton, Massachusetts, surrounded by his family, friends, fellow officers, and the men and women who served with him throughout his 49-year career in military service.

Major General George W. Keefe was born in 1939 in Northampton. He attended public schools in Northampton and graduated from Northampton High School in 1956. He received his associate's degree from Holyoke Community College in 1966.

He enlisted in the Massachusetts Air National Guard's 104th Tactical Fighter Group in 1956 as a crash fire rescue specialist, attaining the rank of master sergeant before he was selected for a commission as an officer and first lieutenant.

He served as a squadron group and vice wing commander at the 104th Tactical Fighter Group before being selected to serve at the Massachusetts National Guard Joint Force Headquarters. He was the last member to serve in uniform of the Massachusetts Air National Guard that was federally activated and deployed from October 1961 to September 1962 in Phalsbourg, France, for Operation Stair Step, the U.S. military's response to the Berlin crisis.

George was also enshrined in the U.S. Air Force's Enlisted Heritage Hall at Maxwell Air Force Base in Alabama as one of the few general officers who rose from the rank of airman basic to major general.

He was selected and appointed as the 39th adjutant general of Massachusetts in 1999 by Governor Paul Cellucci. With this appointment, he became the first U.S. Air Force officer to serve as a

Massachusetts adjutant general since 1778. That is a long time, even by Massachusetts reckoning.

He continued to serve under Lieutenant Governor and then acting Governor Jane Swift, and Governor Mitt Romney reappointed George to a second term as adjutant general, a position he held until retiring in 2005 after 49 years of military service.

Among one of the bigger moments in his job as adjutant general was September 11, 2001, when he had to activate the Massachusetts National Guard to respond to the terror attacks on New York City that involved two jetliners that had flown out of Logan International Airport in Boston.

I first met Major General Keefe at the start of my second term in office. I had just won my first reelection campaign and he had just been appointed adjutant general of Massachusetts National Guard. I respected the experience and long view that he brought to his position, and he was very helpful to me then and over the next 6 years in understanding the priorities of the Massachusetts National Guard and introducing me to the soldiers, airmen, and uniformed men and women who serve in the Massachusetts Guard and Reserve as well as their families.

I appreciated his Irish sense of humor, and I admired and respected his dedication and service to our country, the Commonwealth, and, most importantly, to the many servicemembers of the Massachusetts National Guard.

Like so many in Massachusetts, his little piece of heaven was his house on Cape Cod where he watched his sons and his grandchildren enjoy the beach, the waves, fried seafood, and the countless whiffle ball and miniature golf matches.

The eldest of his four sons, Gary W. Keefe, currently serves as adjutant general of the Massachusetts Air National Guard.

Few lives are as filled with service, love of friends and family, and so firmly rooted in Massachusetts as that of former Major General George W. Keefe. He made a big difference in the lives of so many people and in the life and history of our Nation.

Major General George W. Keefe was not only a great man but, more importantly, a very, very good man. He will be missed, and we salute him as we say farewell and Godspeed.

PROTECT AMERICA'S BAKERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand up for New Jersey jobs and New Jersey workers who are the best in the world. In Fair Lawn, New Jersey, the men and women at Mondelez bake top-quality products like Oreos, Teddy Grahams, Ritz Crackers, Chips Ahoy, and Barnum's Animal Crackers.

Mr. Speaker, Americans who enjoy Oreos or animal crackers would be proud to know that these delicious cookies and crackers are produced right here in America. However, I believe they would be shocked to hear about some of the recent practices of the company that threaten these employees' retirement and will outsource their U.S. production jobs to Mexico, an issue that Democrats and Republicans alike are rightly sounding the alarm about.

In the past month, Mondelez announced its intention to withdraw from its employees' retirement plan that the company participated in for 60 years, setting the stage for a retirement catastrophe that could impact more than 100,000 American workers.

The men and women I represent have worked hard and played by the rules their whole lives, responsibly planning for their retirements, taking care of their families, doing what they need to do. Mondelez can't just change the rules mid-game as people prepare for their retirements.

Mr. Speaker, America's seniors deserve security when they retire, and our workers deserve nothing but the best. Destroying retirement income, shipping jobs overseas to low-wage countries, and eroding the middle class sets us on a dangerous and unsustainable path.

I stand with the Bakery, Confectionary, Tobacco Workers & Grain Millers Local 719 in Fair Lawn and America's jobs. And I hope that Mondelez can sit down at the table and find a way to keep their commitments to New Jersey workers while continuing to make a great product in the United States of America and in New Jersey in the district that I represent.

HONORING THE CAREER OF ARMY CORPS COLONEL JOHN P. LLOYD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of Colonel John P. Lloyd, commander of the Pittsburgh District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Colonel Lloyd assumed command of the Pittsburgh District on July 29, 2016. As the commander, he is responsible for carrying out the district's mission within the Ohio River basin, which includes more than 328 miles of navigable waterways on the Allegheny River, Monongahela River, and upper Ohio River.

The Pittsburgh District's 26,000 square miles include portions of western Pennsylvania, northeastern West Virginia, eastern Ohio, western Maryland, and southwestern New York. Colonel Lloyd oversees 23 navigation locks and dams, 16 multipurpose flood damage reduction reservoirs, 80 local flood damage reduction projects, and other projects to protect and enhance water resources.

Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of getting to know Colonel Lloyd during his tenure as commander of the Pittsburgh District, and he is a true public servant. He oversaw the Task Force Power Restoration effort in Puerto Rico after Hurricanes Irma and Maria tore through in 2017. He mobilized and deployed a specialized team of Army Corps personnel to rebuild the island's electrical system of power generation, transmission, and distribution.

Colonel Lloyd's team worked with FEMA, the Department of Energy, the power industry, Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority, and other stakeholders to restore more than 85 percent of Puerto Rico's prestorm power grid within 5 months. He displayed truly remarkable leadership.

Colonel Lloyd also took the time to travel to my district to meet with the Punxsutawney Borough Council to discuss modifications for its levees.

His expertise is second to none, and we have been fortunate enough to have Colonel Lloyd at the helm in the Pittsburgh District.

Prior to his assignment in Pittsburgh, Colonel Lloyd served in a variety of engineer command and leadership positions, including battalion commander of the 19th Engineer Battalion at Fort Knox, Kentucky. Before that, he served as the Army fellow assigned to the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies in Honolulu, Hawaii.

□ 1015

Colonel Lloyd is a man with numerous military awards and decorations, and the accolades surely do match his commitment and dedication to his job.

I wish Colonel Lloyd the best as he departs the Pittsburgh District for his next assignment. He has done an outstanding job for the citizens of northwestern Pennsylvania, and it has been an honor and a privilege to get to know this fine individual over the past 2 years.

NATIONAL ORCA PROTECTION MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HECK. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago we reached another troublesome milestone for Puget Sound's magnificent, but endangered, orca population.

We lost yet another southern resident orca, this time a 23-year-old male known as L-92. This is the third death just in the past year, and the sixth in the past 2 years.

There are now just 75 southern resident orcas left, the lowest number in 34 years. In fact, that is 13 fewer whales than when the population was initially listed in 2005 under the Endangered Species Act.

I am sad about this loss and frustrated about this loss. Indeed, I am beyond frustrated. I am beyond frustrated because we know what needs to be done to save this iconic species in

the Pacific Northwest. But, quite frankly, the Federal Government isn't living up to its partnership responsibility.

Back home in Washington State, the State government and local partners are stepping up. Governor Inslee earlier this year created the Southern Resident Orca Task Force, and he charged two terrific public servants, my friends, Stephanie Solien and Les Purce, with leading it. But these partners can't do it alone; nor should they.

We all have to fully invest in the Puget Sound in orca recovery programs. Mr. Speaker, I remind you Puget Sound is the largest estuary in the United States of America.

The good news is we know where our efforts need to go. Eighty percent of the southern resident orcas' diet is Chinook salmon, and these salmon populations are in just as much danger of extinction as our orcas. Most of those salmon are gone. They are being eaten by sea lions and seals; and where they swim in Puget Sound it is simply too polluted.

The pollution killing them is from storm water runoff—toxic metals, chemicals, and oils. It kills literally in a matter of hours, and we have the film to prove it. Storm water runoff remains the largest source of pollution in Puget Sound, and we cannot save our beloved orcas and our salmon if we do not stop that. Period.

So we will fight for funding to tackle these problems. But I also believe we have to raise awareness. That is why last week I introduced H. Res. 959, which would designate June 2018 as National Orca Protection Month. In Washington State, we gather every June to celebrate our southern resident orcas. We join Native American Tribes who have always recognized and honored the spiritual and cultural significance of that which they call the Blackfish.

But as the orca population has declined, these celebrations have turned into calls for action. National Orca Protection Month serves as a reminder of work that requires a year-round focus. It is vital that the Federal Government play its vital partnership role.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask Members to please support this resolution to designate National Orca Protection Month. Let's give our Federal agencies the resources they need to prevent the extinction of this beautiful and magnificent species and ensure that orcas survive for generations yet to come.

PREVENTING INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL CHILD ABDUCTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the heartbreaking story of an Orange County father named Randy Collins. On March 3, 2003, Randy and his wife

welcomed their son, Keisuke, to the world.

Following their divorce, Randy became concerned that his ex-wife would flee with their son to her home country, Japan. The California court system agreed and granted a temporary restraining order on foreign travel for their son. Unfortunately, this did not prevent the abduction from taking place.

I first met Randy during my time in the California State Senate when we worked together on legislation to prevent future international parental child abductions. I am proud the bill, named Keisuke's Law in honor of Randy's son, passed the State legislature unanimously and was signed into law on September 7, 2012.

This month marks 12 years since Randy, a loving and devoted father, last saw his son. Japan continues to have one of the worst records in returning abducted children like Keisuke to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, as the mother of four, I can only imagine the pain that Randy must feel missing each passing milestone of his son's life. This is a grave injustice, and I will continue to support Randy and all families whose children have been wrongfully abducted.

REMEMBERING DUNCAN GIGERICH

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Duncan Gigerich whose life was tragically cut short on June 9, 2018.

Duncan was only 19 years old at the time he passed away, yet he demonstrated maturity well beyond his years. As a high school football player, Duncan demonstrated leadership skills both on and off the field. Duncan just returned from a semester abroad in New Zealand where he studied the country's natural history and culture while learning invaluable outdoor leadership and survival skills. He was undoubtedly full of life and eager to embark on each new adventure before him.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my sincerest condolences to the Gigerich and Dirk families and to all those who were fortunate enough to know Duncan. His memory will live on through the many friends, family, and places that experienced Duncan's loving spirit and immense appreciation for the outdoors.

May he rest in peace.

CONGRATULATING DEPUTY CHIEF GARAVEN ON HIS RETIREMENT

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Paul Garaven on his retirement from the Tustin Police Department.

Deputy Chief Garaven has served over 30 years at the Tustin Police Department beginning in 1987 as a part-time volunteer reservist. Since then, he has held numerous positions within the department, including time spent undercover with the special investigations unit.

No matter the title Deputy Chief Garaven held, he devoted every day of his career to making the city of Tustin

a safer and better place for all. On July 3, Deputy Chief Garaven will end his long and impressive career at the Tustin Police Department.

Thankfully, the image of a young undercover officer will remain to inspire the next generation of officers at the police department to strive for greatness in everything they do.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Deputy Chief Garaven on an outstanding 30-year career serving the city of Tustin. I wish him the absolute best as he begins the next great chapter of his life.

ENSURING SAFE DRINKING WATER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD) for 5 minutes.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, this weekend I visited Flint, Michigan, where I met with neighbors and residents, one of whom was named Joyce.

Joyce is one of the more than 100,000 residents in Flint who have and continue to endure a life-threatening water crisis in their city which has gone on for years. Like too many families in Flint, Joyce's family has suffered incredible loss due to the criminal contamination of Flint's water.

Joyce's son's name is Joseph. He was a father of three, and as any of us would, he believed that the water that he drank, bathed, and cooked with—the water that he gave to his children—was clean. He had no reason to believe otherwise.

But after the city of Flint changed its water source from Detroit's water system to Flint River in 2014 to cut costs, Joseph began to develop rashes and bacteria that ate away at his flesh forcing him to tape his skin together on his face and on his back with band-aids.

It was so bad that his doctors kept asking him if he had traveled to a Third World country recently. Where in the world had he been that had caused his organs to deteriorate as rapidly as they were?

Joseph died leaving behind his three children; his family; and his mother, Joyce, who continues to keep his memory alive.

Joseph's story is tragic and heart-wrenching, and the sad part is that this is not a one-off case. Samples of drinking water from Flint found 13,000 parts per billion of lead in the community's water, which is nearly 900 times higher than the EPA's maximum limit of 15 parts per billion.

Scientific evidence shows that this lead contamination has killed at least a dozen people in Flint from Legionnaires' disease. It has deteriorated the short- and long-term health of tens of thousands of people in the community, including at least 9,000 children under the age of 6.

It has created ripple effects causing fetal death and lower fertility rates that continue to have an impact on those who are affected and will con-

tinue to have an impact on this community for generations to come.

Now, there are other cases of other illnesses such as cancers and things that are not even being tracked but are likely related to this contaminated water, and that will continue.

It has been over 1,500 days since this crisis began and the people of Flint today still do not have clean water. Understandably, they don't trust their government to tell them the truth after they have been told the water is clean and safe time and again, only to show that it is not and people continue to get sick.

These are the same officials who decided to put cost savings over human lives who later reassured the community that the water was safe when they knew that it wasn't. Now, despite this heartache, death, and destruction, those responsible in local, State, and Federal Government have not been held accountable for creating and perpetuating this horrifying crisis.

Poisoning over 100,000 people through their water is criminal, yet not a single person has been charged. Not only that, but the State has declared the water in Flint to be lead-free and has shut down the only bottled distribution facility in the city. The need is still there, so we have churches and volunteers in the city who are coming together and cobbling together a means to distribute bottled water in whatever way that they can, taking care of each other, and demanding accountability for those responsible for this devastation.

Understandably, they feel they have been forgotten, that their voices are not being heard, and that they have been left behind. All they are asking is that this country—our country—hear their personal stories and shine a light on the problems that still continue.

We understand that this is not a problem isolated to Flint, Michigan, but is a problem that faces communities all across the country. We know that Flint is not alone. With the aging and crumbling infrastructure in this country, we know that too many of our communities don't have safe water to drink. We need Federal investment in our country's dangerously dilapidated water infrastructure now.

In my home State of Hawaii alone, it is estimated that we will need over \$1 billion in drinking water investment over the next 20 years just to ensure that our people have safe water to drink.

I am a co-sponsor of the WATER Act which will make these critical improvements to our drinking water and wastewater services, replace old, lead-ridden pipes, and stop sewage overflows and other problems that are contaminating our national water infrastructure.

We must hold those responsible for the poisoning of Flint accountable for the lives that they have ruined. Along with passing the WATER Act into law, we need to expand water testing in

high-risk areas. We need to send a message to this country that we stand together. Water is life. We cannot survive without it.

□ 1030

RECOGNIZING THE YOUTH POLICE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Youth Police Academy of the Falls Township Police Department, a 10-day program beginning its 2018 session in mid-July. This program teaches its students Pennsylvania State laws and gives them lessons on patrol scenarios, crime scene investigations, and the use of force.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to share with you that this educational experience for Bucks County youth has received over \$6,000 in community support. Much of this money was raised through a 5K run and walk event in Fallsington, organized by Marty McLoughlin and Linda Stout, the co-owners of a local small business, Extreme Fitness Personal Training.

I commend the work of Police Chief Bill Wilcox and the entire Falls Township Police Department for supporting our community's youth in their personal and professional growth and respect for law enforcement.

I would like to recognize Marty and Linda for their hard work and generosity, and I encourage all in our community to follow their lead.

RECOGNIZING DR. ROBERT FRASER

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a public servant in our community for his dedication to improving the lives and educational experiences of Bucks County students.

Dr. Robert Fraser, the superintendent of the Council Rock School District, recently became one of only 30 school superintendents in the United States who have successfully completed the National Superintendent Certification Program.

This elite program helps bring education professionals up to speed on the various issues that have recently presented themselves in the American school system. It covers such facets as instructional leadership, budget management, and using cutting-edge technology to ensure that Council Rock students and faculty are fully equipped to use the most effective resources to assist in the learning process.

I commend Dr. Fraser for his commitment to our community's students, and I would like to thank Jerold Grupp and the entire Council Rock School Board for all of their work.

RECOGNIZING KRISTIAN FALKENSTEIN

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the heroic actions of an individual from Bucks County, Pennsylvania, for which he was awarded the Carnegie Medal from the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission, which

seeks to recognize acts of civilian bravery. Kristian Falkenstein of Newtown played a critical role in saving the life of a 32-year-old man who was swept out to sea on the Jersey shore last year.

After seeing a man being swept out to sea, Kristian immediately sprang into action, swimming out to save this man. When Kristian reached him, he was barely above water. Despite the tall waves and strong rip current, Kristian was able to keep him afloat for several minutes until two lifeguards and a responding police officer were able to swim out to them with flotation devices to assist until the Coast Guard was able to respond.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to report that all individuals have recovered from this ordeal. I commend Kristian for his tremendous act of bravery, which undoubtedly saved a life that day.

Kristian, your community and your country are extremely proud of you.

CIVILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, once again, I am proud to rise and stand in the well of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of those who have called for civility. I compliment them for calling for civility. I think civility is appropriate at all times, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do have to ask: Where were you when the President of the United States of America stood before law enforcement officers and said: "You don't have to be so nice when you have a person within your care, custody, and control?"—paraphrasing him, of course. Where were you?

Where was your compassion for the many people who have been victims of brutality at the hands of the constabulary?

Where is your compassion for all of the people who understand that that was a message, whether intended or not, to the constabulary, to the police, that you can abuse people who are in your care, custody, and control? Where were you? Why didn't you speak out?

Where was your sense of outrage as it relates to the President of the United States of America encouraging persons to assault people who were within the care, custody, and control of the police?

Encouraging people to do something unconstitutional, it would have been and is still unconstitutional to assault people who are in your care, custody, and control if you are a peace officer. So where were you?

Where were you when the President said there were some nice people among those at Charlottesville, among those who happened to be in the KKK, the neo-Nazis, those who were espousing harm to people?

As you know, a woman lost her life in Charlottesville. Where were you?

Why didn't you come out strongly against the President of the United States of America? Where were you?

And then, my dear brothers and sisters, my friends across the aisle, why is it that you can find reason to condemn others and propose a resolution, but you propose not one single resolution for the President, who has consistently and persistently created levels of incivility that have emanated to the extent that some people may have been harmed already? Where were you?

Why is it such that you can be outraged now, but you couldn't be outraged then? Where are you now as he is putting his bigotry into policy? Where are you?

Why won't you stand up to this President? Are you aiding and abetting? Are you a part of the President's support system to implement the bigotry that he is putting into policy?

It is being done when the President met with those persons at the White House to talk about immigration and then called certain countries in Africa s—hole countries.

Now, ironically, he wants to do away with the diversity visas, which happen to impact people who may be in Africa. Where were you? Why won't you stand up? Why would you want to implement this level of bigotry into policy?

I commend you and I am proud of you for wanting civility. I stand for civility. But I also know this. Those who make peaceful protests impossible make other forms of protest inevitable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President and to direct their remarks to the Chair.

COMBATING OPIOIDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the opioid crisis that is devastating families and communities all across our country, including my fair State of North Carolina and my district in western North Carolina.

Like the rest of the country, North Carolina has not escaped the opioid epidemic. My State has seen a terrifying rise in the number of opioid-related deaths. From 1999 to 2016, the number of deaths tied to opioids grew more than 800 percent.

In 2016 alone, there were almost 2,000 opioid deaths in North Carolina. In just one of the counties I represent, Gaston County, the number of dispensed opioid pills rose to more than 20.5 million pills. That is in a county of just over 200,000 people. That same county experienced a thirteenfold jump in heroin deaths, as well.

While I can list facts all day, it is only by talking to the loved ones who have lost family members due to opioid addiction or those who have come

through addiction and are on the other side that you can truly understand the devastating effects of this crisis. Take, for example, one of my constituents, Jennifer Kline.

Jennifer lost her brother, Jake, to opioid addiction. Before Jake became an addict, Jennifer and her brother shared a very, very close relationship. But opioid addiction turned him into a person she barely knew. Even though Jake went to rehab and had a family who supported him through this whole process throughout his addiction, he still lost the battle against opioids.

I had the honor of meeting with Jennifer. She helped me and my staff host a workshop for local law enforcement in my district, where she shared the heartbreaking story of Jake's addiction. Jake's and her story is a powerful reminder that we must do more to address this epidemic. We are not doing enough. The human toll of this crisis is very, very real, indeed.

Like Jennifer, I have been working hard to help raise awareness in my district, the 10th District of North Carolina, against the dangers of opioid addiction. I have been working with local businesses, law enforcement officials, and other community leaders to combat this crisis: I have hosted roundtables and helped facilitate discussions between community leaders on different ways we can work together to combat this crisis and this epidemic; I have been there as local municipalities have received funds for tools that enable safe disposal of unused prescriptions, as well.

Over the past 2 years, there have been dozens of bills passed in the House that will help people like Jake and provide support for family members like Jennifer. These bills address this issue from all sides. Some of these bills help with the prevention of addiction; others ensure everyone has access to treatment and help facilitate their recovery; still, others provide important support to communities affected so that they can have the tools and resources they need to combat this epidemic.

Last Friday, these bills were passed in the House of Representatives together in a bill, H.R. 6, the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act. It is now headed to the United States Senate and, hopefully, to the President's desk for signature.

This is an important, holistic step that this Chamber has taken on a bipartisan basis to help combat the opioid epidemic and help prevent the tragedy experienced by the Kline family from happening to other families in this country.

We all have stories. We all have loved ones who have been affected by this crisis. Congress must do more. We will continue this fight until we eradicate this epidemic once and for all.

IMMIGRATION AND GOP'S ATTACK
ON WORKING PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention to the outright assault on working people in America by the Trump administration.

When candidate Trump ran and carried States like Ohio, Michigan, and Wisconsin, he promised to renegotiate NAFTA to secure U.S. jobs and stop outsourcing. He said he would fight to raise people's paychecks.

Well, wages aren't keeping up with the cost of living as workers backslide on hourly wages, while healthcare and prescription drug costs rise and retirement benefits are being cut.

This week, Harley Davidson just announced it will outsource hundreds of jobs because of the Trump trade war. Meanwhile, the NAFTA trade deficit remains far too high under the Trump administration. That means more lost U.S. jobs and a diminished middle class.

Now, why has President Trump delayed NAFTA renegotiations so critical to creating a level playing field both in our country and across our continent?

Instead of renegotiating NAFTA to heal these gaping deficits and to prevent pitting one group of workers against another on this continent, he is targeting the lowest wage workers in the Americas and tearing them apart from their children, their families, and their communities. Most are agricultural workers who work in grueling jobs, for which U.S. citizens rarely apply.

□ 1045

Let me bring you to Ohio. Just in the past 3 weeks, Ohio communities have faced six massive worker raids at two Corso Lawn and Garden centers and at four Fresh Mark animal slaughter facilities.

America has a choice: We can either grow and process our food and floriculture inside this country; or, if we fail to tend it, we will outsource more and more of our production and be forced to import more food and cede more jobs that relate to agriculture.

These worker raids create a climate of fear where workers are too afraid to stand up for their rights, to report wage theft, or to redress dangerous work conditions facing them.

Working in a meat slaughterhouse is among the most dangerous jobs in the United States of America. NAFTA forces workers who work in these jobs to exist in a shadow economy and be treated as, yes, less than human.

The raw truth is NAFTA was purposefully designed to create an exodus of millions of displaced small farmers in the Mexican countryside who have become an exploitable underclass of vast dimension across this continent. Millions and millions of small farmers were turned off their land, forming an endless pool of cheap, exploitable labor

in the Americas. I call it the most significant continental sacrilege in my lifetime.

Voila. There it is, the cold, hard truth of NAFTA's underbelly, still left unaddressed after a quarter century.

Their lives are viewed as cheap, those human lives given no value in this continent's enormous economy. Yet we wouldn't eat without them. We wouldn't recreate without them.

Where is President Trump? Instead of fixing this NAFTA problem, he has sidelined NAFTA renegotiation. Instead of fixing this problem, congressional Republicans passed a GOP tax scam that gives away trillions to the ultrawealthy—the top 1 percent got 83 percent of the benefits—while adding trillions to our deficit. Meanwhile, workers are facing increased health costs, cutbacks in retirement benefits, unaffordable medicine and healthcare, and rising education costs for their children.

How about that? Instead of carefully targeted trade relief and going after closed global markets, the Trump administration starts a trade war with most of our allies.

It isn't productive that this President of the United States is offending the President of Mexico and the Prime Minister of Canada. Really? Our closest neighbors.

Young people are expressing workplace frustration as well with the jobs in the so-called gig economy with Uber or elsewhere, where a 20-year-old, sure, can work, but with far fewer benefits and much less security and stability.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for a better deal for workers across this continent, starting with an enforceable NAFTA trade pact that has strong labor provisions and a labor secretariat on both the agriculture and industrial side.

I am one of the Democrats willing to work with Republicans and roll up my sleeves to reach that compromise, as difficult as I know it will be.

TAX REFORM AND ECONOMIC
HEALTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, proud to share a snapshot of rising wages, more jobs, and increasing opportunity in the Fourth Congressional District of Washington, which I have the distinct pleasure of representing.

In the city of Yakima, unemployment is at 5.5 percent, as reported in April by the Washington Employment Security Department. That number is reportedly the lowest it has been for that month since electronic reporting began in 1990. Yakima County is the most populous county in central Washington and had a May unemployment rate at 6.0 percent, which is the lowest rate in decades.

In another major population center in Washington, the Tri-Cities, unem-

ployment was at 5.2 percent in May. Wages in the Tri-Cities area are up 3.8 percent over 2017 and are among the fastest growing in the State.

The latest jobs report showed decreasing unemployment rates across my district in every single county, with Okanogan at 6.3 percent; Grant, 6.1; Franklin, 5.5; Douglas at 5.2; Benton at 5.1; Adams at 4.8; and Walla Walla at 4.3.

New jobs in construction, food manufacturing, and professional business services are largely driving the regional growth in the labor force. These numbers are more than just statistics, Mr. Speaker. Increasing employment opportunities mean families can provide a more secure future for their children. Graduating students are able to choose from more options after graduation.

My constituents deserve a Federal Government whose policies foster this kind of growth through lower taxes and smarter regulation. We should encourage entrepreneurs by helping, not hurting, growth.

Since tax reform was made law, local businesses in my district, such as Irwin Research & Development and Abbott's Printing in Yakima, have expressed optimism at the prospect of increasing investment and giving earnings to workers rather than the Federal Government.

The ability of businesses to write off the full value of equipment and other assets will help Buhrmaster Baking Company in Yakima plan for equipment upgrades. Chukar Cherries in Prosser has announced a \$1.8 million, 12,000-square-foot expansion, in large part due to tax reform.

Cacchiotti Orthodontics announced hourly raises for their Moses Lake employees thanks to tax reform. Pacific Power, which serves Yakima County, announced that it will pass tax reform savings on to its ratepayers. Washington Federal, with branches in Moses Lake and Quincy, announced 5 percent merit-based increases in wages for all employees earning less than \$100,000, as well as an investment in employee training programs.

Pacific Northwest companies such as Alaska Airlines, Costco, Boeing, Premera Blue Cross, and Starbucks have announced millions in increased benefits, raises, employee education, and nonprofit donations.

To sum it all up, central Washington's economy is experiencing growth, and that is good news for workers and for their families. I will continue to work on behalf of my constituents to promote economic opportunity, and I am proud that this tax reform is working as it was promised to work.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 52 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOST) at noon.

PRAYER

Dr. Jack Trieber, North Valley Baptist Church, Santa Clara, California, offered the following prayer:

Father, I thank You so much, Almighty God, that we can come into Your presence and pray for this great body of people that serve us.

We thank You for our Congressmen today. We pray that You keep them safe, men and women, their children, their mates, their grandchildren. We pray for our country today that it would have this day of safety and security.

Lord, it is my prayer that as our leaders serve today, that You give them wisdom, that You give them patience, that You give them kindness and understanding.

May we remember the words of the Scripture that: "Righteousness exalts a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people." Remember the Bible says today that: "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord."

We thank You for America. We thank You for the privilege of prayer in this very sacred assembly.

In Jesus' name, amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CICILLINE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING DR. JACK TRIEBER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to introduce my friend and constituent, Dr. Jack Trieber, pastor of North Valley Baptist Church in Santa

Clara, California in my district. I thank him for his words of wisdom and comfort, and for joining us to deliver the opening prayer in the House today.

Pastor Trieber has been a source of strength and guidance for my constituents for more than four decades. He is a personal friend and counselor and source of strength to me. He and his wife, Cindie, have been friends since I entered public service, and I appreciate that Pastor Trieber accompanied me to last year's annual National Prayer Breakfast to join leaders from across the country in discussing the importance of faith to the strength of our Nation.

Under the pastor's leadership, North Valley Baptist Church has grown from an assembly of 22 people in 1976, the year I was born, to a current average of 3,000 in attendance each Sunday. He is a true patriot.

He believes in this country, and it is a real honor to have had him open our House with his prayers.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

TAX CUTS ARE WORKING

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

MR. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, it has only been 6 months since the new tax reform law was put into place, but already, we are seeing many positive economic outcomes.

Unemployment is at the lowest rate in 18 years; Hispanic and African American unemployment has reached a record low; over 1 million jobs have been created; and there are now more job openings than job seekers. Wages are increasing, and Americans are seeing more money in their wallets.

On top of that, people are also seeing lower utility bills, keeping more of their hard-earned money. Small businesses are increasingly optimistic about the economy, reporting higher wages for their workers and plans for expansion.

Mr. Speaker, the promising results we have seen in such a short time show that the tax cuts are working. And this is just the beginning. Let's take these results, build on them, and continue to better the lives of the American people.

COVERAGE FOR PREEXISTING CONDITIONS

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act improved access to quality healthcare for millions of

Americans. One of the most important protections in this law is that insurance companies can no longer deny people coverage because they have a preexisting condition.

Millions of Americans with arthritis, cancer, diabetes, mental illness, and other preexisting conditions have benefited from this requirement. And that is why it is so disturbing that earlier this month the Trump administration went to court to argue that insurance companies should no longer have to cover people with preexisting conditions.

If they succeed, it will further unravel the Affordable Care Act. It will be harder for individuals and small businesses to buy health insurance. Some experts believe that there will be even more Americans without health coverage than ever before. This is wrong. The President is putting the interests of health insurance companies and health insurance company CEOs ahead of American consumers.

Republicans in Congress should be demanding that this President stop. They should demand that their constituents have access to the best healthcare possible, but, instead, they are silent in the face of a President trying to take away coverage for preexisting medical conditions.

It is wrong. We can do better.

PRAYERS FOR KATIE ARRINGTON

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, South Carolinians extend sincere thoughts and prayers to State Representative Katie Arrington, who was injured in a tragic auto accident on Friday. We are grateful to learn that Katie will make a full recovery.

On June 12, Katie achieved the Republican nomination for Congress for the historic First District of South Carolina. When successful in November, she will be the first Republican Federal elected official in the history of South Carolina, in the tradition of Ambassador Nikki Haley who was South Carolina's first female Governor in 340 years.

Also, yesterday, Republicans nominated Pamela Evette to be the first female Republican Lieutenant Governor ever, and Lexington Republicans selected Paula Rawl Calhoun for the South Carolina State House.

Katie served as an executive with military defense contracts, ensuring servicemembers will have the tools necessary to succeed. She is on the board of many organizations, including Women In Defense, Charleston Defense Contractors Association, and South Carolina Cyber.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Congratulations on yesterday's primary victories by Governor Henry

McMaster, Attorney General Alan Wilson, and congressional nominee William Timmons.

IMPROVE OUR HEALTHCARE SYSTEM

(Mr. SCHNEIDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the more than 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions who are under attack from the Trump administration.

Some of these people have chronic health conditions such as asthma and diabetes. Some are waging courageous fights against cancer. Some are tackling challenges with mental health or substance abuse. These are our family and friends. They are our neighbors, our coworkers, our caregivers. They are us.

Sadly, if the administration has its way, they will once more be subjected to discrimination that could deprive them of coverage, condemn them to a lifetime's worth of staggering medical bills, and push their families into devastating bankruptcy.

One of my constituents in Highland Park who found coverage through the ACA wrote me:

My preexisting condition is not a result of my lifestyle choices, as some like to believe. I don't deserve to be demonized and financially thrashed just because of something I cannot control.

I agree. Seventy percent of the public also support making sure people with preexisting conditions have protections. I urge the Trump administration to abandon its legal effort to undermine the ACA. Enough with the sabotage.

We owe it to these 130 million people to do better. Instead of building barriers to healthcare, let's work together and improve our healthcare system.

WELCOMING CONGRESSIONAL ART COMPETITION WINNER MEGAN SMITH TO THE CAPITOL

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I welcome Megan Smith to the Capitol. Megan is the winner of the Pennsylvania Fifth Congressional District's Congressional Artwork Competition.

The annual art competition, organized by the Congressional Institute, showcases the artwork of high school students across every congressional district in the country.

Megan just graduated from Bellefonte Area High School earlier this month. Her artwork titled, "Spoons," is a drawing of five different spoons on top of blue, pink, and white collage paper.

All of the winning pieces will be displayed for the year in the Cannon tun-

nel where they will be viewed by Members of Congress, staff, and the many visitors of the Capitol every day.

I am looking forward to spending time with Megan and her parents at this afternoon's reception where she and her fellow winners from across the country will be honored for their work.

I congratulate Megan and all of the students who participated in the competition, and I am excited to see all of the new artwork hanging in the tunnel.

STATEHOOD FOR PUERTO RICO

(Mrs. MURPHY of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for bipartisan legislation to begin Puerto Rico's transition to statehood.

There are over 3 million U.S. citizens in Puerto Rico, and over 5 million individuals of Puerto Rican heritage in the States. My Florida district is home to more Puerto Ricans than any other district in the country.

I care deeply about Puerto Rico because my constituents care deeply about Puerto Rico. But every Member of Congress should care about Puerto Ricans because they are our fellow citizens. We are part of the same American family.

Puerto Rico has been a territory for 120 years. Its residents are treated unequally under key Federal laws. This impairs economic progress and quality of life, spurring migration to the mainland. And even though Puerto Ricans serve in the military with distinction, they cannot vote for their President and Commander-in-Chief. They have no Senators, and have only one nonvoting delegate in the House.

The hard truth is that Puerto Rico's lack of political power too often makes it an afterthought in Washington, as the Federal Government's poor response to Hurricane Maria made painfully clear.

I support statehood because I support equality. The people of Puerto Rico deserve the same rights and responsibilities as their fellow citizens in Florida and every other State.

Puerto Rico has earned its star on the American flag.

RECOGNIZING THOSE AFFECTED BY THE EASTPOINT FIRE

(Mr. DUNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the hardworking people of Eastpoint, Florida, who lost their homes, their belongings, and even their livelihoods to a devastating fire this week.

This past weekend a fire broke out in Franklin County, which destroyed more than 40 homes and almost 1,000 acres. My heart goes out to those

whose lives have been forever changed by this horrible and unexpected wildfire. My office stands ready to assist them in any way we can.

Thank you to all of our first responders, volunteer firefighters, and local law enforcement for your heroic efforts in containing this blaze. Your quick actions saved many lives.

Thank you also to Franklin County Sheriff, A. J. "Tony" Smith, Franklin County Emergency Management Director Pam Brownell, local community leaders, the Salvation Army, and the American Red Cross, all of whom stepped up and provided aid and comfort to those who need it the most.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in praying for the victims and their families during this time of loss.

POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER AWARENESS DAY

Mr. SUOZZI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, 20 veterans commit suicide in the United States every day. This is not only a crisis; it is a national shame.

Today, June 27, is Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day. We need to come together as Democrats and Republicans to help those suffering from PTSD.

Too many veterans suffering alone in the dark are not eligible for VA benefits, or are unable to navigate the VA bureaucracy.

I am proud to have introduced the bipartisan Mental Health Services for All Veterans Act, H.R. 2736, which would provide every member of the military mental health services, whether Active Duty, Reserve, or National Guard, even if they were less-than-honorably discharged.

Mental health, PTSD, 20 suicides a day—this crisis in a community of heroes must be addressed.

□ 1215

HONORING WILLIAM DALLUGE

(Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my friend, William Dalluge, Jr., a lifetime resident of Blue Mound, Illinois, who retired as Pleasant View Township clerk in April.

William, who is known to everyone as "Whompie," is a staple in the Blue Mound community. Born and raised there, Whompie has always called Blue Mound home. Even from a young age, he knew the importance of giving back to his community. In 1961, he started a small business by leasing and operating the Standard Gas station in town for 9 years. The following 16 years, he was co-owner of the Blue Mound Furniture Store.

What is most remarkable about Whompie is that he has spent nearly all his life in the service of others. Not only is he a U.S. Army veteran, but Whompie sat on the Blue Mound Town Board for 4 years, serving as the village president another 4.

He volunteered his time as a Boy Scout troop leader and has been actively involved in the Interchurch Food Pantry since 1984. For the past 29 years, the citizens of Blue Mound have known Whompie as their Pleasant View Township clerk until his retirement this spring.

However, if you ask him, Whompie's greatest accomplishment has been his nearly 69-year marriage to his wife, Nelda. Together, they have three children, six grandchildren, and three great-grandchildren.

Whompie, congratulations on a well-earned retirement. Best wishes to you and your family.

FOREIGN INTERFERENCE IN U.S. ELECTIONS

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the 2016 election and its fallout highlighted what many Americans already knew, that special interests bankroll candidates in exchange for expected favors down the road and loopholes allow foreign governments to influence our elections. Look no further than the pervasive impact of Russian-sponsored political ads on Facebook in 2016.

My bill, the REFUSE Act, Repelling Encroachment by Foreigners into U.S. Elections, tightens campaign finance laws and lobbyist disclosure rules to protect our democracy from foreign influence.

First, to stem the bleed of special interest money into our elections, our bill sets a reasonable limit on foreign ownership within corporate PACs and 501(c)(4) nonprofits that spend on our elections. Second, the bill tightens reporting requirements for foreign agents and gives the Justice Department real enforcement authority to go after the bad guys.

Until we repeal Citizens United, which threw open the floodgates for billionaires and special interests to spend unlimited secret money on our elections, we need commonsense legislation like the REFUSE Act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in fortifying our democratic Republic against foreign influence.

HONORING OFFICER MATHEW MAZANY

(Mr. JOYCE of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I want to honor the life and service of a brave constituent of mine, Mentor police officer Mathew Mazany.

Officer Mazany, a 14-year veteran officer, was killed in a tragic hit-and-run on Sunday morning while helping with a traffic stop.

He achieved his dream by following in the footsteps of his father, who also served as a police officer for 34 years in Maple Heights, not too far from Mentor. His coworkers and those who knew him best described him as a happy-go-lucky kind of guy who enjoyed protecting the Mentor community.

Officer Mazany leaves behind a son, brother, father, and countless others who had the pleasure of knowing him. His legacy and dedication to public service will not be forgotten.

My prayers are with Officer Mathew Mazany's family, his friends, the city of Mentor, and the Mentor Police Department during this difficult time.

SUPPORTING OUR MILITARY

(Mrs. ROBY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for H.R. 6157, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act.

Over the last year and a half, our unified government has taken the necessary steps to unleash the economy and foster growth here in the United States. Because of this work, our economy is strong today.

Now we must do the work required to ensure that our military is strong, too, especially after the damaging sequestration cuts and funding limitations placed on our military by the previous administration. As a member of the Defense Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I have been proud to have a seat at the table through this process. I appreciate the leadership of Chairwoman KAY GRANGER as we work to properly fund our military.

I am grateful to serve Alabama's Second District that is home to Maxwell-Gunter Air Force Base and Fort Rucker. I am proud that this bill provides the resources to support their critical missions.

Mr. Speaker, one of Congress' most fundamental constitutional responsibilities is to provide for the common defense. This bill fulfills that responsibility and ensures that our military remains the tip of the spear. I will proudly vote for H.R. 6157 to properly fund our military.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6157, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JUNE 29, 2018, THROUGH JULY 9, 2018

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 964 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 964

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6157) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and available pro forma amendments described in section 3 of House Resolution 961. Each further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as 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 except amendments described in section 3 of House Resolution 961, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from June 29, 2018, through July 9, 2018 —

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 4. It shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider concurrent resolutions providing for adjournment during the month of July, 2018.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Wyoming is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my colleague from California (Mrs. TORRES) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 964, which provides for the consideration of additional amendments to H.R. 6157, the Department of Defense Appropriations

Act for fiscal year 2019. This rule makes in order an additional 29 amendments: 8 Republican, 16 Democratic, and 5 bipartisan amendments.

Mr. Speaker, as we discussed on this floor yesterday and many times previously, providing funding that our men and women in uniform need to defend this great Republic is by far the most important responsibility we have as Members of the United States Congress. Today's rule gives us the opportunity to get the input and hear the voices of additional Members as we listen to and consider their amendments to H.R. 6157.

In the National Defense Strategy that was released late last year, Secretary Mattis described the situation facing our Armed Forces this way: "Today, we are emerging from a period of strategic atrophy, aware that our competitive military advantage has been eroding. We are facing increased global disorder, characterized by decline in the longstanding rules-based international order—creating a security environment more complex and volatile than any we have experienced in recent memory."

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I would say more than any that we have lived through and any that we have existed in since World War II.

Without the kind of sustained and predictable investment that appropriations bills and the appropriation process needs, we will simply not be able to restore readiness to modernize our military or to maintain our strategic advantage. We will rapidly lose our ability to project our forces as well as our military advantage.

We cannot allow that to happen. The rule and the underlying bill that we are debating today are both crucial steps to continue the progress that we have already made and crucial steps toward ensuring that the commitment that we made in order to provide 2 years of funding for our men and women in uniform is kept.

This bill helps provide the very resources and modernization that the National Defense Strategy said were so crucially needed. We have to make sure that our Department of Defense can provide combat-credible military forces needed to deter war and protect the security of our Nation.

Today's rule, Mr. Speaker, gives us the opportunity to debate this important piece of legislation and get the input from Members of this body who would like to make it even better.

One of the amendments, Mr. Speaker, made in order by this rule was offered by my colleague from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) and cosponsored by a bipartisan group of Members. It would allow the Department of Defense to dual buy CVN-80 and CVN-81. These are our next two aircraft carriers. The Navy has stated that this dual buy authority could likely save taxpayers \$2.5 billion on these two aircraft carriers.

This amendment serves two purposes. It helps ensure that we are using tax-

payer resources wisely, and it helps move us toward the Navy's necessary and stated goal of a 355-ship Navy.

There are several other good amendments, Mr. Speaker, made in order by this rule, some that I probably won't support. But the rule takes serious ideas about how we can strengthen the Nation's Armed Forces, how we can make the defense of this Nation our priority, and brings them to the floor of this House for our consideration.

I look forward to considering each amendment and completing the Defense Appropriations process in this House. The work we are doing here is vital, but it is only part of the job, Mr. Speaker. We have to pass the appropriations bill through this body, and then we have to make sure that our colleagues on the other side of this building, our colleagues in the Senate, do the same. We can't hold funding for our military hostage to other priorities, even for additional domestic spending. We simply must provide reliable funding at necessary levels for the men and women in uniform who are putting their lives on the line for all of us.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the rule that will allow consideration of additional amendments to H.R. 6157.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order 29 amendments to H.R. 6157, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2019. The underlying legislation is the product of bipartisan negotiations, which have been going on for months. Bipartisan negotiations are a really good thing, and I am glad that, on this one issue, we are finding ways to work together.

In particular, I want to recognize the work that Representative AGUILAR, Representative HURD, and many of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle have been doing to create a path forward and look for a solution to President Trump's self-created Dreamer crisis. That is what we are supposed to be doing here: working together to solve problems.

Unfortunately, this Republican leadership doesn't believe in working with the other side. They are only interested in negotiating with their own. So it is not surprising that it isn't going very well. That is why they pulled their own immigration bill last week.

Maybe the Republican leadership, which has blocked the bipartisan Dream Act time and time again, and which has blocked the bipartisan USA Act time and time again, should trust their Members to craft and vote on compromise legislation.

□ 1230

But they don't have the courage or the vision to do that, do they?

Now we have another crisis, which, again, the President has created, a crisis that has outraged our constituents. Thousands of children, even infants and toddlers, are ripped from their parents at our southern border, children who have done absolutely nothing wrong, children who did not choose to come here on their own, kids too young to know the name of the country that they came from, too young to know what asylum is, too young to know what illegal entry means. Some of these kids only know two words: "mom" and "dad."

We have heard the recordings of these children crying out for their parents while being made fun of. Many of us have visited the detention centers, and it is heartbreaking and it is unnecessary.

So, while I congratulate the Appropriations Committee for their hard work on the defense bill, I have to remind the Speaker that we have 95 days to finish our work for funding the Federal Government. But I would challenge my colleagues to imagine one day, a single day, without their child, unsure if they would ever see them again.

We have some time to do the defense bill, but on the issue of family separation, we cannot afford to wait another day. Congress should be addressing this crisis today. It is not going to be easy. This administration clearly did not think through this policy that they have created.

Right now, we have children in HHS care, but where are their parents? Some are in custody of the U.S. Marshals or ICE, already deported, or maybe some are free on bond.

HHS said yesterday that they were not reuniting kids with their parents who are in detention. What does that mean? Are they going to be free? If not, what is the plan?

Let's look at the best-case scenario: a parent who gets out on bond and goes to HHS and asks for their child is told, "Show us your documents. Prove you are really the parent," and this parent who has been in custody has nothing.

Where is the plan to help these parents obtain their documents? Where are these plans to help these children reunite with their parents?

Does the administration even know where all the parents are and how they are supposed to be reunited with their kids?

How are they keeping track of the babies, the babies who are simply too young to even know their name?

We have many unanswered questions. We should be making sure those kids get to their parents, making sure that every single one of those children is accounted for. That is doing our job.

Instead, we are passing another appropriations bill with the full knowledge that we will probably do what we have done every year that I have been here: We will pass a CR at the end of

the fiscal year, and then we will probably pass another CR, and then another, and then another, and then another, because we can't legislate together.

This rule makes in order 29 amendments, but not a single one of them deals with the issues of the kids. Why not allow a vote on the amendment I offered with Representative SCHIFF to prohibit detaining children at military facilities?

Why not allow a vote on my amendment to block certain Cabinet members from using military aircraft until the children are reunited? Is it more important for Scott Pruitt to get on a plane than for a baby from El Salvador to get back into his mother's arms? or the amendment offered by my colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. POLIS? Representative POLIS' amendment would have prohibited the Department of Defense from transferring resources to the Department of Justice to carry out prosecution of migrant families.

Don't our troops need these resources? Shouldn't our military be focused on keeping us safe from ISIS and North Korea, not toddlers and babies?

And why is the Republican leadership afraid to allow us to have a vote? I guess babies are too controversial for the Republican caucus. I guess keeping families together is a poison pill amendment.

By refusing Congress a vote, this House is giving up its responsibility to make immigration laws, plain and simple. This House should be a check on the administration. That is the way the system is supposed to work. But we are not doing that. Instead, by refusing to let us have a vote on the floor, the Republican House majority is endorsing President Trump's family jails.

Mr. Speaker, this House majority owns this crisis. Let me be clear: A vote for this rule is a vote for more of President Trump's cruelty to these babies. It is a vote to keep innocent children from their parents.

This House has the power to reunite these families. This House has the power to end separation. This House has the power to stop hateful immigration policies.

But this House won't act. Because of that, thousands of families may be destroyed forever. We must defeat this rule and give this House an opportunity to act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that this House actually is going to be taking up a bill that addresses these issues. Mr. GOODLATTE's bill will come up within the next hour or so here on this floor. The bill itself would require that the Department of Homeland Security maintain the care and custody of aliens together, with their children, as well as providing funding for DHS family residential centers.

So I think that it is fair to say that there is bipartisan concern for the plight of these children, the plight of these families. I think all of us who are mothers understand the emotions involved here and understand that we don't want to perpetuate a situation that, in fact, also was occurring when President Obama was in office.

But I think it is also important to note that we have got to secure our border and we have got to be in a position where we are recognizing that people who come here illegally cannot be allowed to stay. People who come here illegally must, in fact, be deported, must, in fact, be apprehended.

We need to end, as we have, the practice of catch and release that we saw during the Obama administration. It is a security issue for us.

The pain and the emotion that we all feel for the families that have been separated I think we all also feel for the angel families, the families that President Trump has met with, the families that have been the victims of violence perpetuated by people who have come to this country illegally.

So I would say, Mr. Speaker, that it is absolutely the wrong thing to do, as my colleague urges the notion that we should defeat this rule so that we can address immigration. It just simply is wrong on a procedural matter. We ought to, in fact, support this rule, pass this rule, not once again hold hostage the men and women in uniform to another issue.

The position of the minority here is apparently that we should stop our bipartisan process and our bipartisan movement on funding the troops so that we can take up an issue that we are already planing to take up. It is not necessary and it is unjustified. I actually would urge exactly the opposite of my colleague from the Rules Committee. We ought to, in fact, pass this rule.

Mr. Speaker, as we think about this issue, we have got to remember that there are families involved not just with respect to the issue of immigration; there are families involved with respect to the men and women who are defending all of us.

I don't think that it is acceptable, I don't think it is justifiable, for us ever to be in a position where we are telling the mother or the father or the spouse of a servicemember that we couldn't get them the funding they needed because our process is broken, that we couldn't get them the funding that they need because we are bickering with each other. I think that is, in fact, absolutely an abrogation of our constitutional responsibilities and duties.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), who is vice chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule to complete consideration of the FY 2019 Defense Appropriations bill.

I thank the Rules Committee and all the Members who submitted amend-

ments to the Defense Appropriations bill. I commend the chairman, Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, Ranking Member LOWEY, Subcommittee Chairwoman GRANGER, and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for their leadership on the FY 2019 Defense Appropriations bill. I would also like to thank our dedicated professional staff who have tirelessly worked on this bill.

I have served on the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee for many years, and providing for our men and women in uniform is a privilege and an honor. This bill provides vital funding for our armed services, including a 2.6 percent pay raise. This bill is an investment in our future superiority on land, air, and at sea.

Earlier this year, Secretary Mattis released the National Defense Strategy. As we know, our Secretary of Defense is focused on readiness and lethality. This bill meets the demands of the Department to restore readiness levels, invest in lethality, buy the equipment that will maintain superiority, and provide for the health and welfare of our men and women in uniform.

We are at a unique time in history that demands U.S. leadership throughout the world. As we know too well, a power vacuum breeds instability and extremism. A strong U.S. military with our allies creates stability.

After too many years of a budget-driven strategy, this bill reflects the investment needed to maintain and secure U.S. interests around the world. The investment we make here today, about 16 percent of our entire Federal budget, has dividends down the road for many years. The security of our Nation, and the peace of the world, depends on a strong U.S. military.

The last time the House passed a stand-alone Defense Appropriations conference report that was signed into law before the end of the fiscal year was September 2009. Let's turn the page on CRs that cripple the Department and return to regular order.

I again thank my colleagues who crafted this bill, our military leadership, and the men and women of the United States military. I urge passage of the rule and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I absolutely agree that a primary duty of this Congress is to fund the military, absolutely. There are military families serving in our Nation and abroad that deserve to get paid.

So I would like to take this moment of privilege to remind this Congress that, before I got here, my son, who joined the United States Air Force, was going to have his pay withheld. I remember him telling me, Mr. Speaker:

Mom, I signed up to serve our great Nation in the United States Air Force, and I signed up to defend and protect my country. I did not sign up to defend and protect the men of my country, but I signed up to protect all of the people in my country. And I resent Congress withholding my pay or tying my pay to the reproductive rights of women.

So let's keep all of those things in mind when we talk about the priorities of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this Congress once provided a check on excessive executive power. But today, in this House, it is all lapdog and no watchdog. Even terrified toddlers torn from their mother's embrace are not beyond the limit of this Congress.

Until very recently, limitation amendments like those I authored to this bill to protect taxpayers from having funds misused were routinely approved for debate—no more.

□ 1245

Just as Trump undermines our democracy, so too do these House Republicans refusing to permit even the pretense of a fair debate on key national issues.

Having enabled Trump's separation of children from their parents, often with their silence, Republicans have blocked amendments that I and 41 of our colleagues sponsored to prevent our military bases from being converted into internment camps for children and, in some cases, their families.

Our military bases have an important mission. It is to ensure our national security, to ensure the utmost readiness for our troops, who may be called into action in many different parts of the globe at the same time. It is not their job to take care of 20,000 people, as the administration has requested, on two Texas military bases. The function there is a totally different one from that to which we have committed in this defense bill.

These are real people, real children. They are toddlers who have been torn from their parents in places like McAllen, which I once represented; real children who cry themselves to sleep every night, held without their freedom and without their loved ones, while some of my former constituents are shopping right down the street.

My constituents at home now in San Antonio, San Marcos, Lockhart, and Austin care about this. Over 1,000 people have reached out to my office, their hearts breaking for these children.

Trump is truly testing the waters of dehumanization, seeing how many people blink an eye when he calls for suspending due process, guaranteed by our Constitution, for people who don't look like him.

I do believe in a no-tolerance policy. The no-tolerance policy that I support is no tolerance for bigotry, no tolerance for the demonization of foreigners which regularly spews forth from this White House, no tolerance for using cages to hold children as hostages.

No matter how grievous the wrong, how insulting the tweet, my colleagues sit here, idle and silent, silently blocking debate on congressional checks on this authoritarian-loving President who seeks to amass more and more power.

Perhaps what we need in this House is a strong, professional ENT—an ear, nose and throat physician—because Republicans have lost their voice when it comes to standing up to Trump on much of anything. You could say that Trump's got their tongue.

Whatever the reason, they are not there standing up for the children, won't even permit a debate on the issue of whether our military bases should be converted to this perverted purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I will never yield to a President who knows no limits, and we will not yield in raising the issue of these children, their separation, and the detainment of their families indefinitely. We must speak out and use every opportunity afforded in this House to defend their presence and to defend a better policy and the use of our tax dollars for what they were intended, not to detain, indefinitely, these babies.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would thank my colleague very much for her son's service in our Armed Forces, and I would also just note that we agree. We don't think that our military servicemembers' salaries should be held hostage for any issue, no matter the issue. That is why we in this body believe we should pass a stand-alone Defense Appropriations bill. That is why we believe that we ought to pass the rule that we are debating today, so that we can get to the debate and the discussion about the stand-alone Defense Appropriations bill. That is why we believe the Senate should take it up and pass it that way as well.

We shouldn't add any legislation to it. The funding that our men and women in uniform need should not be made a situation where it is held hostage to other political issues. It is simply not justifiable, no matter the issue.

I would note once again, Mr. Speaker, and this is crucially important, that one of the fundamental values that our men and women in uniform are fighting for and defending is the rule of law, and for too long in the previous administration we had policies like catch and release that were sanctioned from the top. We had policies like sanctuary cities that were sanctioned from the top. We had situations, Mr. Speaker, where the laws of the Republic that were passed by this body, passed by the Senate, signed into law by the President, were simply not enforced. That is not a situation that we can allow to continue.

I think it is important that we address the issue of the separation of families at the border. No one wants to see that happen or that continue. I think we need to focus on it. We need to make sure that we come up with solutions for it, like the kinds of solutions that are going to be presented on this floor shortly.

I think, as we do that, we have also got to remember the larger issues involved, including the security of the

Nation. That is not just about the resources that this bill provides; it is also about making sure that our borders are secure.

One of the things that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have refused to deal with and to address time and again is funding for a border wall. President Trump has made clear that part of securing this Nation is providing funding for a border wall. That is something that we have got to make sure we appropriate. That is also something that the bill that we will consider this afternoon does.

I am hopeful that we will see support from the other side of the aisle for a bill that deals with the issue of separating children from families at the border.

I also would point out, Mr. Speaker, that this House has been very dedicated and focused and very active in dealing with the issue of human trafficking. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle know very well that many of the situations we are seeing at our border that involve children are not family situations. They are situations where those children are brought here by human traffickers. Those children are brought here to be exploited. That is something we have got to make sure we protect against.

When we as a nation allow sanctuary cities to continue to exist, when we look the other way and say we won't enforce our immigration laws, we are, in fact, perpetuating a system where those children are put at risk, and we are not doing our duty, our fundamental obligation, to protect and defend those children.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, that the concern for the children of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle were as broad as it needs to be, to encompass, frankly, all of the threats that these kids are facing.

I think it is important that we pass this rule, we pass this underlying bill, and we move on to address and focus on the issue of immigration in a way in which Members on both sides of the aisle can agree.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to add that I absolutely agree with my colleague from the other side of the aisle on one thing, and that is that we should be absolutely focused and work together on the issues on which we agree, such as the USA Act.

Mr. Speaker, why aren't we allowed to have a vote on the floor when that is bipartisan legislation created by a bipartisan group of Members?

If we want to talk about the rule of law, Mr. Speaker, we can't talk from both ends. Either we support the rule of law or we don't. Yet this Republican Congress, time and time and time again, has been complicit with President Trump and his family's conflicts of interest when it comes to dealing

with China, when it comes to dealing with our trade agreements, when it comes to dealing with Russia and now possibly North Korea.

Mr. Speaker, the Trump administration has ripped thousands of children from their parents' arms at the border, sending them all over the country. Separating children from their parent poses ongoing psychological harm and trauma, yet the government has no clear plans to reunite those families. For that reason, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative BASS' bill, H.R. 6236, the Family Unity Rights and Protection Act, which would require the Federal Government to reunite families which have been forcibly separated at the border.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS) to discuss this proposal.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, mothers and fathers who sought a safe haven for their children watched helplessly as their children were being snatched away from them by our government.

These families were fleeing unimaginable violence. They had no idea where their infants were being taken. They had no idea the treatment they would receive. These parents, in many instances, still have no idea where their children are located or how to communicate with them.

The Trump administration established no formal process to return these children. I am terrified at the thought that these parents may never see their children again. If the parents are deported and their children are sent all over this country, how will the parents find their children?

Just imagine the mother from El Salvador who is deported back to El Salvador, who came here dirt-poor to begin with. She gets deported back to El Salvador. Her child is sent off to New York. How is she ever supposed to find that child again?

It appears that the only real plan was to separate families as a deterrent to legal immigration. Coming to America should not mean permanently losing your child, especially if you came to America and it was not illegal. If you came in search of asylum, that is not illegal immigration.

The zero-tolerance policy will have a lasting effect. Pediatricians and health experts agree that child-parent separation will result in neurological damage. I will tell you that I have received numerous phone calls from experts, pediatricians, social workers, and child welfare workers.

The other night, I even received a very long email from a distraught

internationally known psychologist, Dr. Phil McGraw. He shared with me his concerns about the impact child-parent separation will have on children. He highlighted that, when children are torn away from their parents and raised in institutions without a stable caregiver, it disrupts the formation of attachments, that children become anxious and fearful, and that this can last for years, if not a lifetime. Dr. Phil also expressed how this impacts a child's brain development, which can lead to negative health and well-being outcomes.

We did this, and now we must undo this. If our government did this policy of separating children from parents, then it should be our government's responsibility to reunite those parents with those children, whether they remain here in the United States or, especially, if they are deported.

This proceeded without a plan, without foresight, and without a second glance at the law or what we stand for as a nation. This is chaos. That is why I am calling for a vote on my bill, H.R. 6236, Family Unity Rights and Protection Act, to require the Federal Government to reunite the parents with the children, to establish a database of children separated from families, and to make sure that parental rights aren't terminated.

We are told that parents can communicate with their children, but let me ask you how a parent in Los Angeles would communicate with a child who is 6 months old in another State.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from California an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, my bill also requires a report outlining the short- and long-term effects on these families and proposed solutions.

As it is, our foster care system is already overrun with over 400,000 children. We know that these kids are in detention right now, but ultimately they will wind up in foster care. Because of the opioid crisis, we don't have enough foster homes for kids who actually need to be in care.

The long-term neurological effects that I describe even apply to children who should be removed from home because their parents have either abused or neglected them. So even when the children should be separated, that separation causes tremendous harm.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has again expired.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from California an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, if that is what happens to children who should be removed from home, we must call for an end to State-sponsored child abuse, because that is what this policy is. This is our Federal Government that is abusing children.

That is why I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on ordering the previous question.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me remind this body of a brief history of our Nation.

During World War II, this country chose to round up Japanese American citizens and put them in internment camps across the country.

□ 1300

Some were held in my hometown at the Los Angeles County Fairgrounds, in Pomona, California.

In 1944, the Supreme Court ruled in *Korematsu v. United States* that the government had every right to incarcerate families in the best interest of our national security. It was wrong and immoral then, and it is wrong and immoral now, and we look back at Japanese internment as a dark moment in our history.

Just yesterday, the Supreme Court finally rejected the ruling and admitted that it was clearly unconstitutional to forcibly place Japanese Americans in concentration camps—74 years later. That is how long it took for our court system to catch up with the reality and to right a horrible wrong.

We are facing a similar dark period in our country now with what is happening at our southern borders. How long will it take this time for us to realize that what this administration is doing at our southern borders is morally repugnant, wrong, and illegal?

How long before we realize that what we are doing is causing emotional harm to families, especially to the children? How long before we consider how history will remember this moment and judge us?

What national security threat are we facing today that warrants such a barbaric response towards families and children? They are exactly that: children, families, babies.

They are coming to our borders pleading for help and protection. They are fleeing kidnapping, rape, murder, and threats. They are not MS-13; they are fleeing MS-13. They want to work and raise their children in peace. Is that so terrible?

This administration is deliberately choosing to inflict trauma onto thousands of children, holding children hostage, using child abuse as a scare tactic to deter families from coming here seeking refuge.

There are still more than 2,000 children separated from their families at this present moment. President Trump may have signed his executive order last week, but he failed to implement a plan to reunite these families—no plan to reunite these families.

We are doing nothing to fix this problem today. And let's be clear: Speaker RYAN's bill, which we may or may not consider this week, does nothing to fix this problem either. All his bill does is pave the way for long-term incarceration of families in prison-like facilities. It would be replacing one form of child abuse for another.

I visited some of these detention centers at our borders. The horrendous conditions we are exposing families to are completely unacceptable.

Where are we, as a nation, when we place children in cage-like cells, inside warehouses, with nothing but an emergency thermal blanket and a thin mat between them and the cold concrete floor, with a toilet in the middle of the cell? Criminally prosecuting every individual, every child, who crosses between a port of entry, who poses no threat to our country, is not only inhumane, it makes us less secure.

We have a limited number of prosecutors. We have to make choices. If you prosecute one crime, it means you are not prosecuting another. So when we send our prosecutors after every single border crosser, who benefits? Let me tell you who benefits. The murderers, the rapists, the drug traffickers, the drug dealers, the pimps, the muggers, and the human traffickers, that is who will benefit from this. We are taking away from where law enforcement agencies need the most and are wasting by traumatizing defenseless families. How does this make us safe?

This administration's impulsive zero-tolerance policy is harming our moral credibility. It is harming our national security. Most of all, it is harming innocent babies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question and the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague and I agree that the court determination, essentially rejecting the Korematsu decision yesterday, was the right one. And we agree that the episode in our Nation's history, in which we were holding Japanese Americans in internment camps, was a dark one and was something that should not have happened. But I think that it is unjustifiable, and I think, frankly, it just politicizes the challenge that we are all facing to compare the current situation at our borders with Japanese internment camps, or with concentration camps, or many of the other exaggerations and, I think, highly irresponsible language that we have heard throughout this debate.

We all have to come together to solve the problem, but we have to come together to enforce our laws. If, in fact, my colleagues are interested in enforcing the laws, if they are interested in solving the problem for the families at the border, and if they are interested in closing the loopholes in the law that have resulted in the separation of those children, then I assume that they will be voting in favor of Mr. GOODLATTE's bill that will be coming up for consideration today.

I would also say, Mr. Speaker, it is not accurate for our colleagues to say that families seeking asylum are having their children ripped out of their arms. Anybody who is seeking asylum,

who goes to a port of entry, is not going to be subject to prosecution and will not be separated from their families.

I think it is very important for us to make clear that we are talking about people seeking to come into this country illegally, and, in many cases, as I mentioned before, we are talking about children who are being trafficked. We have to make sure, as we deal with this issue and as we come to a resolution and a solution that will help these kids, that, in fact, we do it in a way that addresses the facts.

Mr. Speaker, it is really important that we focus back on the issue that we are here to talk about today, and that is Defense Appropriations.

What we have seen this afternoon is the same thing that we seem to see every time this bill comes up. This is a really important, really good bipartisan bill, and our colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to talk about everything under the Sun, apparently, except Defense Appropriations.

If we don't get Defense Appropriations right, if we don't get it passed through this House and passed through the Senate and signed before September 30, we are looking at the possibility of another continuing resolution for the Defense Department.

Now, we have seen this happen before. We saw it happen last year. We watched the Democrats in the Senate, for example, shut down the government because they wanted to hold our troops hostage, because they were in a position where they wanted to do everything possible except just pass Defense Appropriations.

Tragically, Mr. Speaker, this isn't just a matter of words like "readiness," "modernization," and "capability." Those words all matter. But there are real men and women behind those words, and families behind them.

So when we are in a situation where we abrogate our duty, and we don't provide the funds that our men and women in uniform need, we end up putting the lives of our servicemen and -women on the line. I don't think that any Member of this body ever wants to be in a situation again where the Secretary of Defense, or the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, or the service chiefs come in and say that we, as a body, have done more damage to the military than any enemy has in the field. That is what we have heard consistently and repeatedly over the course of the last several years.

Taking the step of passing this rule and making sure that we pass this underlying appropriations bill is a crucial part of continuing on the path of fulfilling the commitment that we made and fulfilling the commitment that the President of the United States made that he would rebuild our military.

Every man and woman in uniform, who puts the uniform on, as Secretary Mattis has said, is essentially writing a blank check to this Nation, and it is a blank check that is payable with their

lives. We ought to stop spending our time on this floor debating a whole bunch of other things. The Senate ought to stop spending its time stuck in the filibuster rule, stuck in the process of going on and on for hours and hours over matters that, frankly, don't have anywhere near the importance that funding our troops does, and they ought to move to get this bill passed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of both the rule and H.R. 6157.

The material previously referred to by Mrs. TORRES is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 964 OFFERED BY
MRS. TORRES

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 5. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6236) to require the reunification of families separated upon entry into the United States as a result of the "zero-tolerance" immigration policy requiring criminal prosecution of all adults apprehended crossing the border illegally. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 6236.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the

opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

BORDER SECURITY AND IMMIGRATION REFORM ACT OF 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, consideration of the bill (H.R. 6136) to amend the immigration laws and provide for border security, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ESPAILLAT. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Espailat moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6136 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

In section 1, in the heading, strike "; TABLE OF CONTENTS".

In subsection (a) of section 1, strike the enumerator and the heading.

Strike subsection (b) of section 1 and all that follows through the end of the bill, and insert the following:

SEC. 2. PROTECTING IMMIGRANT CHILDREN FROM GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED ABUSE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, judicial determination, consent decree, or settlement agreement, no officer or employee of the United States may detain an alien who entered the United States with the alien's child who has not attained 18 years of age separately from such child for the purpose of deterring immigration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6136, the Border Security and Immigration Reform Act, has been touted as "the compromise bill." But don't let that fool you. This bill cuts legal immigration by 40 percent. This bill cancels diversity green cards. This bill eliminates most family reunification. And finally, this bill hurts asylum seekers.

This bill is anything but a compromise. It is anything but fair. And it is certainly not pro-family.

We have spent the last few days and weeks watching babies ripped away from their parents' arms. We heard their cries in the middle of the night as they missed their parents, and the American people were truly moved by this humanitarian crisis.

This crisis drew attention from international institutions and organizations, such as the United Nations, Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, all of them condemning the separation of children from their families.

This Nation has a longstanding tradition of providing asylum to those who flee death, terror, and natural disasters. We need to continue to be a beacon of hope and aspiration for the rest of the world. Asylum seekers, including women who have been raped, deserve due process, not these massive arraignment hearings, which blatantly go against our democratic traditions.

Let's be honest here, last week's executive order and this morning's tweet where the President admits that this bill is about "strong borders," tells us that this is not about our families or injustice. This is about him getting \$25

billion for a wall and another \$7 billion to hold families in detention facilities. Yes, families in jail or tent cities or maybe even in military camps, similar to the Japanese internment camps used during World War II.

Children really belong in schools. They deserve to be safe with their parents, not to be jailed in cages that look like kennels. Babies as young as 9 months old are being held in my district, in East Harlem, away from their moms.

If Republicans are serious about families, we should pass this motion to recommit and the Keep the Families Together Act. This act is simple. It would protect immigrant children from government-sponsored abuse, and it would keep us in compliance with the Flores decree—yes, a court decree. This decree disallows children to be held for more than 20 days.

It also is in line with yesterday's preliminary injunction, which requires that children younger than 5 years old be returned to their parents within 14 days and older children be returned within 30 days.

□ 1315

Mr. Speaker, show some basic compassion for these young children, their brothers and sisters, and their parents. Every single Member of Congress should be able to stand behind the simple idea that families, regardless of where they come from, belong together. The separation of children from their families constitutes child abuse.

Mr. Speaker, we need to finally ask ourselves: will we continue to be a country of aspirations or will we continue to be a country of deportation? Will we step up to be the country that allowed me, as a young boy, to find safety next to my mother and father?

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I claim time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this effort to distract us from the major problems that we are attempting to address in our country. This motion to recommit deals only with a red herring. It fixes nothing, but rather ensures that catch and release will remain in effect.

The American people want a holistic approach to reforming immigration laws that focuses on enforcement first before legalization. The motion to recommit simply does not do that.

H.R. 6136 helps solve the problem with a surge of people coming illegally into the United States by funding the border wall construction and other infrastructure at the border, and it closes the loopholes that require catch and release of aliens who have entered illegally. The bill begins the process of reforming the way U.S. green cards are

allocated. And it provides a path to legalization for the DACA-eligible population.

H.R. 6136 addresses the areas that need to be addressed in immigration: enforcement, including a true fix to the issue of separation of children from their parents; it includes border security, legal immigration, and legalization for DACA-eligible individuals.

The motion to recommit does none of that. I urge my colleagues to oppose that motion.

I also want to call to everyone's attention the Statement of Administration Policy issued by the Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget just this morning. It says in part: "The administration strongly supports House passage of H.R. 6136, the Border Security and Immigration Reform Act of 2018. . . ."

"H.R. 6136 would end the visa lottery program and would begin moving toward a merit-based system for admission. H.R. 6136 would also reduce extended-family chain migration by removing family preference categories for siblings and adult married children. . . ."

"Overall, the Border Security and Immigration Reform Act of 2018 would support the administration's goals of securing the border, closing legal loopholes, moving to a system of merit-based immigration, and providing a responsible solution to DACA.

"If H.R. 6136 were presented to the President, his advisers would recommend that he sign it into law."

But, you don't have to listen to his advisers. You can listen to the President himself, because he tweeted this morning: "House Republicans should pass the strong but fair immigration bill, known as Goodlatte II, in their afternoon vote today, even though the Dems won't let it pass in the Senate. Passage will show that we want strong borders and security while the Dems want open borders equals crime. Win."

That is what we need to do today. We need to win by defeating this motion to recommit and passing this important legislation that brings America forward in addressing our immigration issues, is an appropriate fix for the DACA population, secures our borders, and moves towards a merit-based immigration system that this country needs. That is what we are about today.

Mr. Speaker, reject the motion to recommit, pass this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Passage of H.R. 6136, if ordered; Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 964; and

Adoption of House Resolution 964, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 230, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 296]

AYES—190

Adams	Galleo	Napolitano
Aguilar	Garamendi	Neal
Barragán	Gomez	Nolan
Bass	Gonzalez (TX)	Norcross
Beatty	Gottheimer	O'Halleran
Bera	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Beyer	Green, Gene	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Panetta
Blum	Gutiérrez	Pascarell
Blumenauer	Hanabusa	Payne
Blunt Rochester	Hastings	Pelosi
Bonamici	Heck	Perlmutter
Boyle, Brendan	Higgins (NY)	Peters
F.	Himes	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Hoyer	Pingree
Brown (MD)	Huffman	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Jackson Lee	Polis
Bustos	Jayapal	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Jeffries	Quigley
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Raskin
Carbajal	Johnson, E. B.	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Kaptur	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Keating	Rosen
Cartwright	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Kennedy	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Khanna	Ruppersberger
Chu, Judy	Kihuen	Ryan (OH)
Ciциlline	Kildee	Sánchez
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Schakowsky
Clay	Krishnamoorthi	Schiff
Cleaver	Kuster (NH)	Schneider
Clyburn	Lamb	Schrader
Cohen	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Correa	Lawrence	Swell (AL)
Costa	Lawson (FL)	Shea-Porter
Courtney	Lee	Sherman
Crist	Levin	Sinema
Cuellar	Lewis (GA)	Sires
Cummings	Lieu, Ted	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Soto
Davis, Danny	Loeb sack	Speier
DeFazio	Lofgren	Suo zzi
Delaney	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham,	Takano
DelBene	M.	Thompson (CA)
Demings	Luján, Ben Ray	Titus
DeSaulnier	Lynch	Tonko
Deutch	Maloney,	Torres
Dingell	Carolyn B.	Tsongas
Doggett	Maloney, Sean	Vargas
Doyle, Michael	Matsui	Veasey
F.	McCollum	Vela
Ellison	McEachin	Velázquez
Engel	McGovern	Visclosky
Eshoo	McNerney	Walz
Españllat	Meeke s	Wasserman
Esty (CT)	Meng	Schultz
Evans	Moore	Waters, Maxine
Foster	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Frankel (FL)	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Fudge	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Gabbard		Yarmuth

NOES—230

Abraham	Barton	Brooks (IN)
Aderholt	Bergman	Buchanan
Allen	Biggs	Buck
Amash	Bilirakis	Bucshon
Amodei	Bishop (MI)	Budd
Arrington	Bishop (UT)	Burgess
Babin	Blackburn	Byrne
Bacon	Bost	Calvert
Banks (IN)	Brady (TX)	Carter (GA)
Barletta	Brat	Chabot
Barr	Brooks (AL)	Cheney

Coffman	Issa	Renacci
Cole	Jenkins (KS)	Rice (SC)
Collins (GA)	Jenkins (WV)	Roby
Collins (NY)	Johnson (LA)	Roe (TN)
Comer	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (AL)
Comstock	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)
Conaway	Jones	Rohrabacher
Cook	Jordan	Rokita
Costello (PA)	Joyce (OH)	Rooney, Francis
Cramer	Katko	Rooney, Thomas
Crawford	Kelly (MS)	J.
Culberson	Kelly (PA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Curbelo (FL)	King (IA)	Roskam
Curtis	King (NY)	Ross
Davidson	Kinzinger	Rothfus
Davis, Rodney	Knight	Rouzer
Denham	Kustoff (TN)	Royce (CA)
DeSantis	Labrador	Russell
DesJarlais	LaHood	Rutherford
Diaz-Balart	LaMalfa	Sanford
Donovan	Lamborn	Scalise
Duffy	Lance	Schweikert
Duncan (SC)	Latta	Scott, Austin
Duncan (TN)	Lesko	Sensenbrenner
Dunn	Lewis (MN)	Sessions
Emmer	LoBiondo	Shimkus
Estes (KS)	Long	Shuster
Faso	Loudermilk	Simpson
Ferguson	Love	Smith (MO)
Fitzpatrick	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)
Flores	MacArthur	Smith (TX)
Fortenberry	Marchant	Smucker
Fox	Marino	Stefanik
Frelinghuysen	Marshall	Stewart
Gaetz	Massie	Stivers
Gallagher	Mast	Taylor
Garrett	McCarthy	Tenney
Gianforte	McCauley	Thompson (PA)
Gibbs	McClintock	Thornberry
Gohmert	McHenry	Tipton
Goodlatte	McKinley	Trott
Gosar	McMorris	Turner
Gowdy	Rodgers	Upton
Granger	McSally	Valadao
Graves (GA)	Meadows	Wagner
Graves (LA)	Mitchell	Walberg
Graves (MO)	Moolenaar	Walden
Griffith	Mooney (WV)	Walker
Grothman	Mullin	Walorski
Guthrie	Newhouse	Walters, Mimi
Handel	Noem	Weber (TX)
Harper	Norman	Webster (FL)
Harris	Nunes	Westerman
Hartzler	Olson	Williams
Hensarling	Palazzo	Wilson (SC)
Herrera Beutler	Palmer	Wittman
Hice, Jody B.	Paulsen	Womack
Higgins (LA)	Pearce	Woodall
Hill	Perry	Yoder
Holding	Pittenger	Yoho
Hollingsworth	Poe (TX)	Young (AK)
Hudson	Poliquin	Young (IA)
Huizenga	Posey	Zeldin
Hultgren	Ratcliffe	
Hunter	Reed	
Hurd	Reichert	

NOT VOTING—7

Black	DeGette	Thompson (MS)
Carter (TX)	Messer	
Crowley	Rush	

□ 1343

Messrs. BACON, COMER, YOUNG of Alaska, PITTENGER, BURGESS, and JORDAN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. BASS, Messrs. BISHOP of Georgia, POCAN, BEYER, SUOZZI, COOPER, PAYNE, and KEATING changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 121, noes 301, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 297]

AYES—121

Amodei	Harper	Poliquin
Bacon	Hartzler	Reed
Barr	Hensarling	Reichert
Barton	Herrera Beutler	Renacci
Bergman	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Bilirakis	Hill	Rooney, Francis
Bishop (MI)	Huizenga	Rooney, Thomas
Bishop (UT)	Hultgren	J.
Bost	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Brady (TX)	Jenkins (KS)	Roskam
Brooks (IN)	Johnson (OH)	Ross
Bucshon	Joyce (OH)	Royce (CA)
Calvert	Katko	Rutherford
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Ryan (WI)
Coffman	King (NY)	Scalise
Cole	Kinzinger	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	Knight	Shimkus
Collins (NY)	Lance	Shuster
Comstock	Lewis (MN)	Simpson
Conaway	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Costello (PA)	Love	Stefanik
Cramer	Lucas	Stewart
Curbelo (FL)	Luetkemeyer	Stivers
Curtis	MacArthur	Thompson (PA)
Davis, Rodney	Marino	Thornberry
Denham	Marshall	Trott
Diaz-Balart	Mast	Turner
Donovan	McCarthy	Upton
Duffy	McCaul	Valadao
Dunn	McHenry	Walberg
Faso	McKinley	Walden
Fitzpatrick	McMorris	Walorski
Flores	Rodgers	Walters, Mimi
Fortenberry	McSally	Wenstrup
Frelinghuysen	Mitchell	Wilson (SC)
Gianforte	Moolenaar	Womack
Gibbs	Newhouse	Woodall
Goodlatte	Nunes	Yoder
Griffith	Paulsen	Young (AK)
Guthrie	Pearce	Young (IA)
Handel	Pittenger	

NOES—301

Abraham	Cheney	Esty (CT)
Adams	Chu, Judy	Evans
Aderholt	Cicilline	Ferguson
Aguilar	Clark (MA)	Fleischmann
Allen	Clarke (NY)	Poster
Amash	Clay	Foxx
Arrington	Cleaver	Frankel (FL)
Babin	Clyburn	Fudge
Banks (IN)	Cohen	Gabbard
Barletta	Comer	Gaetz
Barragán	Connolly	Gallagher
Bass	Cook	Gallego
Beatty	Cooper	Garamendi
Bera	Correa	Garrett
Beyer	Costa	Gohmert
Biggs	Courtney	Gomez
Bishop (GA)	Crawford	Gonzalez (TX)
Blackburn	Crist	Gosar
Blum	Cuellar	Gottheimer
Blumenauer	Culberson	Gowdy
Blunt Rochester	Cummings	Granger
Bonamici	Davidson	Graves (GA)
Boyle, Brendan	Davis (CA)	Graves (LA)
F.	Davis, Danny	Graves (MO)
Brady (PA)	DeFazio	Green, Al
Brat	Delaney	Green, Gene
Brooks (AL)	DeLauro	Grijalva
Brown (MD)	DelBene	Grothman
Brownley (CA)	Demings	Gutiérrez
Buchanan	DeSantis	Hanabusa
Buck	DeSaulnier	Harris
Budd	DesJarlais	Hastings
Burgess	Deutch	Heck
Bustos	Dingell	Hice, Jody B.
Butterfield	Doggett	Higgins (NY)
Byrne	Doyle, Michael	Himes
Capuano	F.	Holding
Carbajal	Duncan (SC)	Hollingsworth
Cárdenas	Duncan (TN)	Hoyer
Carson (IN)	Ellison	Hudson
Carter (GA)	Emmer	Huffman
Carter (TX)	Engel	Hunter
Cartwright	Eshoo	Hurd
Castor (FL)	Españillat	Jackson Lee
Castro (TX)	Estes (KS)	Jayapal

Jeffries	McEachin	Sánchez
Jenkins (WV)	McGovern	Sanford
Johnson (GA)	McNerney	Sarbanes
Johnson (LA)	Meadows	Schakowsky
Johnson, E. B.	Meeks	Schiff
Johnson, Sam	Meng	Schneider
Jones	Mooney (WV)	Schrader
Jordan	Moore	Schweikert
Kaptur	Moulton	Scott (VA)
Keating	Mullin	Scott, David
Kelly (IL)	Murphy (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Kelly (MS)	Nadler	Serrano
Kennedy	Napolitano	Sessions
Khanna	Neal	Sewell (AL)
Kihuen	Noem	Shea-Porter
Kildee	Nolan	Sherman
Kilmer	Norcross	Sinema
Kind	Norman	Sires
King (IA)	O'Halleran	Smith (MO)
Krishnamoorthi	O'Rourke	Smith (NE)
Kuster (NH)	Olson	Smith (TX)
Kustoff (TN)	Palazzo	Smith (WA)
Labrador	Pallone	Smucker
LaHood	Palmer	Soto
LaMalfa	Panetta	Speier
Lamb	Pascrell	Suozzi
Lamborn	Payne	Swalwell (CA)
Langevin	Pelosi	Takano
Larsen (WA)	Perlmutter	Taylor
Larson (CT)	Perry	Tenney
Latta	Peters	Thompson (CA)
Lawrence	Peterson	Tipton
Lawson (FL)	Pingree	Titus
Lee	Pocan	Tonko
Lesko	Poe (TX)	Torres
Levin	Polis	Tsongas
Lewis (GA)	Posey	Vargas
Lieu, Ted	Price (NC)	Veasey
Lipinski	Quigley	Vela
Loeb sack	Raskin	Velázquez
Lofgren	Ratcliffe	Visclosky
Long	Rice (NY)	Walker
Loudermilk	Rice (SC)	Walz
Lowenthal	Richmond	Wasserman
Lowe y	Roby	Schultz
Lujan Grisham,	Roe (TN)	Waters, Maxine
M.	Rogers (AL)	Watson Coleman
Lujan, Ben Ray	Rohrabacher	Weber (TX)
Lynch	Rokita	Webster (FL)
Maloney,	Rosen	Welch
Carolyn B.	Rothfus	Westerman
Maloney, Sean	Rouzer	Williams
Marchant	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (FL)
Massie	Ruiz	Wittman
Matsui	Ruppersberger	Yarmuth
McClintock	Russell	Yoho
McCollum	Ryan (OH)	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—6

□ 1350

So the bill was not passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6157, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JUNE 29, 2018, THROUGH JULY 9, 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 964) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6157) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, and providing for proceedings during the period from June 9, 2018, through July 9, 2018, on which a recorded vote was ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

RECORDED VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 231, noes 188, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 298]

AYES—231

Abraham	Gowdy	Palazzo
Aderholt	Granger	Palmer
Allen	Graves (GA)	Paulsen
Amash	Graves (LA)	Pearce
Amodei	Graves (MO)	Perry
Arrington	Griffith	Pittenger
Babin	Grothman	Poe (TX)
Bacon	Guthrie	Poliquin
Banks (IN)	Handel	Posey
Barletta	Harper	Ratcliffe
Barr	Harris	Reed
Barton	Hartzler	Reichert
Bergman	Hensarling	Renacci
Biggs	Herrera Beutler	Rice (SC)
Bilirakis	Hice, Jody B.	Roby
Bishop (MI)	Higgins (LA)	Roe (TN)
Bishop (UT)	Hill	Rogers (AL)
Blackburn	Holding	Rogers (KY)
Blum	Hollingsworth	Rohrabacher
Bost	Hudson	Rokita
Brady (TX)	Huizenga	Rooney, Francis
Brat	Hultgren	Rooney, Thomas
Brooks (AL)	Hunter	J.
Brooks (IN)	Hurd	Ros-Lehtinen
Buchanan	Issa	Roskam
Buck	Jenkins (KS)	Ross
Bucshon	Jenkins (WV)	Rothfus
Budd	Johnson (LA)	Rouzer
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Royce (CA)
Byrne	Johnson, Sam	Russell
Calvert	Jones	Rutherford
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Sanford
Carter (TX)	Joyce (OH)	Scalise
Chabot	Katko	Schweikert
Cheney	Kelly (MS)	Scott, Austin
Coffman	Kelly (PA)	Sensenbrenner
Cole	King (IA)	Sessions
Collins (GA)	King (NY)	Shimkus
Collins (NY)	Kinzinger	Shuster
Comer	Knight	Simpson
Comstock	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (MO)
Conaway	Labrador	Smith (NE)
Cook	LaHood	Smith (NJ)
Costello (PA)	LaMalfa	Smith (TX)
Cramer	Lamborn	Smucker
Crawford	Lance	Stefanik
Culberson	Latta	Stewart
Curbelo (FL)	Lesko	Stivers
Curtis	Lewis (MN)	Taylor
Davidson	LoBiondo	Tenney
Davis, Rodney	Long	Thompson (PA)
Denham	Loudermilk	Thornberry
DeSantis	Love	Tipton
DesJarlais	Lucas	Trott
Diaz-Balart	Luetkemeyer	Turner
Donovan	MacArthur	Upton
Duffy	Marino	Valadao
Duncan (SC)	Marshall	Walberg
Duncan (TN)	Massie	Wagner
Dunn	Mast	Walberg
Emmer	McCarthy	Walden
Estes (KS)	McCaul	Walker
Faso	McClintock	Walorski
Ferguson	McHenry	Walters, Mimi
Fitzpatrick	McKinley	Weber (TX)
Fleischmann	McMorris	Webster (FL)
Flores	Rodgers	Wenstrup
Fortenberry	McSally	Westerman
Foxx	Meadows	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Mitchell	Wilson (SC)
Gaetz	Moolenaar	Wittman
Gallagher	Mooney (WV)	Womack
Garrett	Mullin	Woodall
Gianforte	Newhouse	Yoder
Gibbs	Noem	Yoho
Gohmert	Norman	Young (AK)
Goodlatte	Nunes	Young (IA)
Gosar	Olson	Zeldin

NOES—188

Adams	Beyer	Boyle, Brendan
Aguilar	Bishop (GA)	F.
Barragán	Blumenauer	Brady (PA)
Bass	Blunt Rochester	Brown (MD)
Beatty	Bonamici	Brownley (CA)
Bera		Bustos

Butterfield	Higgins (NY)	Panetta	Brooks (IN)	Hill	Reed	Hoyer	Maloney,	Ryan (OH)
Capuano	Himes	Pascrell	Buchanan	Holding	Reichert	Huffman	Carolyn B.	Sánchez
Carbajal	Hoyer	Payne	Buck	Hollingsworth	Renacci	Jackson Lee	Maloney, Sean	Sarbanes
Cárdenas	Huffman	Pelosi	Bucshon	Hudson	Rice (SC)	Jayapal	Massie	Schakowsky
Carden (IN)	Jackson Lee	Perlmutter	Budd	Huizenga	Roby	Jeffries	Matsui	Schiff
Cartwright	Jayapal	Peters	Burgess	Hultgren	Roe (TN)	Johnson (GA)	McCollum	Schrader
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Peterson	Byrne	Hunter	Rogers (AL)	Johnson, E. B.	McEachin	Scott (VA)
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Pingree	Calvert	Hurd	Rogers (KY)	Jones	McGovern	Scott, David
Chu, Judy	Johnson, E. B.	Pocan	Carter (GA)	Issa	Rohrabacher	Kaptur	McNerney	Serrano
Cicilline	Kaptur	Polis	Carter (TX)	Jenkins (KS)	Rokita	Keating	Meeks	Sewell (AL)
Clark (MA)	Keating	Price (NC)	Chabot	Jenkins (WV)	Rooney, Francis	Kelly (IL)	Meng	Shea-Porter
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Quigley	Cheney	Johnson (LA)	Rooney, Thomas	Kennedy	Moore	Sherman
Clay	Kennedy	Raskin	Coffman	Johnson (OH)	J.	Khanna	Moulton	Sires
Cleaver	Khanna	Rice (NY)	Cole	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen	Kihuen	Nadler	Smith (WA)
Clyburn	Kihuen	Richmond	Collins (GA)	Jordan	Roskam	Kildee	Napolitano	Soto
Cohen	Kildee	Rosen	Collins (NY)	Joyce (OH)	Ross	Kilmer	Neal	Speier
Connolly	Kilmer	Royal-Allard	Comer	Katko	Rothfus	Kind	Nolan	Suozzi
Cooper	Kind	Ruiz	Comstock	Kelly (MS)	Rouzer	Krishnamoorthi	Norcross	Swalwell (CA)
Correa	Krishnamoorthi	Ruppersberger	Conaway	Kelly (PA)	Royce (CA)	Kuster (NH)	O'Rourke	Takano
Costa	Kuster (NH)	Cook	Curbelo (PA)	King (IA)	Russell	Lamb	Pallone	Thompson (CA)
Courtney	Lamb	Costello (PA)	Cramer	King (NY)	Rutherford	Langevin	Panetta	Titus
Crist	Langevin	Crawford	Schakowsky	Kinzinger	Sanford	Larsen (WA)	Pascrell	Tonko
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Culberson	Schiff	Knight	Scalise	Larson (CT)	Payne	Torres
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Curbelo (FL)	Schneider	Kustoff (TN)	Schneider	Lawrence	Pelosi	Tsongas
Davis (CA)	Lawrence	Curtis	Schweikert	Labrador	Scott, Austin	Lawson (FL)	Perlmutter	Vargas
Davis, Danny	Lawson (FL)	Davidson	LaHood	LaMalfa	Sensenbrenner	Lee	Peters	Veasey
DeFazio	Lee	Davis, Rodney	Lance	Lamborn	Sessions	Levin	Peterson	Veasey
Delaney	Levin	Denham	Lance	Latta	Shimkus	Lewis (GA)	Pingree	Vela
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	DesSantis	Latta	Lesko	Shuster	Lieu, Ted	Pocan	Velázquez
DelBene	Lieu, Ted	DeSjarlais	Lesko	Lewis (MN)	Simpson	Lipinski	Polis	Visclosky
Demings	Lipinski	Diaz-Balart	Lewis (MN)	LoBiondo	Sinema	Loeb sack	Price (NC)	Walz
DeSaulnier	Loeb sack	Donovan	LoBiondo	Duffy	Smith (MO)	Lofgren	Quigley	Wasserman
Deutch	Lofgren	Duffy	Long	Duncan (SC)	Smith (NE)	Lowenthal	Raskin	Schultz
Dingell	Lowenthal	Duncan (TN)	Love	Loudermilk	Smith (NJ)	Lowe y	Rice (NY)	Waters, Maxine
Doggett	Lowe y	Dunn	Lucas	Love	Smith (TX)	Lujan Grisham,	Rosen	Watson Coleman
Doyle, Michael	Lujan Grisham,	Emmer	Luetkemeyer	MacArthur	Smucker	M.	Roybal-Allard	Welch
F.	M.	Estes (KS)	MacArthur	Marchant	Stefanik	Luján, Ben Ray	Ruiz	Wilson (FL)
Ellison	Luján, Ben Ray	Faso	Marchant	Marino	Stewart	Ruppersberger	Ruppersberger	Yarmuth
Engel	Lynch	Ferguson	Marino	Marshall	Stivers			
Eshoo	Maloney,	Fitzpatrick	Marshall	Mast	Taylor			
Españillat	Carolyn B.	Fleischmann	Mast	McCarthy	Tenney			
Esty (CT)	Maloney, Sean	Flores	McCarthy	McCaul	Thompson (PA)	Bishop (MI)	Garrett	Olson
Evans	Matsui	Fortenberry	McCaul	Fox	Thornberry	Black	Lynch	Richmond
Foster	McCormack	Graham	McClintock	McHenry	Tipton	Crowley	Meadows	Rush
Frankel (FL)	McEachin	Granger	McClintock	Gaetz	Trott	DeGette	Messer	Thompson (MS)
Fudge	McGovern	Gowdy	McClintock	Gallagher	Turner			
Gabbard	McNerney	Granger	McClintock	Gianforte	Turner			
Galleo	Meeks	Granger	McClintock	Gibbs	Upton			
Garamendi	Meng	Granger	McClintock	Gohmert	Valadao			
Gomez	Moore	Granger	McClintock	Goodlatte	Wagner			
Gonzalez (TX)	Moulton	Granger	McClintock	Gosar	Walberg			
Gottheimer	Murphy (FL)	Granger	McClintock	Gottheimer	Walden			
Green, Al	Nadler	Granger	McClintock	Gowdy	Walker			
Green, Gene	Napolitano	Granger	McClintock	Gowdy	Walorski			
Grijalva	Neal	Granger	McClintock	Gowdy	Walters, Mimi			
Gutiérrez	Nolan	Granger	McClintock	Gowdy	Weber (TX)			
Hanabusa	O'Halleran	Granger	McClintock	Gowdy	Webster (FL)			
Hastings	O'Rourke	Granger	McClintock	Gowdy	Wenstrup			
Heck	Pallone	Granger	McClintock	Gowdy	Westerman			

NOT VOTING—8

Black	Marchant	Rush
Crowley	Messer	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Norcross	

□ 1358

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 185, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 299]

AYES—230

Abraham	Banks (IN)	Bishop (UT)
Aderholt	Barletta	Blackburn
Allen	Barr	Blum
Amodei	Barton	Bost
Arrington	Bergman	Brady (TX)
Babin	Biggs	Brat
Bacon	Bilirakis	Brooks (AL)

NOES—185

Adams	Chu, Judy	Doggett
Aguilar	Cicilline	Doyle, Michael
Amash	Clark (MA)	F.
Barragán	Clarke (NY)	Ellison
Bass	Clay	Engel
Beatty	Cleaver	Eshoo
Bera	Clyburn	Españillat
Beyer	Cohen	Esty (CT)
Bishop (GA)	Connolly	Evans
Blumenauer	Cooper	Foster
Blunt Rochester	Correa	Frankel (FL)
Bonamici	Costa	Fudge
Boyle, Brendan	Courtney	Gabbard
F.	Crist	Galleo
Brady (PA)	Cuellar	Garamendi
Brown (MD)	Cummings	Gomez
Brownley (CA)	Davis (CA)	Gonzalez (TX)
Bustos	Davis, Danny	Green, Al
Butterfield	DeFazio	Green, Gene
Capuano	Delaney	Grijalva
Carbajal	DeLauro	Gutiérrez
Cárdenas	DelBene	Hanabusa
Carden (IN)	Demings	Hastings
Cartwright	DeSaulnier	Heck
Castor (FL)	Deutch	Higgins (NY)
Castro (TX)	Dingell	Himes

NOT VOTING—12

Bishop (MI)	Garrett	Olson
Black	Lynch	Richmond
Crowley	Meadows	Rush
DeGette	Messer	Thompson (MS)

□ 1409

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 27, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 27, 2018, at 11:38 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 2385.

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 5895.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the ayes and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

AMERICAN LEADERSHIP IN SPACE TECHNOLOGY AND ADVANCED ROCKETRY ACT

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5345) to designate the Marshall Space Flight Center of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to provide leadership for the U.S. rocket propulsion industrial base, and for other purposes, as amended.

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

H.R. 5345

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “American Leadership in Space Technology and Advanced Rocketry Act” or the “ALSTAR Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Non-military rocket propulsion is an enabling technology for our Nation’s future prosperous way of life.

(2) Non-military rocket propulsion technologies are critical to national security, intelligence gathering, communications, weather forecasting, navigation, communications, entertainment, land use, Earth observation, and scientific exploration.

(3) The non-military rocket propulsion industry is a source of high-quality jobs.

(4) Multiple Federal agencies and companies are involved in non-military rocket propulsion research, development, and manufacturing.

(5) Integration, coordination, and cooperation would strengthen the United States non-military rocket propulsion industrial base.

(6) Erosion of the non-military rocket propulsion industrial base would seriously impact national security, space exploration potential, and economic growth.

(7) The Marshall Space Flight Center has decades of experience working with other Government agencies and industry partners to study and coordinate these capabilities.

(8) The Marshall Space Flight Center has made historic and unique contributions—

(A) by bringing stakeholders together to work on non-military rocket propulsion industrial base sustainment;

(B) of technical expertise to key studies and review boards; and

(C) by consistently participating in interagency working groups to address non-military rocket propulsion issues.

SEC. 3. NON-MILITARY ROCKET PROPULSION LEADERSHIP.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Marshall Space Flight Center is the National Aeronautics and Space Administration’s lead center for non-military rocket propulsion and is essential to sustaining and promoting U.S. leadership in non-military rocket propulsion and developing the next generation of non-military rocket propulsion capabilities.

(b) LEADERSHIP IN NON-MILITARY ROCKET PROPULSION.—The Marshall Space Flight Center shall provide national leadership in NASA in non-military rocket propulsion by—

(1) contributing to interagency coordination for the preservation of critical national non-military rocket propulsion capabilities;

(2) collaborating with industry, academia, and professional organizations to most effectively use national capabilities and resources;

(3) monitoring public- and private-sector non-military rocket propulsion activities to develop and promote a strong, healthy non-military rocket propulsion industrial base;

(4) facilitating technical solutions for existing and emerging non-military rocket propulsion challenges;

(5) supporting the development and refinement of non-military rocket propulsion for small satellites;

(6) evaluating and recommending, as appropriate, new non-military rocket propulsion technologies for further development; and

(7) providing information required by national decisionmakers so that policies and other instruments of the Government support the development and strengthening of the Nation’s non-military rocket propulsion capabilities throughout the 21st century.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5345, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the Congressman for the Tennessee Valley of the State of Alabama, I am uniquely situated to appreciate the valuable contribution the Marshall Space Flight Center has made and continues to make to America’s rocket propulsion capabilities.

As a child growing up in Huntsville, Alabama, I well remember the 1960s as nearby Saturn V rocket engine tests shook the ground and rattled the windows. I also remember the great pride in America I felt the moment Neil Armstrong stepped on the Moon after leaving the Earth on one of our Saturn V rockets.

No doubt about it, developing and improving rocket propulsion is essential to America’s leadership in space exploration and national security.

It has been the Marshall Space Flight Center that has provided and continues to provide the cutting-edge expertise America needs in both solid and liquid rocket propulsion.

□ 1415

Over the last several years, Americans have witnessed a resurgence in the rocket propulsion industry. As traditional and emerging actors move forward, it is important that the Federal Government minimize expensive duplication and support healthy cooperation and communication between the private sector and the Federal Government to promote America’s robust rocket propulsion industry.

With President Trump’s establishment of Space Force as an independent

branch of the military, rocket propulsion is recognized as even more important to securing America’s future than ever before because America’s military relies heavily on its space assets—global positioning satellites being but one example—to protect our national security.

As Congress guides America’s national space policy, we must promote the robust rocket propulsion industrial base that is essential to our space presence.

My bill, H.R. 5345, the American Leadership in Space Technology and Advanced Rocketry Act of 2018, commonly known as the ALSTAR Act, helps ensure the long-term stability of the rocket propulsion industry through better coordination and collaboration between all relevant stakeholders, public and private.

Specifically, the ALSTAR Act formally designates Marshall Space Flight Center as NASA’s current and future lead center for rocket propulsion.

In addition, the ALSTAR Act directs Marshall to explore, develop, and mature new rocket propulsion technology in cooperation with partners across and outside of government. This new emphasis, while building on a strong foundation, helps to ensure that America remains at the forefront of space exploration.

Mr. Speaker, in the 1940s and 1950s, voyages to the Moon were thought impossible, but America rose to the challenge and overcame the impossible. Today, America must, once again, challenge itself to reach far beyond its limits.

Through our increased attention, focus, and support of utilization of space and the exploration of deep space, we too can overcome the impossible and help inspire the next generation of Americans to look to the stars and go where no one has gone before.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I support a robust and innovative space industry. I also believe that it is very important that we leverage the investment taxpayers have allowed the Nation to make in its facilities and workforce.

The bill before us today that is known as H.R. 5345, also known as the American Leadership in Space Technology and Advanced Rocketry Act, recognizes the rocket propulsion work of the Marshall Space Flight Center and that center’s role in helping to develop the next generation of rocket propulsion capabilities. The Marshall Space Flight Center has a long and storied history in rocket development dating back to the huge Saturn V rockets that powered our astronauts to the Moon. That tradition continues to this day.

Mr. Speaker, I support moving this bill out of the House floor, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the vice chairman of the Space Subcommittee for yielding me time, and I appreciate all that Mr. BROOKS, the gentleman from Alabama, has done for space exploration and for spaceflight.

The House Science, Space, and Technology Committee has demonstrated time and again that U.S. leadership in space is a bipartisan priority. The scientists, engineers, and technicians at the Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, Alabama, have, for more than half a century, led the world in the development of rocket propulsion.

H.R. 5345, the American Leadership in Space Technology and Advanced Rocketry Act, recognizes the impressive accomplishments of Marshall as well as vital, ongoing work they continue to do to ensure continued American leadership in space technology and rocketry capabilities.

As our future in space looks bolder, bigger, and brighter, I am confident that Marshall will continue to be a reliable, powerful, and dependable team player in moving this Nation forward.

Mr. Speaker, Vice Chairman BROOKS has always been a strong and effective advocate for space initiatives and Marshall Space Flight Center. I appreciate all he has done on the subject, and I very much appreciate his being such a leader on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and it is a privilege to work with Representative MO BROOKS on the Space Subcommittee advancing our Nation's priorities and doing our part to ensure strong leadership in America's space program.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for this important bill. He is a true champion of Marshall Space Flight Center, the center's employees, and the important work they do every day to keep America first in space.

The excitement and enthusiasm about our Government and private space activities have been building toward a fever pitch. The fine scientists, engineers, and technicians at Marshall Space Flight Center have for more than half a century led the world in the development of rocket propulsion.

This bill recognizes the impressive accomplishments of Marshall as well as the vital, ongoing work they continue to do to ensure continued American leadership in space.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to have worked on and cosponsored this legislation with my colleague, Mr. BROOKS. As our future in space looks bolder and brighter, I am confident that the Marshall Space Flight Center will continue to be a reliable, powerful, and dependable team player moving this Nation forward.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5345, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMERCIAL SPACE SUPPORT VEHICLE ACT

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5346) to amend title 51, United States Code, to provide for licenses and experimental permits for space support vehicles, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5346

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Commercial Space Support Vehicle Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

Section 50902 of title 51, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (21) through (25) as paragraphs (23) through (27), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (20) the following:

"(21) 'space support flight' means a flight in the air that is—

"(A) not a launch or reentry; but

"(B) related to launch or reentry services.

"(22) 'space support vehicle' means a vehicle that is—

"(A) a launch vehicle;

"(B) a reentry vehicle; or

"(C) a component of a launch or reentry vehicle."

SEC. 3. LICENSING OF SPACE SUPPORT FLIGHTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 50904 of title 51, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(e) SPACE SUPPORT FLIGHTS.—

"(1) The Secretary of Transportation may issue or transfer a license for multiple space support flights of a space support vehicle to a citizen of the United States, but only if such citizen holds an operator license issued under this chapter for launch or reentry of such space support vehicle as, or included as a component of, a launch vehicle or reentry vehicle.

"(2) A licensee may only carry out a space support flight of a space support vehicle under a license for carrying a person or property for compensation or hire if such flight lands at the same site from which the vehicle took flight."

(b) LIMITATION ON WAIVER OF REQUIREMENTS.—Section 50905(b)(3) of title 51, United States Code, is amended by inserting "or the operation of a space support vehicle," after "or a reentry vehicle".

SEC. 4. EXPERIMENTAL PERMITS FOR SPACE SUPPORT FLIGHTS.

Section 50906 of title 51, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

"(d) The Secretary may issue a permit only for—

"(1) reusable suborbital rockets or reusable launch vehicles that will be launched into a suborbital trajectory or reentered under that permit solely for—

"(A) research and development to test design concepts, equipment, or operating techniques;

"(B) showing compliance with requirements as part of the process for obtaining a license for launch or reentry under this chapter; or

"(C) crew training for a launch or reentry using the design of the rocket or vehicle for which the permit would be issued; or

"(2) a space support vehicle, or a vehicle that is in development to become a space support vehicle, operated by a citizen of the United States for space support flights that will be conducted under the permit for, or in support of, the purposes described in subparagraphs (A) through (C) of paragraph (1)."; and

(2) by striking subsection (h) and inserting the following:

"(h) No person may, under a permit, operate a reusable suborbital rocket, reusable launch vehicle, or space support vehicle for carrying any property or human being for compensation or hire."

SEC. 5. COMMUNICATION AND TRANSPARENCY.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to limit the authority of the Secretary of Transportation to discuss potential regulatory approaches, potential performance standards, or any other topic related to this Act and the amendments made by this Act with the commercial space industry prior to the issuance of a notice of proposed rulemaking.

SEC. 6. APPLICABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on March 1, 2019.

(b) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Transportation may issue such regulations as are necessary to carry out the amendments made by this Act beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5346, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5346, the Commercial Space Support Vehicle Act, was largely developed with input from a Department of Transportation report on approaches for streamlining the licensing and permitting of hybrid launch vehicles to enable non-launch flight operations. Hybrid launch vehicles are those that have some of the

characteristics of aircraft and some of the characteristics of launch vehicles.

Companies would like to utilize space support vehicles to train crews and spaceflight participants by exposing them to the physiological effects encountered in spaceflight or conduct research in reduced gravity environments. Spaceports, like those in Florida and other States, would like to attract those companies to operate out of their facilities.

The DOT report concluded that: "The option of having a single statutory regime and regulatory office oversee a demonstrated commercial space program throughout its operational life cycle would allow consistent application of regulatory philosophy and safety oversight and be more efficient and cost effective for the launch operator as well as the licensing agency. For an evolving industry, a regulatory environment that can adjust to accommodate changes would allow for more flexible and more responsive oversight."

Additionally, a GAO report issued last year recommended that the FAA examine the FAA's current regulatory framework for space support vehicles and suggest legislative or regulatory changes as applicable.

I believe H.R. 5346 provides the appropriate regulatory approach by authorizing the Secretary of Transportation to develop the regulations by March 1, 2019, allowing licensed space support flights. The intent of timing is to include the development of regulations in the regulatory reform process that the Vice President and the National Space Council tasked the FAA to complete by that date.

Of course, I want to thank my friend of many, many decades, Congressman LAWSON from the great State of Florida, for his cosponsorship and support of this bill, as well as Chairman LAMAR SMITH and Subcommittee Chairman BRIAN BABIN, both of Texas, for advancing and cosponsoring this great piece of legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support a robust and successful commercial space industry. In that regard, I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues on policies that facilitate the Nation's continued growth and leadership in space.

The bill before us today, H.R. 5346, known as the Commercial Space Support Vehicle Act, will amend the statute to provide the Secretary of Transportation with authority to license or permit space support vehicles for space support flights such as crew training or research and development that are related to space launch or reentry.

While I am not aware of any pressing need for this amendment at this time, it may provide the industry with some additional flexibility.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, it is very important to point out, too, that the

FAA's Office of Commercial Space Transportation is sufficiently resourced to accommodate any additional work so that the office can continue to focus on its core responsibilities of licensing and permitting commercial space launch and reentry vehicles.

Mr. Speaker, I support moving the bill out of the House, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the longtime efforts of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY) to advance space initiatives. His efforts are reflected in H.R. 5346, the Commercial Space Support Vehicle Act, which he authored and brings to the floor today.

Maintaining and expanding America's leadership in human space activity, especially in the commercial space sector, is a priority of mine and of paramount importance to Mr. POSEY and the members on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

The Commercial Space Support Vehicle Act was developed with input from the Department of Transportation as a new and better approach to streamline the licensing and permitting process of hybrid launch vehicles.

Private companies would like to use space support vehicles to train crews and spaceflight participants by exposing them to the physiological effects and reduced gravity environment encountered in spaceflight, and many spaceports would like to encourage those companies to operate out of their facilities.

H.R. 5346 provides the fairest, most appropriate regulatory approach by authorizing the Secretary of Transportation to develop regulations, according to the requirements of the bill, by March 1, 2019, thereby enabling licensed space support flights.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank Mr. POSEY who is always a leader on space issues for taking the initiative on this bill.

□ 1430

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. BILL POSEY, for his tireless efforts in drafting the Commercial Space Support Vehicle Act and his leadership in the Space Subcommittee in moving this bill to the House floor today. He has always been and continues to be one of the leading champions in Congress for American leadership in space. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this bill.

Simply said, this bill will create jobs and economic growth in the Nation's commercial spaceports, and it will streamline licensing requirements so that our innovators in the hybrid launch vehicle market can train future

space flight crews and participants. These innovators are at the forefront of providing aerial platforms for very important microgravity research.

GAO recommended in its report that the FAA examine the FAA's current regulatory framework for space support vehicles and suggest legislative or regulatory changes as applicable. I believe H.R. 5346 provides the appropriate regulatory approach by authorizing the Secretary of Transportation to develop the regulations by March 1, 2019, which will allow licensed space support flights.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I once again want to thank the cosponsors on both sides of the aisle. This has been about a 9-year journey to make this much-needed change to our laws.

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5346.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY SCIENCE AND INNOVATION ACT OF 2018

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5905) to authorize basic research programs in the Department of Energy Office of Science for fiscal years 2018 and 2019, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5905

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 "Department of Energy Science and Innovation Act of 2018".

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

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Definitions.
- Sec. 3. Mission.
- Sec. 4. Basic energy sciences.
- Sec. 5. Advanced scientific computing research.
- Sec. 6. High energy physics.
- Sec. 7. Biological and environmental research.
- Sec. 8. Fusion energy.
- Sec. 9. Nuclear physics.
- Sec. 10. Science laboratories infrastructure program.
- Sec. 11. Authorization of appropriations.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) DEPARTMENT.—The term "Department" means the Department of Energy.

(2) **DIRECTOR.**—The term “Director” means the Director of the Office of Science of the Department.

(3) **NATIONAL LABORATORY.**—The term “National Laboratory” has the meaning given that term in section 2 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801).

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Energy.

SEC. 3. MISSION.

Section 209 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7139) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) **MISSION.**—The mission of the Office of Science shall be the delivery of scientific discoveries, capabilities, and major scientific tools to transform the understanding of nature and to advance the energy, economic, and national security of the United States.”.

SEC. 4. BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES.

(a) **PROGRAM.**—The Director shall carry out a program in basic energy sciences, including materials sciences and engineering, chemical sciences, physical biosciences, and geosciences, for the purpose of providing the scientific foundations for new energy technologies.

(b) **MISSION.**—The mission of the program described in subsection (a) shall be to support fundamental research to understand, predict, and ultimately control matter and energy at the electronic, atomic, and molecular levels in order to provide the foundations for new energy technologies and to support Department missions in energy, environment, and national security.

(c) **BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES USER FACILITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director shall carry out a program for the development, construction, operation, and maintenance of national user facilities.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—To the maximum extent practicable, the national user facilities developed, constructed, operated, or maintained under paragraph (1) shall serve the needs of the Department, industry, the academic community, and other relevant entities to create and examine materials and chemical processes for the purpose of improving the competitiveness of the United States.

(3) **INCLUDED FACILITIES.**—The national user facilities developed, constructed, operated, or maintained under paragraph (1) shall include—

- (A) x-ray light sources;
- (B) neutron sources;
- (C) nanoscale science research centers; and
- (D) such other facilities as the Director considers appropriate, consistent with section 209 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7139).

(d) **BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE.**—

(1) **ADVANCED PHOTON SOURCE UPGRADE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall provide for the upgrade to the Advanced Photon Source described in the publication approved by the Basic Energy Sciences Advisory Committee on June 9, 2016, titled “Report on Facility Upgrades”, including the development of a multi-bend achromat lattice to produce a high flux of coherent x-rays within the hard x-ray energy region and a suite of beamlines optimized for this source.

(B) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this paragraph:

(i) **FLUX.**—The term “flux” means the rate of flow of photons.

(ii) **HARD X-RAY.**—The term “hard x-ray” means a photon with energy greater than 20 kiloelectron volts.

(C) **START OF OPERATIONS.**—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, ensure that the start of full operations of the upgrade under this paragraph occurs before December 31, 2025.

(D) **FUNDING.**—Out of funds authorized to be appropriated under section 11 for Basic Energy Sciences, there shall be made available to the Secretary to carry out the upgrade under this paragraph—

- (i) \$93,000,000 for fiscal year 2018; and
- (ii) \$130,000,000 for fiscal year 2019.

(2) **SPALLATION NEUTRON SOURCE PROTON POWER UPGRADE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall provide for a proton power upgrade to the Spallation Neutron Source.

(B) **DEFINITION OF PROTON POWER UPGRADE.**—For the purposes of this paragraph, the term “proton power upgrade” means the Spallation Neutron Source power upgrade described in—

(i) the publication of the Office of Science of the Department of Energy titled “Facilities for the Future of Science: A Twenty-Year Outlook”, published December 2003;

(ii) the publication of the Office of Science of the Department of Energy titled “Four Years Later: An Interim Report on Facilities for the Future of Science: A Twenty-Year Outlook”, published August 2007; and

(iii) the publication approved by the Basic Energy Sciences Advisory Committee on June 9, 2016, titled “Report on Facility Upgrades”.

(C) **START OF OPERATIONS.**—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, ensure that the start of full operations of the upgrade under this paragraph occurs before December 31, 2025.

(D) **FUNDING.**—Out of funds authorized to be appropriated under section 11 for Basic Energy Sciences, there shall be made available to the Secretary to carry out the upgrade under this paragraph—

- (i) \$36,000,000 for fiscal year 2018; and
- (ii) \$60,800,000 for fiscal year 2019.

(3) **SPALLATION NEUTRON SOURCE SECOND TARGET STATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall provide for a second target station for the Spallation Neutron Source.

(B) **DEFINITION OF SECOND TARGET STATION.**—For the purposes of this paragraph, the term “second target station” means the Spallation Neutron Source second target station described in—

(i) the publication of the Office of Science of the Department of Energy titled “Facilities for the Future of Science: A Twenty-Year Outlook”, published December 2003;

(ii) the publication of the Office of Science of the Department of Energy titled “Four Years Later: An Interim Report on Facilities for the Future of Science: A Twenty-Year Outlook”, published August 2007; and

(iii) the publication approved by the Basic Energy Sciences Advisory Committee on June 9, 2016, titled “Report on Facility Upgrades”.

(C) **START OF OPERATIONS.**—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, ensure that the start of full operations of the second target station under this paragraph occurs before December 31, 2030, with the option for early operation in 2028.

(D) **FUNDING.**—Out of funds authorized to be appropriated under section 11 for Basic Energy Sciences, there shall be made available to the Secretary to carry out activities, including construction, under this paragraph—

- (i) \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2018; and
- (ii) \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2019.

(4) **ADVANCED LIGHT SOURCE UPGRADE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall provide for the upgrade to the Advanced Light Source described in the publication approved by the Basic Energy Sciences Advisory Committee on June 9, 2016, titled “Report on Facility Upgrades”, including the development of a multi-bend achromat lattice to produce

a high flux of coherent x-rays within the soft x-ray energy region.

(B) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this paragraph:

(i) **FLUX.**—The term “flux” means the rate of flow of photons.

(ii) **SOFT X-RAY.**—The term “soft x-ray” means a photon with energy in the range from 50 to 2,000 electron volts.

(C) **START OF OPERATIONS.**—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, ensure that the start of full operations of the upgrade under this paragraph occurs before December 31, 2026.

(D) **FUNDING.**—Out of funds authorized to be appropriated under section 11 for Basic Energy Sciences, there shall be made available to the Secretary to carry out the upgrade under this paragraph—

- (i) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2018; and
- (ii) \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2019.

(5) **LINAC COHERENT LIGHT SOURCE II HIGH ENERGY UPGRADE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall provide for the upgrade to the Linac Coherent Light Source II facility described in the publication approved by the Basic Energy Sciences Advisory Committee on June 9, 2016, titled “Report on Facility Upgrades”, including the development of experimental capabilities for high energy x-rays to reveal fundamental scientific discoveries. The Secretary shall ensure the upgrade under this paragraph enables the production and use of high energy, ultra-short pulse x-rays delivered at a high repetition rate.

(B) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this paragraph:

(i) **HIGH ENERGY X-RAY.**—The term a “high energy x-ray” means a photon with an energy at or exceeding 12 kiloelectron volts.

(ii) **HIGH REPETITION RATE.**—The term “high repetition rate” means the delivery of x-ray pulses up to one million pulses per second.

(iii) **ULTRA-SHORT PULSE X-RAYS.**—The term “ultra-short pulse x-rays” means x-ray bursts capable of durations of less than one hundred femtoseconds.

(C) **START OF OPERATIONS.**—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, ensure that the start of full operations of the upgrade under this paragraph occurs before December 31, 2025.

(D) **FUNDING.**—Out of funds authorized to be appropriated under section 11 for Basic Energy Sciences, there shall be made available to the Secretary to carry out the upgrade under this paragraph—

- (i) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2018; and
- (ii) \$55,000,000 for fiscal year 2019.

(e) **ACCELERATOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.**—The Director shall carry out research and development on advanced accelerator and storage ring technologies relevant to the development of Basic Energy Sciences user facilities, in consultation with the Office of Science’s High Energy Physics and Nuclear Physics programs.

(f) **SOLAR FUELS RESEARCH INITIATIVE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 973 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16313) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 973. SOLAR FUELS RESEARCH INITIATIVE.

“(a) **INITIATIVE.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall carry out a research initiative, to be known as the ‘Solar Fuels Research Initiative’ (referred to in this section as the ‘Initiative’) to expand theoretical and fundamental knowledge of photochemistry, electrochemistry, biochemistry, and materials science useful for the practical development of experimental systems to convert solar energy to chemical energy.

“(2) **LEVERAGING.**—In carrying out programs and activities under the Initiative, the Secretary shall leverage expertise and resources from—

“(A) the Basic Energy Sciences Program and the Biological and Environmental Research Program of the Office of Science; and
 “(B) the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

“(3) TEAMS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the Initiative, the Secretary shall organize activities among multidisciplinary teams to leverage, to the maximum extent practicable, expertise from the National Laboratories, institutions of higher education, and the private sector.

“(B) GOALS.—The multidisciplinary teams described in subparagraph (A) shall pursue aggressive, milestone-driven, basic research goals.

“(C) RESOURCES.—The Secretary shall provide sufficient resources to the multidisciplinary teams described in subparagraph (A) to achieve the goals described in subparagraph (B) over a period of time to be determined by the Secretary.

“(4) ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary may organize additional activities under this subsection through Energy Frontier Research Centers, Energy Innovation Hubs, or other organizational structures.

“(b) ARTIFICIAL PHOTOSYNTHESIS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out under the Initiative a program to support research needed to bridge scientific barriers to, and discover knowledge relevant to, artificial photosynthetic systems.

“(2) ACTIVITIES.—As part of the program described in paragraph (1)—

“(A) the Director of the Office of Basic Energy Sciences shall support basic research to pursue distinct lines of scientific inquiry, including—

“(i) photoinduced production of hydrogen and oxygen from water; and

“(ii) the sustainable photoinduced reduction of carbon dioxide to fuel products including hydrocarbons, alcohols, carbon monoxide, and natural gas; and

“(B) the Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy shall support translational research, development, and validation of physical concepts developed under the program.

“(3) STANDARD OF REVIEW.—The Secretary shall review activities carried out under the program described in paragraph (1) to determine the achievement of technical milestones.

“(4) FUNDING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—From within funds authorized to be appropriated under section 11 of the Department of Energy Science and Innovation Act of 2018, for Basic Energy Sciences, the Secretary shall make available for carrying out activities under this subsection \$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2019.

“(B) PROHIBITION.—No funds allocated to the program described in paragraph (1) may be obligated or expended for commercial application of energy technology.

“(c) BIOCHEMISTRY, REPLICATION OF NATURAL PHOTOSYNTHESIS, AND RELATED PROCESSES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out under the Initiative a program to support research needed to replicate natural photosynthetic processes by use of artificial photosynthetic components and materials.

“(2) ACTIVITIES.—As part of the program described in paragraph (1)—

“(A) the Director of the Office of Basic Energy Sciences shall support basic research to expand fundamental knowledge to replicate natural synthesis processes, including—

“(i) the photoinduced reduction of dinitrogen to ammonia; and

“(ii) the absorption of carbon dioxide from ambient air;

“(iii) molecular-based charge separation and storage;

“(iv) photoinitiated electron transfer; and

“(v) catalysis in biological or biomimetic systems;

“(B) the Associate Director of Biological and Environmental Research shall support systems biology and genomics approaches to understand genetic and physiological pathways connected to photosynthetic mechanisms; and

“(C) the Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy shall support translational research, development, and validation of physical concepts developed under the program.

“(3) STANDARD OF REVIEW.—The Secretary shall review activities carried out under the program described in paragraph (1) to determine the achievement of technical milestones.

“(4) FUNDING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—From within funds authorized to be appropriated under section 11 of the Department of Energy Science and Innovation Act of 2018, for Basic Energy Sciences and Biological and Environmental Research, the Secretary shall make available for carrying out activities under this subsection \$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2019.

“(B) PROHIBITION.—No funds allocated to the program described in paragraph (1) may be obligated or expended for commercial application of energy technology.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 is amended by striking the item relating to section 973 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 973. Solar fuels research initiative.”.

(g) ELECTRICITY STORAGE RESEARCH INITIATIVE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 975 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16315) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 975. ELECTRICITY STORAGE RESEARCH INITIATIVE.

“(a) INITIATIVE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out a research initiative, to be known as the ‘Electricity Storage Research Initiative’ (referred to in this section as the ‘Initiative’)—

“(A) to expand theoretical and fundamental knowledge to control, store, and convert—

“(i) electrical energy to chemical energy; and

“(ii) chemical energy to electrical energy; and

“(B) to support scientific inquiry into the practical understanding of chemical and physical processes that occur within systems involving crystalline and amorphous solids, polymers, and organic and aqueous liquids.

“(2) LEVERAGING.—In carrying out programs and activities under the Initiative, the Secretary shall leverage expertise and resources from—

“(A) the Basic Energy Sciences Program, the Advanced Scientific Computing Research Program, and the Biological and Environmental Research Program of the Office of Science; and

“(B) the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

“(3) TEAMS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the Initiative, the Secretary shall organize activities among multidisciplinary teams to leverage, to the maximum extent practicable, expertise from the National Laboratories, institutions of higher education, and the private sector.

“(B) GOALS.—The multidisciplinary teams described in subparagraph (A) shall pursue aggressive, milestone-driven, basic research goals.

“(C) RESOURCES.—The Secretary shall provide sufficient resources to the multidisciplinary teams described in subparagraph (A) to achieve the goals described in subparagraph (B) over a period of time to be determined by the Secretary.

“(4) ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary may organize additional activities under this subsection through Energy Frontier Research Centers, Energy Innovation Hubs, or other organizational structures.

“(b) MULTIVALENT SYSTEMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out under the Initiative a program to support research needed to bridge scientific barriers to, and discover knowledge relevant to, multivalent ion materials in electric energy storage systems.

“(2) ACTIVITIES.—As part of the program described in paragraph (1)—

“(A) the Director of the Office of Basic Energy Sciences shall investigate electrochemical properties and the dynamics of materials, including charge transfer phenomena and mass transport in materials; and

“(B) the Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy shall support translational research, development, and validation of physical concepts developed under the program.

“(3) STANDARD OF REVIEW.—The Secretary shall review activities carried out under the program described in paragraph (1) to determine the achievement of technical milestones.

“(4) FUNDING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—From within funds authorized to be appropriated under section 11 of the Department of Energy Science and Innovation Act of 2018, for Basic Energy Sciences and Biological and Environmental Research, the Secretary shall make available for carrying out activities under this subsection \$50,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2018 through 2019.

“(B) PROHIBITION.—No funds allocated to the program described in paragraph (1) may be obligated or expended for commercial application of energy technology.

“(c) ELECTROCHEMISTRY MODELING AND SIMULATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out under the Initiative a program to support research to model and simulate organic electrolytes, including the static and dynamic electrochemical behavior and phenomena of organic electrolytes at the molecular and atomic level in monovalent and multivalent systems.

“(2) ACTIVITIES.—As part of the program described in paragraph (1)—

“(A) the Director of the Office of Basic Energy Sciences, in coordination with the Associate Director of Advanced Scientific Computing Research, shall support the development of high performance computational tools through a joint development process to maximize the effectiveness of current and projected high performance computing systems; and

“(B) the Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy shall support translational research, development, and validation of physical concepts developed under the program.

“(3) STANDARD OF REVIEW.—The Secretary shall review activities carried out under the program described in paragraph (1) to determine the achievement of technical milestones.

“(4) FUNDING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—From within funds authorized to be appropriated under section 11 of the Department of Energy Science and Innovation Act of 2018, for Basic Energy Sciences and Advanced Scientific Computing Research, the Secretary shall make available for carrying out activities under this

subsection \$30,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2018 through 2019.

“(B) PROHIBITION.—No funds allocated to the program described in paragraph (1) may be obligated or expended for commercial application of energy technology.

“(d) MESOSCALE ELECTROCHEMISTRY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out under the Initiative a program to support research needed to reveal electrochemistry in confined mesoscale spaces, including scientific discoveries relevant to—

“(A) bio-electrochemistry and electrochemical energy conversion and storage in confined spaces; and

“(B) the dynamics of the phenomena described in subparagraph (A).

“(2) ACTIVITIES.—As part of the program described in paragraph (1)—

“(A) the Director of the Office of Basic Energy Sciences and the Associate Director of Biological and Environmental Research shall investigate phenomena of mesoscale electrochemical confinement for the purpose of replicating and controlling new electrochemical behavior; and

“(B) the Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy shall support translational research, development, and validation of physical concepts developed under the program.

“(3) STANDARD OF REVIEW.—The Secretary shall review activities carried out under the program described in paragraph (1) to determine the achievement of technical milestones.

“(4) FUNDING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—From within funds authorized to be appropriated under section 11 of the Department of Energy Science and Innovation Act of 2018, for Basic Energy Sciences and Biological and Environmental Research, the Secretary shall make available for carrying out activities under this subsection \$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2019.

“(B) PROHIBITION.—No funds allocated to the program described in paragraph (1) may be obligated or expended for commercial application of energy technology.”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Energy Policy Act of 2005 is amended by striking the item relating to section 975 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 975. Electricity storage research initiative.”

(h) ENERGY FRONTIER RESEARCH CENTERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall carry out a program to provide awards, on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis, to multi-institutional collaborations or other appropriate entities to conduct fundamental and use-inspired energy research to accelerate scientific breakthroughs.

(2) COLLABORATIONS.—A collaboration receiving an award under this subsection may include multiple types of institutions and private sector entities.

(3) SELECTION AND DURATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A collaboration under this subsection shall be selected for a period of 4 years.

(B) EXISTING CENTERS.—An Energy Frontier Research Center in existence and supported by the Director on the date of enactment of this Act may continue to receive support for a period of 4 years beginning on the date of establishment of that center.

(C) REAPPLICATION.—After the end of the period described in subparagraph (A) or (B), as applicable, a recipient of an award may reapply for selection on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis.

(D) TERMINATION.—Consistent with the existing authorities of the Department, the Director may terminate an underperforming center for cause during the performance period.

(i) MATERIALS RESEARCH DATABASE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As part of the program in materials sciences and engineering, the Director shall support the development of a web-based platform to provide access to a database of computed information on known and predicted materials properties and computational tools to accelerate breakthroughs in materials discovery and design.

(2) In carrying out this section, the Director shall—

(A) conduct cooperative research with industry, academia, and other research institutions to facilitate the design of novel materials;

(B) leverage existing high performance computing systems to conduct high-throughput calculations, and develop computational and data mining algorithms for the prediction of material properties;

(C) advance understanding, prediction, and manipulation of materials;

(D) strengthen the foundation for new technologies and advanced manufacturing; and

(E) drive the development of advanced materials for applications that span the Department’s missions in energy, environment, and national security.

(3) In carrying out this section, the Director shall leverage programs and activities across the Department.

SEC. 5. ADVANCED SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING RESEARCH.

(a) PROGRAM.—The Director shall carry out a research, development, and demonstration program to advance computational and networking capabilities to analyze, model, simulate, and predict complex phenomena relevant to the development of new energy technologies and the competitiveness of the United States.

(b) AMERICAN SUPER COMPUTING LEADERSHIP.—

(1) RENAMING OF ACT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 1 of the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 (15 U.S.C. 5501 note; Public Law 108-423) is amended by striking “Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004” and inserting “American Super Computing Leadership Act”.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 976(a)(1) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16316(1)) is amended by striking “Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004” and inserting “American Super Computing Leadership Act”.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2 of the American Super Computing Leadership Act (15 U.S.C. 5541), as renamed by paragraph (1), is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (5) as paragraphs (3) through (6), respectively;

(B) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) DEPARTMENT.—The term ‘Department’ means the Department of Energy.

“(2) EXASCALE COMPUTING.—The term ‘exascale computing’ means computing through the use of a computing machine that performs near or above 10 to the 18th power operations per second.”; and

(C) in paragraph (6) (as redesignated by subparagraph (A)), by striking “, acting through the Director of the Office of Science of the Department of Energy”.

(3) DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY HIGH-END COMPUTING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.—Section 3 of the American Super Computing Leadership Act (15 U.S.C. 5542), as renamed by paragraph (1), is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “program” and inserting “coordinated program across the Department”;

(B) in subsection (b)(2), by striking “, which may” and all that follows through “multithreading architectures”; and

(C) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

“(d) EXASCALE COMPUTING PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a research program (referred to in this subsection as the ‘Program’) for exascale computing, including the development of two or more exascale computing machine architectures, to promote the missions of the Department.

“(2) EXECUTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the Program, the Secretary shall—

“(i) establish a National Laboratory partnership for industry partners and institutions of higher education for codesign of exascale hardware, technology, software, and applications across all applicable organizations of the Department;

“(ii) acquire multiple exascale computing systems at the existing Departmental facilities that represent at least two distinct technology options developed under clause (i);

“(iii) develop such advancements in hardware and software technology as are required to fully realize the potential of an exascale production system in addressing Department target applications and solving scientific problems involving predictive modeling and simulation, large scale data analytics and management, and artificial intelligence;

“(iv) explore the use of exascale computing technologies to advance a broad range of science and engineering; and

“(v) provide, as appropriate, on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis, access for researchers in industries in the United States, institutions of higher education, National Laboratories, and other Federal agencies to the exascale computing systems developed pursuant to clause (i).

“(B) SELECTION OF PARTNERS.—The Secretary shall select the partnerships with the computing facilities of the Department under subparagraph (A) through a competitive, peer-review process.

“(3) CODESIGN AND APPLICATION DEVELOPMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

“(i) carry out the Program through an integration of applications, computer science, applied mathematics, and computer hardware architecture using the partnerships established pursuant to paragraph (2) to ensure that, to the maximum extent practicable, two or more exascale computing machine architectures are capable of solving Department target applications and broader scientific problems, including predictive modeling and simulation, large scale data analytics and management, and artificial intelligence; and

“(ii) conduct outreach programs to increase the readiness for the use of such platforms by domestic industries, including manufacturers.

“(B) REPORT.—(i) The Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing how the integration under subparagraph (A) is furthering application science data and computational workloads across application interests, including national security, material science, physical science, cybersecurity, biological science, the Materials Genome and BRAIN Initiatives of the President, advanced manufacturing, and the national electric grid.

“(ii) The roles and responsibilities of National Laboratories and industry, including the definition of the roles and responsibilities within the Department to ensure an integrated program across the Department.

“(4) PROJECT REVIEW.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The exascale architectures developed pursuant to partnerships established pursuant to paragraph (2) shall be reviewed through a project review process.

“(B) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on—

“(i) the results of the review conducted under subparagraph (A); and

“(ii) the coordination and management of the Program to ensure an integrated research program across the Department.

“(5) ANNUAL REPORTS.—At the time of the budget submission of the Department for each fiscal year, the Secretary, in consultation with the members of the partnerships established pursuant to paragraph (2), shall submit to Congress a report that describes funding for the Program as a whole by functional element of the Department and critical milestones.”

(c) HIGH-PERFORMANCE COMPUTING AND NETWORKING RESEARCH.—The Director shall support research in high-performance computing and networking relevant to energy applications, including modeling, simulation, machine learning, and advanced data analytics for basic and applied energy research programs carried out by the Secretary.

(d) APPLIED MATHEMATICS AND SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT FOR HIGH-END COMPUTING SYSTEMS, COMPUTATIONAL, AND COMPUTER SCIENCES RESEARCH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall carry out activities to develop, test, and support—

(A) mathematics, models, statistics, and algorithms for complex systems and programming environments; and

(B) tools, languages, and operations for high-end computing systems (as defined in section 2 of the American Super Computing Leadership Act (15 U.S.C. 5541), as renamed by this section).

(2) PORTFOLIO BALANCE.—The Director shall maintain a balanced portfolio within the advanced scientific computing research and development program established under section 976 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16316) that supports robust investment in applied mathematical, computational, and computer sciences research while accommodating necessary investments in high-performance computing hardware and facilities.

(e) WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.—The Director of the Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research shall support the development of a computational science workforce through a program that—

(1) facilitates collaboration between university students and researchers at the National Laboratories; and

(2) endeavors to advance science in areas relevant to the mission of the Department through the application of computational science.

SEC. 6. HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS.

(a) PROGRAM.—The Director shall carry out a research program on the fundamental constituents of matter and energy and the nature of space and time.

(b) MISSION.—The mission of the program described in subsection (a) shall be to support theoretical and experimental research in both elementary particle physics and fundamental accelerator science and technology to understand fundamental properties of the universe.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the Director should incorporate the findings and recommendations of the Particle Physics Project Prioritization Panel's report entitled “Building for Discovery: Strategic Plan for U.S. Particle Physics in the Global Context”, into the Department's

planning process as part of the program described in subsection (a);

(2) the Director should prioritize domestically hosted research projects that will maintain the United States position as a global leader in particle physics and attract the world's most talented physicists and foreign investment for international collaboration; and

(3) the nations that lead in particle physics by hosting international teams dedicated to a common scientific goal attract the world's best talent and inspire future generations of physicists and technologists.

(d) NEUTRINO RESEARCH.—As part of the program described in subsection (a), the Director shall carry out research activities on rare decay processes and the nature of the neutrino, which may include collaborations with the National Science Foundation or international collaborations.

(e) LONG-BASELINE NEUTRINO FACILITY FOR DEEP UNDERGROUND NEUTRINO EXPERIMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide for a Long-Baseline Neutrino Facility to facilitate the international Deep Underground Neutrino Experiment to enable a program in neutrino physics to measure the fundamental properties of neutrinos, explore physics beyond the Standard Model, and better clarify the nature of matter and antimatter.

(2) FACILITY CAPABILITIES.—The Secretary shall ensure that the facility described in paragraph (1) will provide, at a minimum, the following capabilities:

(A) A broad-band neutrino beam capable of 1.2 megawatts (MW) of beam power and upgradable to 2.4 MW of beam power.

(B) Four caverns excavated for a forty kiloton fiducial detector mass and supporting surface buildings and utilities.

(C) Neutrino detector facilities at both the Far Site in South Dakota and the Near Site in Illinois to categorize and study neutrinos on their 800-mile journey between the two sites.

(D) Cryogenic systems to support neutrino detectors.

(3) START OF OPERATIONS.—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, ensure that the start of full operations of the facility under this subsection occurs before December 31, 2026.

(4) FUNDING.—Out of funds authorized to be appropriated under section 11 for High Energy Physics, there shall be made available to the Secretary to carry out activities, including construction of the facility, under this subsection—

(A) \$95,000,000 for fiscal year 2018; and

(B) \$175,000,000 for fiscal year 2019.

(5) DARK ENERGY AND DARK MATTER RESEARCH.—As part of the program described in paragraph (1), the Director shall carry out research activities on the nature of dark energy and dark matter, which may include collaborations with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration or the National Science Foundation, or international collaborations.

(6) INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION.—The Director, as practicable and in coordination with other appropriate Federal agencies as necessary, shall ensure the access of United States researchers to the most advanced accelerator facilities and research capabilities in the world, including the Large Hadron Collider.

SEC. 7. BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH.

(a) PROGRAM.—The Director shall carry out a program of basic research in the areas of biological systems science and environmental science relevant to the development of new energy technologies and to support Department missions in energy, environment, and national security.

(b) BIOLOGICAL SYSTEMS.—The Director shall carry out research and development activities in fundamental, structural, computational, and systems biology to increase systems-level understanding of the complex biological systems, which may include activities—

(1) to accelerate breakthroughs and new knowledge that would enable the cost-effective, sustainable production of—

(A) biomass-based liquid transportation fuels;

(B) bioenergy; and

(C) biobased materials;

(2) to improve understanding of the global carbon cycle, including processes for removing carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, through photosynthesis and other biological processes, for sequestration and storage; and

(3) to understand the biological mechanisms used to transform, immobilize, or remove contaminants from subsurface environments.

(c) BIOENERGY RESEARCH CENTERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out activities under subsection (a), the Director shall select and establish up to 4 bioenergy research centers to conduct basic and fundamental research in plant and microbial systems biology, bio imaging and analysis, and genomics to inform the production of fuels, chemicals from sustainable biomass resources, and to facilitate the translation of basic research results to industry.

(2) SELECTION.—The Director shall select centers under paragraph (1) on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis. The Director shall consider applications from National Laboratories, multi-institutional collaborations, and other appropriate entities.

(3) DURATION.—A center established under this subsection shall receive support for a period of not more than 5 years, subject to the availability of appropriations.

(4) EXISTING CENTERS.—The Director may select a center for participation under this subsection that is in existence, or undergoing a renewal process, on the date of enactment of this Act. Such center shall be eligible to receive support for the duration the 5-year period beginning on the date of establishment of such center.

(5) RENEWAL.—Upon the expiration of any period of support of a center under this subsection, the Director may renew support for the center, on a merit-reviewed basis, for a period of not more than 5 years.

(6) TERMINATION.—Consistent with the existing authorities of the Department, the Director may terminate an underperforming center for cause during the performance period.

(d) LOW DOSE RADIATION RESEARCH PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle G of title IX of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16311 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 977 the following new section:

“SEC. 977A. LOW-DOSE RADIATION RESEARCH PROGRAM.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out a basic research program on low-dose radiation to—

“(1) enhance the scientific understanding of, and reduce uncertainties associated with, the effects of exposure to low-dose radiation; and

“(2) inform improved risk-assessment and risk-management methods with respect to such radiation.

“(b) PROGRAM COMPONENTS.—In carrying out the program required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

“(1) formulate scientific goals for low-dose radiation basic research in the United States;

“(2) identify ongoing scientific challenges for understanding the long-term effects of ionizing radiation on biological systems;

“(3) develop a long-term strategic and prioritized basic research agenda to address such scientific challenges in coordination with other research efforts;

“(4) leverage the collective body of knowledge from existing low-dose radiation research; and

“(5) engage with other Federal agencies, research communities, and potential users of information produced under this section, including institutions concerning radiation research, medical physics, radiology, health physics, and emergency response.

“(c) COORDINATION.—In carrying out the program, the Secretary, in coordination with the Physical Science Subcommittee of the National Science and Technology Council, shall—

“(1) support the directives under section 106 of the American Innovation and Competitiveness Act (42 U.S.C. 6601 note);

“(2) ensure that the Office of Science of the Department of Energy consults with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Institutes of Health, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Defense, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Department of Homeland Security;

“(3) advise and assist the National Science and Technology Council on policies and initiatives in radiation biology, including enhancing scientific knowledge of the effects of low-dose radiation on biological systems to improve radiation risk-assessment and risk-management methods; and

“(4) identify opportunities to stimulate international cooperation relating to low-dose radiation and leverage research and knowledge from sources outside of the United States.

“(d) RESEARCH PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a 4-year research plan that identifies and prioritizes basic research needs relating to low-dose radiation. In developing such plan, the Secretary shall incorporate the components described in subsection (b).

“(e) DEFINITION OF LOW-DOSE RADIATION.—In this section, the term ‘low-dose radiation’ means a radiation dose of less than 100 millisieverts.

“(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to subject any research carried out by the Secretary for the program under this section to any limitations described in 977(e) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16317(e)).

“(g) FUNDING.—From within funds authorized to be appropriated under section 11 of the Department of Energy Science and Innovation Act of 2018, for Biological and Environmental Research, the Secretary make available to carry out this section—

“(1) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2018; and

“(2) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2019.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for subtitle G of title IX of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 977 the following:

“977A. Low-dose radiation research program.”.

(e) MODELING RESEARCH.—As part of the activities described in subsection (a), the Director is authorized to carry out research to develop multiscale computational models that incorporate and examine interactions among human and earth systems.

(f) LIMITATION FOR RESEARCH FUNDS.—The Director shall not approve new climate

science-related initiatives without making a determination that such work is well-coordinated with any relevant work carried out by other Federal agencies.

SEC. 8. FUSION ENERGY.

(a) PROGRAM.—The Director shall carry out a fusion energy sciences research program to expand the understanding of plasmas and matter at very high temperatures and densities and build the science and engineering foundation needed to develop a fusion energy source.

(b) INERTIAL FUSION ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall carry out a program of research and technology development in inertial fusion for energy applications, including ion beam, laser, and pulsed power fusion systems.

(c) TOKAMAK RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall support research and development activities and facility operations to optimize the tokamak approach to fusion energy.

(2) INTERNATIONAL THERMONUCLEAR EXPERIMENTAL REACTOR CONSTRUCTION.—Section 972 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16312) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(7) ITER CONSTRUCTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized United States participation in the construction and operations of the ITER project, as agreed to under the April 25, 2007 ‘Agreement on the Establishment of the ITER International Fusion Energy Organization for the Joint Implementation of the ITER Project.’.

“(B) FACILITY REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall ensure that the mission-oriented user facility will enable the study of a burning plasma, and shall be built to have the following characteristics in its full configuration:

“(i) A tokamak device with a plasma radius of 6.2 meters and a magnetic field of 5.3 T.

“(ii) Capable of creating and sustaining a 15-million-Ampere plasma current for greater than 300 seconds.

“(C) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—From within funds authorized to be appropriated under section 11 of the Department of Energy Science and Innovation Act of 2018, for Fusion Energy Sciences, there is authorized for in-kind contributions under this paragraph—

“(i) \$122,000,000 for fiscal year 2018; and

“(ii) \$163,000,000 for fiscal year 2019.

“(D) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—From within funds authorized to be appropriated under section 11 of the Department of Energy Science and Innovation Act of 2018, for Fusion Energy Sciences, there is authorized for cash contributions under this paragraph—

“(i) \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2018; and

“(ii) \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2019.”.

(d) ALTERNATIVE AND ENABLING CONCEPTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As part of the program described in subsection (a), the Director shall support research and development activities and facility operations at United States universities, national laboratories, and private facilities for a portfolio of alternative and enabling fusion energy concepts that may provide solutions to significant challenges to the establishment of a commercial magnetic fusion power plant, prioritized based on the ability of the United States to play a leadership role in the international fusion research community. Fusion energy concepts and activities explored under this paragraph may include—

(A) high magnetic field approaches facilitated by high temperature superconductors;

(B) advanced stellarator concepts;

(C) non-tokamak confinement configurations operating at low magnetic fields;

(D) magnetized target fusion energy concepts;

(E) liquid metals to address issues associated with fusion plasma interactions with the inner wall of the encasing device;

(F) immersion blankets for heat management and fuel breeding;

(G) advanced scientific computing activities; and

(H) other promising fusion energy concepts identified by the Director.

(2) COORDINATION WITH ARPA-E.—The Under Secretary and the Director shall coordinate with the Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy (in this paragraph referred to as “ARPA-E”) to—

(A) assess the potential for any fusion energy project supported by ARPA-E to represent a promising approach to a commercially viable fusion power plant;

(B) determine whether the results of any fusion energy project supported by ARPA-E merit the support of follow-on research activities carried out by the Office of Science; and

(C) avoid unintentional duplication of activities.

(e) FAIRNESS IN COMPETITION FOR SOLICITATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL PROJECT ACTIVITIES.—Section 33 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2053) is amended by inserting before the first sentence the following: “In this section, with respect to international research projects, the term ‘private facilities or laboratories’ means facilities or laboratories located in the United States.”.

(f) IDENTIFICATION OF PRIORITIES.—

(1) REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the fusion energy research and development activities that the Department proposes to carry out over the 10-year period following the date of the report under not fewer than 3 realistic budget scenarios, including a scenario based on 3-percent annual growth in the non-ITER portion of the budget for fusion energy research and development activities.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The report required under subparagraph (A) shall—

(i) identify specific areas of fusion energy research and enabling technology development, including activities to advance inertial and alternative fusion energy concepts, in which the United States can and should establish or solidify a lead in the global fusion energy development effort;

(ii) identify priorities for initiation of facility construction and facility decommissioning under each of the three budget scenarios described in subparagraph (A); and

(iii) assess the ability of the fusion workforce of the United States to carry out the activities identified under clauses (i) and (ii), including the adequacy of programs at institutions of higher education in the United States to train the leaders and workers of the next generation of fusion energy researchers.

(2) PROCESS.—In order to develop the report required under paragraph (1)(A), the Secretary shall leverage best practices and lessons learned from the process used to develop the most recent report of the Particle Physics Project Prioritization Panel of the High Energy Physics Advisory Panel.

(3) REQUIREMENT.—No member of the Fusion Energy Sciences Advisory Committee shall be excluded from participating in developing or voting on final approval of the report required under paragraph (1)(A).

SEC. 9. NUCLEAR PHYSICS.

(a) PROGRAM.—The Director shall carry out a program of experimental and theoretical

research, and support associated facilities, to discover, explore, and understand all forms of nuclear matter.

(b) ISOTOPE DEVELOPMENT AND PRODUCTION FOR RESEARCH APPLICATIONS.—The Director—

(1) may carry out a program for the production of isotopes, including the development of techniques to produce isotopes, that the Secretary determines are needed for research, medical, industrial, or related purposes; and

(2) shall ensure that isotope production activities carried out under the program under this paragraph do not compete with private industry unless the Director determines that critical national interests require the involvement of the Federal Government.

(c) RENAMING OF THE RARE ISOTOPE ACCELERATOR.—Section 981 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16321) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “RARE ISOTOPE ACCELERATOR” and inserting “FACILITY FOR RARE ISOTOPE BEAMS”; and

(2) by striking “Rare Isotope Accelerator” each place it appears and inserting “Facility for Rare Isotope Beams”.

(d) FACILITY FOR RARE ISOTOPE BEAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide for a Facility for Rare Isotope Beams to advance the understanding of rare nuclear isotopes and the evolution of the cosmos.

(2) FACILITY CAPABILITY.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall provide for, at a minimum, a rare isotope beam facility capable of 400 kW of beam power.

(3) START OF OPERATIONS.—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, ensure that the start of full operations of the facility under this subsection occurs before June 30, 2022, with early operation in 2018.

(4) FUNDING.—Out of funds authorized to be appropriated under section 11 for Nuclear Physics, there shall be made available to the Secretary to carry out activities, including construction of the facility, under this subsection—

(A) \$101,200,000 for fiscal year 2018; and

(B) \$86,000,000 for fiscal year 2019.

SEC. 10. SCIENCE LABORATORIES INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall carry out a program to improve the safety, efficiency, and mission readiness of infrastructure at Office of Science laboratories. The program shall include projects to—

(1) renovate or replace space that does not meet research needs;

(2) replace facilities that are no longer cost effective to renovate or operate;

(3) modernize utility systems to prevent failures and ensure efficiency;

(4) remove excess facilities to allow safe and efficient operations; and

(5) construct modern facilities to conduct advanced research in controlled environmental conditions.

(b) APPROACH.—In carrying out this section, the Director shall utilize all available approaches and mechanisms, including capital line items, minor construction projects, energy savings performance contracts, utility energy service contracts, alternative financing, and expense funding, as appropriate.

SEC. 11. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 2018.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for the Office of Science for fiscal year 2018 \$6,259,903,000, of which—

(1) \$2,090,000,000 shall be for Basic Energy Science;

(2) \$908,000,000 shall be for High Energy Physics;

(3) \$673,000,000 shall be for Biological and Environmental Research;

(4) \$684,000,000 shall be for Nuclear Physics;

(5) \$810,000,000 shall be for Advanced Scientific Computing Research;

(6) \$532,111,000 shall be for Fusion Energy Sciences;

(7) \$257,292,000 shall be for Science Laboratories Infrastructure;

(8) \$183,000,000 shall be for Science Program Direction;

(9) \$103,000,000 shall be for Safeguards and Security; and

(10) \$19,500,000 shall be for Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists.

(b) FISCAL YEAR 2019.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for the Office of Science for fiscal year 2019 \$6,600,000,000, of which—

(1) \$2,129,233,000 shall be for Basic Energy Science;

(2) \$1,004,510,000 shall be for High Energy Physics;

(3) \$673,000,000 shall be for Biological and Environmental Research;

(4) \$690,000,000 shall be for Nuclear Physics;

(5) \$899,010,000 shall be for Advanced Scientific Computing Research;

(6) \$640,000,000 shall be for Fusion Energy Sciences;

(7) \$257,292,000 shall be for Science Laboratories Infrastructure;

(8) \$181,345,000 shall be for Science Program Direction;

(9) \$106,110,000 shall be for Safeguards and Security; and

(10) \$19,500,000 shall be for Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5905, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5905, the Department of Energy Science and Innovation Act of 2018.

This legislation authorizes the Department of Energy’s Office of Science programs for fiscal years 2018 and 2019. It also authorizes upgrades and new construction of major user facilities at the Department of Energy national labs and universities.

Over the past 4 years, the Energy Subcommittee has met with stakeholders, held hearings, and worked extensively with our colleagues to draft the language included in today’s legislation. During this comprehensive process, we spoke with DOE officials, directors of DOE national labs, academia, and industry representatives about the right priorities for these Office of Science programs. The result was a series of bills that the Science, Space, and Technology Committee has advanced through the House this Congress, including H.R. 589, H.R. 4376, H.R. 4377, and H.R. 4675.

The legislation we will consider today combines these bills to form a bipartisan authorization of the department’s basic science research. This includes more than \$6 billion in fundamental research and discovery science, largely performed at DOE national laboratories and user facilities around the country.

Last month, I had the opportunity to visit a number of these facilities at Argonne National Laboratory and Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory with several of my Science, Space, and Technology Committee colleagues. We got to see firsthand the incredible work that those researchers do for our country and for the world.

From advanced scientific computing to nuclear physics to fusion energy science, focusing on basic research at our national labs provides the best opportunity for U.S. economic growth and technology innovation.

H.R. 5905 authorizes funding for critical infrastructure projects at these national labs. In the Basic Energy Sciences program, it authorizes upgrades to world-leading X-ray light source facilities around the country, like the Advanced Photon Source at Argonne National Laboratory and the Advanced Light Source at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.

These facilities give American scientists the tools they need to study the structure and behavior of both physical and biological materials, enabling innovation in many fields, including creating new materials for industrial as well as pharmaceutical use.

This legislation also authorizes the construction of new DOE research facilities for physics and high-energy physics. This includes construction of the Facility for Rare Isotope Beams, or FRIB, at Michigan State University, which will enable critical nuclear physics research across a wide breadth of fields, ranging from astrophysics to medicine, and eventually the construction of the Long-Baseline Neutrino Facility at Fermilab, an internationally coordinated project to build the world’s highest intensity neutrino beam. The research at this facility will help shed light on the universe and its origins.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, also specifically authorizes basic research in fields that are critical to U.S. dominance in science and technology. It authorizes research in exascale computing, electricity storage, and fusion energy sciences. It establishes a DOE exascale computing program, a low-dose radiation research program, and programs for managing our Energy Frontier Research Centers and Bioenergy Research Centers, while also ensuring that we fulfill our commitments to the ITER project for fiscal years 2018 and 2019.

Significant investments in basic science research by foreign countries like China threaten America’s global standing as the leader in scientific knowledge. To maintain our competitive advantage as a world leader in science, we must continue to support

the research and research infrastructure that will lead to next generation technologies.

H.R. 5905 is a commonsense bill that will maintain American leadership in science. I want to thank Chairman SMITH, Representative LOFGREN, Vice Chairman LUCAS, and many of my Science, Space, and Technology Committee colleagues for cosponsoring this important legislation. I am grateful for the opportunity to work with the members of this committee to gather research that will help America compete around the world.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5905, the Department of Energy Science and Innovation Act of 2018. This bill provides important statutory direction to the Department of Energy's Office of Science, which is our Nation's largest supporter of research in the physical sciences. So it is impossible to overstate its importance to our energy future and to our overall innovation enterprise.

This agency also operates more than 30 world-class scientific user facilities, whose applications range from developing new materials for next generation batteries, to new pharmaceuticals that will better treat diseases, to even examining the fundamental building blocks of the universe.

Much of this bill is derived from previous bipartisan, bicameral agreements that were included in H.R. 589, the House-passed Department of Energy Research and Innovation Act of 2017.

As we await Senate action on that legislation, I support moving forward with additional language included in this bill that would authorize upgrades to several important user facilities, direct DOE to provide sufficient support to maintain our commitments to the ITER international fusion project, and provide statutory authority to fund low-dose radiation research as well as a promising computational materials initiative at our national labs.

I also note that I am happy to see robust funding levels included in this bipartisan bill, particularly for the Biological and Environmental Research program, which supports critical research to reduce uncertainties and better understand the impacts of climate change. I strongly support this bill and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me thank the chairman of the Energy Subcommittee, Mr. WEBER, the gentleman from Texas, for yielding.

I strongly support this bill, H.R. 5905, the Department of Energy Science and Innovation Act of 2018. This bipartisan legislation, sponsored by 12 members of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee authorizes the basic research programs within the DOE Office of Science for fiscal years 2018 and 2019. The programs include research in basic energy sciences, advanced scientific computing, high-energy physics, biological and environmental research, fusion energy science, and nuclear physics.

These basic research programs are the core mission of the Department of Energy and will produce the scientific discoveries that will help maintain U.S. leadership in technology.

This bill also prioritizes basic research funding for solar fuels, electricity storage, bioenergy research, exascale computing, and low-dose radiation research. It provides the Office of Science funding for upgrades and construction of seven high-priority user facilities at DOE national labs.

This legislation is the product of more than 4 years of bipartisan work by the Science, Space, and Technology Committee to advance basic research and set clear science priorities for the Department of Energy.

H.R. 5905 builds on the initiatives included in the House-passed bill, H.R. 589, the Department of Energy Research and Innovation Act, and also incorporates four bipartisan Science, Space, and Technology Committee infrastructure bills that passed the House in February.

One example of the central missions authorized in the DOE Science and Innovation Act is the exascale computing program. Developing an exascale system is critical to enabling scientific discovery, strengthening national security, and promoting U.S. competitiveness. Exascale computing will have real-world benefits for American industry and entice the best researchers in the world to conduct groundbreaking science at the DOE labs.

To strengthen U.S. energy independence, this legislation also supports fusion energy sciences. When commercial fusion becomes available, it will revolutionize the energy market and could significantly reduce global carbon emissions.

H.R. 5905 also authorizes funds for U.S. contributions to the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor project, a critical step to achieving commercial fusion energy.

Again, I want to thank Representative WEBER, as well as Representative LOFGREN, for their longstanding support of basic research and investments in our world-class science facilities at the DOE national labs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

□ 1445

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL), the distinguished doctor.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5905, the Department of Energy Science and Innovation Act, sponsored by my friend and colleague Representative WEBER. His bill contains the text of my bill, the Low-Dose Radiation Research Act, which unanimously passed the House this past February.

The language directs the Department of Energy to utilize \$20 million to carry out a research program on low-dose radiation within the Office of Science. This program will increase our understanding of the health effects that low doses of radiation have on biological systems.

Research has consistently shown us the adverse health effects associated with high doses of radiation, but we are a long way from accurately assessing the effects of low doses of radiation. As the product of industrial activities, medical procedures, and naturally occurring systems, humans are exposed to low doses of radiation every day, and it is imperative we can accurately assess this risk.

There is broad consensus among the radiobiology community that more research is necessary for Federal agencies, physicians, and related experts to advance the use of radiation technologies. We have invaluable diagnostic tools today, such as CT scans, which emit low doses of radiation. It is vital that physicians are able to inform patients of the health risks associated with these types of imaging processes. As a physician in my home State of Kansas, I have a firsthand understanding of the crucial importance of verified research and ensuring the best medical outcomes for my patients.

I am proud to support this bill and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, by harnessing the strength of our national labs and investing in basic research, H.R. 5905 will help ensure Americans' leadership in science and technology.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank my 11 colleagues on the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology who have cosponsored H.R. 5905, including Chairman LAMAR SMITH, Representative ZOE LOFGREN, and Vice Chairman FRANK LUCAS. I also want to thank the dozens of researchers and stakeholders who provided feedback as we developed this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this commonsense, bipartisan legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is great legislation. Again, I want to urge the adoption of this common-sense, bipartisan legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5905, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARPA-E ACT OF 2018

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5906) to amend the America COMPETES Act to establish Department of Energy policy for Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5906

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “ARPA-E Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY-ENERGY.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Section 5012(b) of the America COMPETES Act (42 U.S.C. 16538(b)) is amended by striking “development of energy technologies” and inserting “development of transformative science and technology solutions to address energy, environmental, economic, and national security challenges”.

(b) GOALS.—Section 5012(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 16538(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1)(A) and inserting the following:

“(A) to enhance the economic and energy security of the United States through the development of energy technologies that—

“(i) reduce imports of energy from foreign sources;

“(ii) reduce energy-related emissions, including greenhouse gases;

“(iii) improve the energy efficiency of all economic sectors;

“(iv) provide transformative solutions to improve the management, clean-up, and disposal of—

“(I) low-level radioactive waste;

“(II) spent nuclear fuel; and

“(III) high-level radioactive waste;

“(v) improve efficiency and reduce the environmental impact of all forms of energy production;

“(vi) improve the resiliency, reliability, and security of the electric grid; and

“(vii) address other challenges within the mission of the Department as determined by the Secretary; and”;

and

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking “energy technology projects” and inserting “advanced technology projects”.

(c) RESPONSIBILITIES.—Section 5012(e)(3)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 16538(e)(3)(A)) is amended by striking “energy”.

(d) STRATEGIC VISION ROADMAP.—Section 5012(h)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 16538(h)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) STRATEGIC VISION ROADMAP.—In the report required under paragraph (1), the Director shall include a roadmap describing the strategic vision that ARPA-E will use to guide the choices of ARPA-E for future technology investments over the following 2 fiscal years.”.

(e) COORDINATION AND NONDUPLICATION.—Section 5012(i)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 16538(i)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Director shall ensure that—

“(A) the activities of ARPA-E are coordinated with, and do not duplicate the efforts of, programs and laboratories within the Department and other relevant research agencies; and

“(B) ARPA-E does not provide funding for a project unless the prospective grantee demonstrates sufficient attempts to secure private financing or indicates that the project is not independently commercially viable.”.

(f) EVALUATION.—Section 5012(l) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 16538(l)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the ARPA-E Act of 2018, the Secretary is authorized to enter into a contract with the National Academy of Sciences under which the National Academy shall conduct an evaluation of how well ARPA-E is achieving the goals and mission of ARPA-E.”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “shall” and inserting “is authorized to”; and

(B) by striking “the recommendation of the National Academy of Sciences” and inserting “a recommendation”.

(g) PROTECTION OF PROPRIETARY INFORMATION.—Section 5012 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 16538) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (n) as subsection (o); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (m) the following new subsection:

“(n) PROTECTION OF PROPRIETARY INFORMATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The following categories of information collected by ARPA-E from recipients of awards under this section shall be considered privileged and confidential and not subject to disclosure pursuant to section 552 of title 5, United States Code:

“(A) Plans for commercialization of technologies developed under the award, including business plans, technology-to-market plans, market studies, and cost and performance models.

“(B) Investments provided to an awardee from third parties (such as venture capital firms, hedge funds, and private equity firms), including amounts and the percentage of ownership of the awardee provided in return for the investments.

“(C) Additional financial support that the awardee—

“(i) plans to invest, or has invested, into the technology developed under the award; or

“(ii) is seeking from third parties.

“(D) Revenue from the licensing or sale of new products or services resulting from research conducted under the award.

(2) EFFECT OF SUBSECTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect—

“(A) the authority of the Secretary to use information without publicly disclosing such information; or

“(B) the responsibility of the Secretary to transmit information to Congress as required by law.”.

(h) FUNDING.—Section 5012(o)(4) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 16538(o)(4)), as redesignated by subsection (g)(1), is amended by striking “dur-

ing the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act”.

(i) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 5012(g)(3)(A)(iii) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 16538(g)(3)(A)(iii)) is amended by striking “subpart” each place it appears and inserting “subparagraph”.

(2) Section 5012(o)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 16538(o)(2)), as redesignated by subsection (g)(1), is amended by striking “paragraphs (4) and (5)” and inserting “paragraph (4)”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5906, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5906, the ARPA-E Act of 2018. This legislation requires the Department to refocus ARPA-E towards developing transformative science and technology solutions to address energy, environment, economic, and national security issues.

ARPA-E was created to ensure that the U.S. energy sector maintained a competitiveness in developing emerging energy technologies. The program was established to help develop high-potential, high-impact energy technologies that were too early stage to attract private sector investment.

ARPA-E was designed to bring this finite R&D funding for a limited time, with the intention to make quick, notable impact on the development of new energy technologies.

In order to accomplish this goal, ARPA-E was given a unique management structure, with flexibility to start and stop research projects that are no longer achieving individual goals, expedited hiring and firing authority to make sure that ARPA-E staff could adequately select and support projects, and the tools to identify market challenges that could affect the advancement in project technologies.

However, we have all heard of the concerns with ARPA-E. The first is the worry that this is just one more of the same from DOE. With the Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy program office funded at over \$2.3 billion, it is easy to see why some would ask if we need another clean energy program.

Second, we have all heard of concerns over the years that ARPA-E wasn't meeting its intended goal—to fund the kind of technologies that are so innovative they would never attract private sector investment—but was instead provided funding to big companies with

access to market capital, or funding research that was already under way in other Federal agencies or in the private sector.

The Science, Space and Technology Committee on which I serve as vice chairman particularly explored these concerns under the Obama administration. I believe there were valid concerns that must be addressed for the program to continue.

ARPA-E is a program that can have tremendous impact on the development of new energy technologies, but we can't have another agency playing favorites or handing out grants that distort our energy markets.

The bill we will consider today will address these concerns and enable ARPA-E to apply its innovative approach to a more appropriate set of technology challenges within the DOE mission, as the Trump administration sees it.

It does not—I repeat, this bill does not—authorize new spending or expand the size of the program. H.R. 5906 will refocus the mission of ARPA-E to mirror the full DOE mission and empower the Agency to promote science and technology-driven solutions.

My bill will allow the Agency to solve big challenges, like nuclear waste management and cleanup and improving the reliability, resiliency, and security of the electric grid.

The ARPA-E Act also provides important steps to prevent the duplication of research across DEO and to require applicants to indicate they have attempted to find private sector financing for a particular technology.

This is a good-government reform that is vital to ensuring that ARPA-E can't be abused for crony capitalism purposes in the future. We can't afford to spend limited taxpayer dollars competing with the private sector.

H.R. 5906 will align ARPA-E's innovative approach with the right mission goals and management. It will build on the basic science and early-stage research of the Department and help fast-track new technologies that will grow our economy.

I want to thank Chairman LAMAR SMITH and Ranking Member JOHNSON for cosponsoring this important legislation and for their leadership in advocating the reformed Agency functions within the Department of Energy's missions and goals. I am grateful for the opportunity to work alongside the other members of the committee to craft a bipartisan bill that will improve—yes, improve—a DOE research program but that still allows Congress the opportunity to reduce funding for the program as appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5906, the ARPA-E Act of 2018.

After years of successes and several independent assessments praising

ARPA-E's work, this bill is a welcomed development. It preserves the mission and flexibility of the Agency while enabling it to consider funding projects or technologies that can address DOE's monumental and longstanding challenge of environmental cleanup at the legacy sites of the Manhattan Project.

It also includes language from a bipartisan ARPA-E Reauthorization Act that our committee's ranking member, Ms. JOHNSON, introduced last year, which would ensure that sensitive business information collected by the Agency remains protected. This will enable even greater private sector engagement in its programs.

The ARPA-E projects have attracted more than \$2.6 billion in private sector follow-on funding. Mr. Speaker, 71 projects have formed new companies, and 109 have gone on to partner with other government agencies to further their research.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman LUCAS and Chairman SMITH for embracing ARPA-E's innovative model and joining our Members in supporting its reauthorization. I support this bill and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma, the vice chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology (Mr. LUCAS), for yielding me time on his bill.

The energy bill we are considering is H.R. 5906, the ARPA-E Act of 2018. It establishes clear DOE policy in a new direction and new requirements for the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy, called ARPA-E, program.

This legislation updates the mission of ARPA-E to focus on developing technological solutions to energy, economic, environmental, and national security challenges. This includes allowing ARPA-E to develop technologies to address the management, cleanup, and disposal of nuclear waste and to enhance the security and resilience of the electric grid.

H.R. 5906 also maximizes the Department's resources. It requires ARPA-E to coordinate with other DOE programs, avoid duplication, and ensures that ARPA-E grants go to innovative technologies that would not otherwise be funded by the private sector.

The bill reforms ARPA-E but does not authorize any funding for ARPA-E. Instead, H.R. 5906 provides much-needed reform to the ARPA-E program. It also leaves the door open for Congress to readdress ARPA-E funding in the future and determine if the Agency is meeting its intended purpose.

Unfortunately, there have been some mischaracterizations of this legislation, so let the RECORD be clear: Sup-

porting H.R. 5906 will not prevent Congress from cutting—as we did in the House-passed Energy and Water Appropriations bill earlier this month—or even eliminating funding to ARPA-E in the future. Instead, it allows us to enact reforms today that refocus ARPA-E on technology within the DOE mission.

In addition, one organization that opposes this legislation apparently didn't read the bill and confused it with another bill that reauthorizes ARPA-E.

Mr. Speaker, thanks go to Vice Chairman LUCAS and Ranking Member JOHNSON for their work on this reform bill and for their support of advanced research around the country.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to mention one more thing, and it might be of interest to all Members, even those who are not on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee. After this bill passes, of the 27 bills that the Science, Space, and Technology Committee has brought to the House floor, 24 of the 27 have, in fact, been bipartisan pieces of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, reforming the mission and the goals of ARPA-E will transform the Agency to do what the DOE does best: develop innovative technology solutions to complex science, energy, and national security challenges.

I again want to thank my nine colleagues on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee who cosponsored H.R. 5906, including Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member JOHNSON. I want to thank the new leadership staff at ARPA-E and the Department of Energy, who provided technical comments and policy recommendations as we developed this legislation.

I urge the adoption of this bipartisan, good-government legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I am very pleased to support H.R. 5906, the ARPA-E Act of 2018.

Even though the agency is still relatively young, ARPA-E has already demonstrated incredible success in advancing high-risk, high-reward energy technology solutions that neither the public nor the private sector had been willing or able to support in the past. This was highlighted in a Congressionally mandated National Academies review of the agency released last year. Industry leaders like Norm Augustine and Bill Gates have repeatedly called for tripling this agency's budget given the unique role that it is now playing in our energy innovation pipeline.

ARPA-E's impressive track record includes over \$2.6 billion in private sector follow-on funding for a group of 136 ARPA-E projects since the agency's founding in 2009. Equally notable, 71 projects have formed new companies and 109 projects have shown enough promise to result in partnerships with other government agencies for further development.

And I'd be remiss if I didn't refer my colleagues to DOE Secretary Perry's address to the ARPA-E Energy Innovation Summit in March, where he said, and I quote, "ARPA-E is one of the reasons DOE has had and is having such a profound impact on American lives." I couldn't have said this better myself.

The ARPA-E Act of 2018 maintains the structure and nimbleness of this critical agency while also enabling it to help tackle one of the Department of Energy's most expensive, intransigent problems, which is managing and remediating the legacy waste sites from our nation's past production of nuclear weapons. The bill also includes language from the bipartisan ARPA-E Reauthorization Act that I introduced last year which would ensure that sensitive business information collected by the agency remains protected. This will enable even greater private sector engagement in future ARPA-E projects and programs.

I would like to thank Mr. LUCAS and Chairman SMITH for working with me to introduce this bill, and I hope that all Members will support this critical investment in our nation's clean energy future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5906, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1500

NATIONAL INNOVATION MODERNIZATION BY LABORATORY EMPOWERMENT ACT

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5907) to provide directors of the National Laboratories signature authority for certain agreements, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5907

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Innovation Modernization by Laboratory Empowerment Act" or the "NIMBLE Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) DEPARTMENT.—The term "Department" means the Department of Energy.

(2) NATIONAL LABORATORY.—The term "National Laboratory" means a Department of Energy nonmilitary national laboratory, including—

- (A) Ames Laboratory;
- (B) Argonne National Laboratory;
- (C) Brookhaven National Laboratory;
- (D) Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory;
- (E) Idaho National Laboratory;
- (F) Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory;
- (G) National Energy Technology Laboratory;
- (H) National Renewable Energy Laboratory;

- (I) Oak Ridge National Laboratory;
- (J) Pacific Northwest National Laboratory;
- (K) Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory;
- (L) Savannah River National Laboratory;
- (M) Stanford Linear Accelerator Center;
- (N) Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility; and

(O) any laboratory operated by the National Nuclear Security Administration, but only with respect to the civilian energy activities thereof.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Energy.

SEC. 3. PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS FOR COMMERCIALIZATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), the Secretary shall delegate to directors of the National Laboratories signature authority with respect to any agreement described in subsection (b) the total cost of which (including the National Laboratory contributions and project recipient cost share) is less than \$1,000,000, if such an agreement falls within the scope of—

(1) a strategic plan for the National Laboratory that has been approved by the Department; or

(2) the most recent congressionally approved budget for Department activities to be carried out by the National Laboratory.

(b) AGREEMENTS.—Subsection (a) applies to—

(1) a cooperative research and development agreement;

(2) a non-Federal work-for-others agreement; and

(3) any other agreement determined to be appropriate by the Secretary, in collaboration with the directors of the National Laboratories.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) ACCOUNTABILITY.—The director of the affected National Laboratory and the affected contractor shall carry out an agreement under this section in accordance with applicable policies of the Department, including by ensuring that the agreement does not compromise any national security, economic, or environmental interest of the United States.

(2) CERTIFICATION.—The director of the affected National Laboratory and the affected contractor shall certify that each activity carried out under a project for which an agreement is entered into under this section does not present, or minimizes, any apparent conflict of interest, and avoids or neutralizes any actual conflict of interest, as a result of the agreement under this section.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF RECORDS.—Within 30 days of entering an agreement under this section, the director of a National Laboratory shall submit to the Secretary for monitoring and review all records of the National Laboratory relating to the agreement.

(4) RATES.—The director of a National Laboratory may charge higher rates for services performed under a partnership agreement entered into pursuant to this section, regardless of the full cost of recovery, if such funds are used exclusively to support further research and development activities at the respective National Laboratory.

(d) EXCEPTION.—This section does not apply to any agreement with a majority foreign-owned company.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 12 of the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3710a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and indenting the subparagraphs appropriately;

(B) by striking "Each Federal agency" and inserting the following:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), each Federal agency"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), in accordance with section 3(a) of the NIMBLE Act, approval by the Secretary of Energy shall not be required for any technology transfer agreement proposed to be entered into by a National Laboratory of the Department of Energy, the total cost of which (including the National Laboratory contributions and project recipient cost share) is less than \$1,000,000."; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking "subsection (a)(1)" each place it appears and inserting "subsection (a)(1)(A)".

SEC. 4. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

Nothing in this Act or an amendment made by this Act abrogates or otherwise affects the primary responsibilities of any National Laboratory to the Department.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of bipartisan legislation I introduced with my good friend from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) to give our national labs the tools they need to better work with outside entities, develop new technologies, and let new business ideas come out of our world-leading research facilities.

As you have heard today with the prior bills passed on the floor, the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee has done tremendous bipartisan work to support our national laboratories and research infrastructure.

I thank Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member JOHNSON—both from Texas—for their bipartisan work on this package, and I was pleased to see my prior past research infrastructure legislation dealing with upgrades at Fermilab, Argonne National Laboratory, and Oak Ridge National Laboratory included in that package.

Our national labs are often referred to as the crown jewels in our research ecosystem here in the United States. Secretary Perry has referred to them as national treasures. These labs house some of the largest, most complicated research equipment in the world, which no one business or research university would ever be able to support.

Our national labs also maintain a number of user facilities where university researchers, other Federal agencies, and the private sector can work with these tools, so long as this work does not interfere with the mission of the department or the lab.

The problem we have with many agreements is simply the time that it takes to negotiate and finalize an agreement. Currently, after a lab makes a determination on an agreement, that agreement must then go through a separate review by the department. While I wholeheartedly agree in our need for thorough oversight, what we are attempting to do is to set a threshold so that smaller agreements do not need to go through this additional review process.

All national labs, except one, have been set up under a government-owned, contractor-operated model. What my bill would do is strengthen this arrangement by giving the labs the necessary trust they need to remain nimble, being able to react to the needs of the private sector and with other researchers being able to come in.

When many researchers need to use a facility for just a few hours, they, obviously, will not wait around 90 days for the government. The private sector does not move at the pace of government, nor should we expect it to. This legislation would cut out some of the red tape of working with the lab, so that the private sector could take good ideas and do what they do best: innovate and react to the market.

With the increased reporting requirements for these agreements, I believe this strikes the proper balance for oversight with the department and the intentions of Congress in creating the government-owned, contractor-operated model for the labs.

I am grateful for the Secretary at our recent hearing signaling his willingness to work with this idea. I believe it fits with the administration's priorities in removing red tape where it is not needed and freeing the private sector up to innovate and bring new ideas to the marketplace.

So I thank my colleagues for their work on this legislation. I also thank the chairman for his cosponsorship of this bill, as well as his leadership on the package of bills authorizing the Office of Science and other DOE activities.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to support passage of this important legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5907, the National Innovation Modernization by Laboratory Empowerment Act.

This bill would provide our national laboratories with the authority to directly enter into certain research agreements with the private sector, as long as those activities align with the laboratories' strategic plans approved by the Department of Energy. This bill also includes appropriate safeguards to prevent waste, fraud, or abuse of this provision.

This language previously passed the House as part of bipartisan legislation that we considered in the last Con-

gress. I am happy to see this important policy change is moving forward once again.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill. I encourage my colleagues to do the same, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the very effective and helpful chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, and also cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HULTGREN for yielding me time on his bill, H.R. 5907, the National Innovation Modernization by Laboratory Empowerment Act, or NIMBLE Act.

This legislation authorizes the Secretary of Energy to provide signature authority to the directors of the national laboratories, allowing these lab directors to make funding decisions on cooperative agreements with industry where the total cost is less than \$1 million.

This commonsense reform provides the labs with more flexibility and eliminates the red tape and bureaucratic process that makes it difficult for businesses to partner with the labs.

DOE national labs can provide the private sector with access to critical research infrastructure as they develop new technologies. But a burdensome approval process can smother an industry's interest and constrict the pace of technology development. This bill gives the labs freedom to pursue agreements that will increase U.S. competitiveness and maintain our innovation and productivity leadership.

I thank Representative RANDY HULTGREN again and this bill's 10 Science, Space, and Technology Committee's cosponsors, including Representative ED PERLMUTTER, Vice Chairman FRANK LUCAS, Energy Subcommittee Chairman RANDY WEBER, and Energy Subcommittee Vice Chairman Steve Knight for their ongoing support of DOE's world-leading national laboratories.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say about Mr. HULTGREN that his leadership on the committee has been appreciated for years. He has never failed to be an effective advocate and leader for the national labs. This is a good example of his interests being put into legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, again, I thank my good friend from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) for his support on this bill. I especially want to thank my really good friend from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, for his important support on this bill. It really is a commonsense bill. It is one that has passed previous Congresses with strong, bipartisan support.

Our labs are a treasure, but they are also a great benefit for innovation. This allows that innovation to continue working, again, on smaller agreements, for those to be able to move more quickly, when, oftentimes, business need to move that quickly. The labs can do this, but if they had to go through the whole cumbersome process of coming through Washington, they wouldn't be able to.

So, again, this is commonsense and bipartisan, and I thank all of the cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5907.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 5515, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5515) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to instruct conferees at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Carbajal moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 5515 be instructed to agree to section 703 of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the motion to instruct.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this motion would bring TRICARE contraception on par with the Affordable Care Act by prohibiting cost sharing for any method of contraception provided in the TRICARE retail pharmacy network or mail order.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation's servicemembers should be provided the same access to preventive healthcare as those insured under the Affordable Care Act.

Currently, TRICARE beneficiaries, including non-Active servicemembers and their dependents, and certain Active military members, do not have the same access to cost-free preventive care as civilians do.

By requiring coverage for contraceptives with no out-of-pocket costs, the ACA increases women's access to contraceptives and saves women \$255 per year, on average. This is a benefit we currently deny our female servicemembers. One-third of our U.S. military are women. Currently, about 15 percent of Active Duty servicemembers and 19 percent of the Reserve forces are comprised of women.

Women are bravely serving in all parts of the military, including infantry and other combat units. Servicewomen are continuing to break barriers across the military, proving again and again that they are indispensable when it comes to defending this Nation.

Unfortunately, this House continues to refuse these brave servicemembers access to the same healthcare that all civilian females have access to.

Preventive healthcare services, including contraception, should be provided to all TRICARE beneficiaries without any copays. Access to preventive healthcare is vital for the health and quality of life of all women serving this Nation, but it is also critical to the readiness of our military.

In 2008, researchers found that the rate of unintended pregnancy was roughly 50 percent higher among servicemembers compared to the general population. This problem is made worse by the fact that it is often difficult for female servicemembers to access this preventive medication in the field.

Another recent study found that, among servicemembers who use contraceptives, only 24 percent brought enough medication to last their entire deployment. Forty-one percent of those needing refills found them difficult to obtain while deployed on Active Duty.

We should not make it more difficult for these women to access contraception by asking them to pay for medication that the civilian population already receives at no cost. We are doing

an absolute disservice to those who are willing to sacrifice their lives to defend our Nation every day by denying them preventive healthcare that is critical to treat certain health conditions and for family planning.

The Senate has included this TRICARE provision in their bill for the past 2 years because they understand this issue goes beyond political parties and personal views. This is about the health and well-being of those who are sacrificing their lives every day to defend our Nation. This is about providing the resources and delivering policies to the military that will increase readiness.

This motion would provide all servicemembers access to preventive healthcare, which they not only deserve, but are entitled to, and I would say earned.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, today, to put politics aside and follow in the Senate's footsteps and support this motion.

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

□ 1515

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California has just laid out a number of arguments in support of a Senate provision. There are obviously Members who may think differently on his arguments, although I do not believe this is the time or the place to have that debate. That will be discussed in the course of the upcoming conference with the Senate.

At this point, I would just like to offer two thoughts. One is the provision that the gentleman talks about requires that there be a mandatory spending offset. Now, when you look for how that spending can be offset, really, the Armed Services Committee only has two ways: one is to increase TRICARE copays, pharmacy copays, and the second one is to reduce retirement benefits. So I notice that the gentleman's motion to instruct does not deal with that part of the equation.

My thought is that it is far better to look at the whole universe of issues in the course of a conference rather than to try to dictate one outcome or another that doesn't include how you pay for something.

Second point, Mr. Speaker, there are 907 House provisions and 603 Senate provisions that will be the subject of this conference. They will all have to be hashed out in one way or another, but the conferees should have the flexibility to deal with all of those 907 and 603 provisions in a way that makes the most sense for national security.

So my suggestion is that the House reject this particular motion and allow the conferees to do their work in looking at the whole universe of what is best for the men and women who serve and what is best for the country's national security.

Mr. Speaker, I would inform the gentleman that I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate those comments from my good friend and chairman of the Armed Services Committee, but the fact of the matter is that, for 2 years, we have not been able, in conference, to address this very important issue. There is always one excuse or a barrier raised at one time or another. And, in fact, what ends up resulting is our servicewomen, who are putting their lives on the line for our country, are being treated as second-class citizens. They are not afforded the same equality as their male counterparts and those in the civilian world.

Mr. Speaker, what this motion does is simply achieve parity with prevailing law. I want to point out that TRICARE beneficiaries want this parity, and it is time we finally deliver.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this motion. Let us finally provide all servicemembers with the same access to preventive healthcare that we all have access to.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to say that there are a number of provisions which Members on one side or the other consider inequitable, and a big part of the challenge we face is, okay, to enact a particular provision, you have to pay for it.

So my point is we need to look at the whole universe not only of what we would like to have done, but also of how it would be paid for.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to instruct conferees will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to close conference.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 188, nays 231, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 300]

YEAS—188

Adams	Beyer	Boyle, Brendan
Aguilar	Bishop (GA)	F.
Barragán	Blumenauer	Brady (PA)
Bass	Blunt Rochester	Brown (MD)
Beatty	Bonamici	Brownley (CA)
Bera		Bustos

Butterfield Heck
 Capuano Higgins (NY)
 Carbajal Himes
 Cárdenas Hoyer
 Carson (IN) Huffman
 Cartwright Jackson Lee
 Castor (FL) Jayapal
 Castro (TX) Jeffries
 Chu, Judy Johnson (GA)
 Cicilline Johnson, E. B.
 Clark (MA) Kaptur
 Clarke (NY) Keating
 Clay Kelly (IL)
 Cleaver Kennedy
 Clyburn Khanna
 Cohen Kihuen
 Connolly Kildee
 Cooper Kilmer
 Correa Kild
 Costa Krishnamoorthi
 Courtney Kuster (NH)
 Crist Lamb
 Cuellar Langevin
 Cummings Larson (WA)
 Davis (CA) Larson (CT)
 Davis, Danny Lawrence
 DeFazio Lawson (FL)
 DeGette Lee
 Delaney Levin
 DeLauro Lewis (GA)
 DelBene Lieu, Ted
 Demings Lipinski
 DeSaulnier Loebsock
 Deutch Lofgren
 Dingell Lowenthal
 Doggett Lowey
 Doyle, Michael F. Lujan Grisham, M.
 Ellison Luján, Ben Ray
 Engel Lynch
 Eshoo Maloney,
 Espaillat Carolyn B.
 Esty (CT) Maloney, Sean
 Evans Matsui
 Foster McCollum
 Frankel (FL) McEachin
 Fudge McGovern
 Gabbard McNerney
 Gallego Meeks
 Garamendi Meng
 Gomez Moore
 Gonzalez (TX) Moulton
 Gottheimer Murphy (FL)
 Green, Al Nadler
 Green, Gene Napolitano
 Grijalva Neal
 Gutiérrez Nolan
 Hanabusa Norcross
 Hastings O'Halleran

NAYS—231

Abraham Collins (NY)
 Aderholt Comer
 Allen Comstock
 Amash Conaway
 Amodei Cook
 Arrington Costello (PA)
 Babin Crawford
 Bacon Culberson
 Banks (IN) Curbelo (FL)
 Barletta Curtis
 Barr Davidson
 Barton Davis, Rodney
 Bergman Denham
 Biggs DeSantis
 Billirakis DesJarlais
 Bishop (MI) Diaz-Balart
 Bishop (UT) Donovan
 Blackburn Duffy
 Blum Duncan (SC)
 Bost Duncan (TN)
 Brady (TX) Dunn
 Brat Emmer
 Brooks (AL) Estes (KS)
 Brooks (IN) Faso
 Buchanan Ferguson
 Buck Fitzpatrick
 Bucshon Fleischmann
 Budd Flores
 Burgess Fortenberry
 Byrne Foxx
 Calvert Frelinghuysen
 Carter (GA) Gaetz
 Carter (TX) Gallagher
 Chabot Garrett
 Cheney Gianforte
 Coffman Gibbs
 Cole Gohmert
 Collins (GA) Goodlatte

O'Rourke Kinzinger
 Pallone Knutson
 Panetta Kustoff (TN)
 Pascrell Labrador
 Payne LaHood
 Pelosi LaMalfa
 Perlmutter Lamborn
 Peters Lance
 Peterson Latta
 Pingree Lesko
 Pocan Lewis (MN)
 Polis LoBiondo
 Price (NC) Long
 Quigley Loudermilk
 Raskin Love
 Rice (NY) Lucas
 Richmond Luetkemeyer
 Rosen MacArthur
 Roybal-Allard Marino
 Ruiz Marshall
 Ruppersberger Marshall
 Ryan (OH) Massie
 Sánchez Rooney, Francis
 Sarbanes J.
 Schakowsky McCaul
 Schiff McClintock
 Schneider McHenry
 Schrader McKinley
 Scott (VA) McMorris
 Scott, David Rodgers
 Serrano Royce (CA)
 Sewell (AL) Meadows
 Shea-Porter Messer
 Sherman Mitchell
 Sinema Moolenaar
 Sires Mooney (WV)
 Smith (WA) Mullin
 Soto Newhouse
 Speier Neom
 Suozzi Norman
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Titus
 Tonko
 Torres
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters, Maxine
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

Nunes Shuster
 Olson Simpson
 Palazzo Smith (MO)
 Palmer Smith (NE)
 Paulsen Smith (NJ)
 Pearce Smith (TX)
 Perry Smucker
 Pittenger Stefaniak
 Poe (TX) Stewart
 Poliquin Stivers
 Posey Taylor
 Ratcliffe Tenney
 Reed Thompson (PA)
 Reichert Thornberry
 Renacci Tipton
 Rice (SC) Trott
 Roby Turner
 Roe (TN) Upton
 Rogers (AL) Valadao
 Rogers (KY) Wagner
 Rohrabacher Walberg
 Rokita Walden
 Rooney, Francis Walker
 Rooney, Thomas Walorski
 J. Walters, Mimi
 Ros-Lehtinen Weber (TX)
 Roskam Webster (FL)
 Ross Wenstrup
 Rothfus Westerman
 Rouzer Williams
 Royce (CA) Wilson (SC)
 Russell Wittman
 Rutherford Womack
 Sanford Woodall
 Scalise Yoder
 Schweikert Yoho
 Scott, Austin Young (AK)
 Sensenbrenner Young (IA)
 Sessions Zeldin
 Shimkus

NOT VOTING—8

Black Gosar
 Cramer Rush
 Crowley Thompson (MS)
 Tsongas
 Walz

□ 1547

Messrs. DUNCAN of South Carolina, POSEY, LAMALFA, GAETZ, LONG, YOUNG of Alaska, and LOUDERMILK changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. ADAMS, Messrs. LARSON of Connecticut and HASTINGS, and Ms. MCCOLLUM changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to instruct conferees was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO PERMIT CLOSED CONFERENCE MEETINGS ON H.R. 5515, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 12 of rule XXII, I move that meetings of the conference between the House and Senate on H.R. 5515 may be closed to the public at such times as classified national security information may be discussed, provided that any sitting Member of Congress shall be entitled to attend any meeting of the conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule XXII, the motion is not debatable, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 403, nays 15, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 301]

YEAS—403

Abraham Denham
 Adams DeSantis
 Aderholt DeSaulnier
 Aguilar DesJarlais
 Allen Deutch
 Amodei Diaz-Balart
 Arrington Dingell
 Babin Doggett
 Bacon Donovan
 Banks (IN) Doyle, Michael F.
 Barletta F.
 Barr Duffy
 Barragan Duncan (SC)
 Barton Duncan (TN)
 Bass Dunn
 Beatty Emmer
 Bera Engel
 Bergman Eshoo
 Beyrer Espaillat
 Biggs Estes (KS)
 Billirakis Esty (CT)
 Bishop (GA) Evans
 Bishop (MI) Faso
 Bishop (UT) Ferguson
 Blackburn Fitzpatrick
 Blum Fleischmann
 Blunt Rochester Flores
 Bonamici Fortenberry
 Bost Foster
 Boyle, Brendan F.
 Brady (PA) Frankel (FL)
 Brady (TX) Frelinghuysen
 Brat Fudge
 Brooks (AL) Gabbard
 Brooks (IN) Gaetz
 Brown (MD) Gallagher
 Brownley (CA) Gallego
 Buchanan Garamendi
 Buck Garrett
 Bucshon Gianforte
 Budd Gibbs
 Burgess Gohmert
 Bustos Gomez
 Butterfield Gonzalez (TX)
 Byrne Goodlatte
 Calvert Gottheimer
 Capuano Gowdy
 Carbajal Granger
 Cárdenas Graves (GA)
 Carson (IN) Graves (LA)
 Carter (GA) Graves (MO)
 Carter (TX) Green, Al
 Cartwright Green, Gene
 Castor (FL) Griffith
 Castro (TX) Grijalva
 Chabot Grothman
 Cheney Guthrie
 Chu, Judy Gutiérrez
 Cicilline Hanabusa
 Clark (MA) Handel
 Clarke (NY) Harper
 Clay Harris
 Cleaver Hartzler
 Clyburn Hastings
 Coffman Heck
 Cohen Hensarling
 Collins (GA) Herrera Beutler
 Collins (NY) Hice, Jody B.
 Comer Higgins (LA)
 Comstock Hill
 Conaway Hollingsworth
 Connolly Hoyer
 Cook Hudson
 Cooper Huffman
 Correa Huizenga
 Costa Hultgren
 Costello (PA) Hunter
 Courtney Hurd
 Crawford Issa
 Crist Jackson Lee
 Cuellar Jeffries
 Culberson Jenkins (KS)
 Cummings Jenkins (WV)
 Curbelo (FL) Johnson (GA)
 Curtis Johnson (LA)
 Davidson Johnson (OH)
 Davis (CA) Johnson (OH)
 Davis, Danny Johnson, E. B.
 Davis, Rodney Johnson, Sam
 DeGette Jordan
 Delaney Joyce (OH)
 DeLauro Katko
 DelBene Kelly (MS)
 Demings Kelly (PA)
 King (IA)
 King (NY)

Kelly (IL)
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 Kennedy
 Khanna
 Kihuen
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger
 Knight
 Krishnamoorthi
 Kuster (NH)
 Kustoff (TN)
 Labrador
 LaHood
 LaMalfa
 Lamb
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latta
 Lawrence
 Lawson (FL)
 Lesko
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (MN)
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loebsock
 Lofgren
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Love
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lujan Grisham, M.
 Luján, Ben Ray
 Lynch
 MacArthur
 Maloney,
 Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean
 Marchant
 Marino
 Marshall
 Mast
 Matsui
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McEachin
 McHenry
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNerney
 McSally
 Meadows
 Meng
 Messer
 Mitchell
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Moulton
 Mullin
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Newhouse
 Neom
 Nolan
 Norcross
 Norman
 Nunes
 O'Halleran
 O'Rourke
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Pallone
 Palmer
 Panetta
 Pascrell
 Paulsen
 Payne

Pearce	Rutherford	Thompson (PA)
Pelosi	Ryan (OH)	Thornberry
Perlmutter	Sánchez	Tipton
Perry	Sanford	Titus
Peters	Sarbanes	Torres
Peterson	Scalise	Trott
Pingree	Schakowsky	Turner
Pittenger	Schiff	Upton
Poe (TX)	Schneider	Valadao
Poliquin	Schrader	Vargas
Posey	Schweikert	Veasey
Price (NC)	Scott (VA)	Vela
Quigley	Scott, Austin	Velázquez
Raskin	Scott, David	Visclosky
Ratcliffe	Sensenbrenner	Wagner
Reed	Serrano	Walberg
Reichert	Sessions	Walden
Renacci	Sewell (AL)	Walker
Rice (NY)	Shea-Porter	Walorski
Rice (SC)	Sherman	Walters, Mimi
Richmond	Shimkus	Wasserman
Roby	Shuster	Schultz
Roe (TN)	Simpson	Waters, Maxine
Rogers (AL)	Sinema	Weber (TX)
Rogers (KY)	Sires	Webster (FL)
Rohrabacher	Smith (MO)	Welch
Rokita	Smith (NE)	Wenstrup
Rooney, Francis	Smith (NJ)	Westerman
Rooney, Thomas J.	Smith (WA)	Williams
	Smucker	Wilson (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen	Soto	Wilson (SC)
Rosen	Speier	Wittman
Roskam	Stefanik	Womack
Ross	Stewart	Woodall
Rothfus	Stivers	Yarmuth
Rouzer	Suozzi	Yoder
Roybal-Allard	Swalwell (CA)	Yoho
Royce (CA)	Takano	Young (AK)
Ruiz	Taylor	Young (IA)
Ruppersberger	Tenney	Zeldin
Russell	Thompson (CA)	

NAYS—15

Amash	Jones	Moore
Blumenauer	Lee	Pocan
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Polis
Ellison	Massie	Tonko
Jayapal	McGovern	Watson Coleman

NOT VOTING—9

Black	Gosar	Thompson (MS)
Cramer	Rush	Tsongas
Crowley	Smith (TX)	Walz

□ 1555

So the motion to close portions of the conference was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 961 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 6157.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) kindly take the chair.

□ 1556

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6157) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, with Mr. HULTGREN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on June 26, 2018, amendment No. 24 printed in part

A of House Report 115-783 offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House Report 115-783 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. LANGEVIN of Rhode Island, and

Amendment No. 20 by Mr. POE of Texas.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 228, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 302]

AYES—188

Abraham	Delaney	Khanna
Allen	DeLauro	Kihuen
Babin	Demings	King (NY)
Bacon	DeSantis	Knight
Banks (IN)	Dingell	Lamb
Bass	Donovan	Lamborn
Beatty	Duffy	Lance
Bera	Emmer	Langevin
Bergman	Estes (KS)	Larsen (WA)
Bilirakis	Esty (CT)	Larson (CT)
Bishop (GA)	Fitzpatrick	Lawrence
Bishop (UT)	Flores	Lewis (MN)
Blunt Rochester	Foster	Lieu, Ted
Brady (PA)	Fudge	Lipinski
Brooks (AL)	Gabbard	LoBiondo
Brooks (IN)	Gaetz	Love
Brown (MD)	Gallagher	Lowey
Budd	Gallego	Lynch
Butterfield	Garamendi	Maloney
Capuano	Garrett	Carolyn B.
Carbajal	Gianforte	Maloney, Sean
Cárdenas	Gohmert	Marchant
Carson (IN)	Gonzalez (TX)	McCaul
Carter (TX)	Gottheimer	McEachin
Cartwright	Graves (GA)	McGovern
Castro (TX)	Graves (MO)	McNerney
Cheney	Green, Gene	McSally
Cicilline	Gutiérrez	Meeks
Clay	Hanabusa	Messer
Cleaver	Harper	Mitchell
Clyburn	Hartzler	Mooney (WV)
Coffman	Hastings	Moulton
Cohen	Hice, Jody B.	Murphy (FL)
Comstock	Higgins (LA)	Napolitano
Conaway	Higgins (NY)	Neal
Cook	Himes	Newhouse
Correa	Hoyer	Nolan
Costa	Hunter	Norcross
Costello (PA)	Jeffries	O'Halleran
Courtney	Johnson (GA)	Olson
Cuellar	Johnson, E. B.	Palazzo
Culberson	Katko	Panetta
Cummings	Keating	Pascroll
Davis (CA)	Kelly (IL)	Paulsen
DeFazio	Kelly (MS)	Pelosi
DeGette	Kennedy	Perlmutter

Peters	Sánchez	Torres
Peterson	Sanford	Turner
Pingree	Schweikert	Veasey
Poe (TX)	Sensenbrenner	Vela
Poliquin	Sewell (AL)	Wagner
Posey	Sherman	Walden
Quigley	Sinema	Walorski
Richmond	Smith (MO)	Wasserman
Rogers (AL)	Smith (NE)	Schultz
Rohrabacher	Smith (NJ)	Weber (TX)
Rooney, Francis	Smith (WA)	Webster (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen	Soto	Wenstrup
Rosen	Speier	Wilson (SC)
Rothfus	Stefanik	Woodall
Ruiz	Stewart	Yoho
Ruppersberger	Suozzi	Zeldin
Russell	Tenney	
Ryan (OH)	Thornberry	

NOES—228

Adams	Graves (LA)	Nunes
Aderholt	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Aguilar	Griffith	Pallone
Amash	Grijalva	Palmer
Amodei	Grothman	Payne
Arrington	Guthrie	Pearce
Barletta	Handel	Perry
Barr	Harris	Pittenger
Barragán	Heck	Pocan
Barton	Hensarling	Polis
Beyer	Herrera Beutler	Price (NC)
Biggs	Hill	Raskin
Bishop (MI)	Holding	Ratcliffe
Blackburn	Hollingsworth	Reed
Blum	Hudson	Reichert
Blumenauer	Huffman	Renacci
Bonamici	Rice (NY)	Rice (SC)
Bost	Hultgren	Roby
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hurd	Roe (TN)
Brady (TX)	Jackson Lee	Rogers (KY)
Brat	Jayapal	Rokita
Brownley (CA)	Jenkins (KS)	Rooney, Thomas J.
Buchanan	Jenkins (WV)	Roskam
Buck	Johnson (LA)	Ross
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Rouzer
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Roybal-Allard
Bustos	Jones	Royce (CA)
Byrne	Jordan	Rutherford
Calvert	Joyce (OH)	Sarbanes
Carter (GA)	Kaptur	Scalise
Castor (FL)	Kelly (PA)	Schakowsky
Chabot	Kildee	Schiff
Chu, Judy	Kilmer	Schneider
Clark (MA)	Kind	Schrader
Clarke (NY)	King (IA)	Scott (VA)
Cole	Kinzinger	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	Krishnamoorthi	Scott, David
Collins (NY)	Kuster (NH)	Serrano
Comer	Kustoff (TN)	Sessions
Connolly	LaHood	Shea-Porter
Cooper	LaMalfa	Shimkus
Crawford	Latta	Shuster
Crist	Lawson (FL)	Simpson
Curbelo (FL)	Lee	Sires
Davidson	Lesko	Smucker
Davis, Danny	Levin	Stivers
Davis, Rodney	Lewis (GA)	Swalwell (CA)
DelBene	Loeb sack	Takano
Denham	Lofgren	Taylor
DeSaulnier	Long	Thompson (CA)
DesJarlais	Loudermilk	Thompson (PA)
Deutch	Lowenthal	Tipton
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Titus
Doggett	Luetkemeyer	Tonko
Doyle, Michael F.	Lujan Grisham,	Trott
Duncan (SC)	M.	Upton
Duncan (TN)	Luján, Ben Ray	Valadao
Dunn	MacArthur	Vargas
Ellison	Marino	Veázquez
Engel	Marshall	Visclosky
Eshoo	Massie	Walberg
Espallat	Mast	Walker
Evans	Matsui	Walters, Mimi
Faso	McCarthy	Waters, Maxine
Ferguson	McClintock	Watson Coleman
Fleischmann	McCollum	Welch
Fortenberry	McHenry	Westerman
Fox	McKinley	Williams
Frankel (FL)	McMorris	Wilson (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Rodgers	Wittman
Gibbs	Meadows	Womack
Gomez	Meng	Yarmuth
Goodlatte	Moolenaar	Yoder
Gosar	Mullin	Young (AK)
Gowdy	Nadler	Young (IA)
Granger	Noem	
	Norman	

NOT VOTING—11

Black	Issa	Thompson (MS)
Cramer	Labrador	Tsongas
Crowley	Rush	Walz
Curtis	Smith (TX)	

□ 1602

Mses. ADAMS, KAPTUR, and Mr. LEVIN changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. PAULSEN and LANCE changed their vote from “no” to “aye.” So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 175, noes 241, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 303]

AYES—175

Abraham	Gallagher	Loudermilk
Allen	Garrett	Luetkemeyer
Amash	Gianforte	Marchant
Arrington	Gibbs	Marino
Babin	Gohmert	Massie
Bacon	Goodlatte	Mast
Banks (IN)	Gosar	McClintock
Barton	Gottheimer	McKinley
Biggs	Gowdy	McMorris
Bilirakis	Graves (GA)	Rodgers
Bishop (MI)	Graves (LA)	McSally
Blackburn	Graves (MO)	Meadows
Blum	Green, Gene	Messer
Brady (TX)	Griffith	Mooney (WV)
Brat	Grothman	Moulton
Brooks (AL)	Guthrie	Mullin
Buck	Harper	Nadler
Bueshon	Hartzler	Napolitano
Budd	Herrera Beutler	Newhouse
Burgess	Hice, Jody B.	Nolan
Carter (GA)	Higgins (LA)	Norman
Castor (FL)	Higgins (NY)	O'Rourke
Chabot	Hill	Olson
Coffman	Holding	Palazzo
Cohen	Hudson	Palmer
Collins (GA)	Huizenga	Paulsen
Collins (NY)	Hultgren	Pearce
Comer	Hunter	Perry
Comstock	Jenkins (KS)	Poe (TX)
Cook	Jenkins (WV)	Poliquin
Crawford	Johnson (LA)	Posey
Culberson	Johnson (OH)	Ratcliffe
Cummings	Johnson, Sam	Reed
Curbelo (FL)	Jones	Renacci
Davidson	Jordan	Rice (SC)
Davis, Rodney	Katko	Roe (TN)
DeSantis	Keating	Rohrabacher
DesJarlais	Kelly (MS)	Rokita
Doggett	Kind	Rooney, Francis
Donovan	King (IA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Duffy	King (NY)	Ross
Duncan (SC)	Knight	Rothfus
Duncan (TN)	Kustoff (TN)	Rouzer
Emmer	LaHood	Royce (CA)
Estes (KS)	LaMalfa	Russell
Ferguson	Lesko	Sanford
Fox	Lewis (MN)	Scalise
Gabbard	Lofgren	Schweikert
Gaetz	Long	Sensenbrenner

Sherman	Trott	Wenstrup
Smith (MO)	Upton	Westerman
Smith (NE)	Vargas	Williams
Smith (NJ)	Wagner	Wittman
Stefanik	Walberg	Woodall
Stivers	Walden	Yoder
Tenney	Walker	Yoho
Thompson (PA)	Walters, Mimi	Young (AK)
Tipton	Weber (TX)	Zeldin
Tonko	Webster (FL)	

NOES—241

Adams	Frelinghuysen	Norcross
Aderholt	Fudge	Nunes
Aguilar	Gallego	O'Halleran
Amodei	Garamendi	Pallone
Barietta	Gomez	Panetta
Barr	Gonzalez (TX)	Pascrell
Barragán	Granger	Payne
Bass	Green, Al	Pelosi
Beatty	Grijalva	Perlmutter
Bera	Gutiérrez	Peters
Bergman	Hanabusa	Peterson
Beyer	Handel	Pingree
Bishop (GA)	Harris	Pittenger
Bishop (UT)	Hastings	Pocan
Blumenauer	Heck	Polis
Blunt Rochester	Hensarling	Price (NC)
Bonamici	Himes	Quigley
Bost	Hollingsworth	Raskin
Boyle, Brendan	Hoyer	Reichert
F.	Huffman	Rice (NY)
Brady (PA)	Hurd	Richmond
Brooks (IN)	Jackson Lee	Roby
Brown (MD)	Jayapal	Rogers (AL)
Brownley (CA)	Jeffries	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Johnson (GA)	Rooney, Thomas
Bustos	Johnson, E. B.	J.
Butterfield	Joyce (OH)	Rosen
Byrne	Kaptur	Roskam
Calvert	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Kelly (PA)	Ruiz
Carbajal	Kennedy	Ruppersberger
Cárdenas	Khanna	Rutherford
Carson (IN)	Kihuen	Ryan (OH)
Carter (TX)	Kildee	Sánchez
Cartwright	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Castro (TX)	Kinzinger	Schakowsky
Cheney	Krishnamoorthi	Schiff
Chu, Judy	Kuster (NH)	Schneider
Ciilline	Lamb	Schrader
Clark (MA)	Lamborn	Scott (VA)
Clarke (NY)	Lance	Scott, Austin
Clay	Langevin	Scott, David
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Sessions
Cole	Latta	Sewell (AL)
Conaway	Lawrence	Shea-Porter
Connolly	Lawson (FL)	Shimkus
Correa	Lee	Shuster
Costa	Levin	Simpson
Costello (PA)	Lewis (GA)	Sinema
Courtney	Lieu, Ted	Sires
Crist	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	LoBiondo	Smucker
Curtis	Loebback	Soto
Davis (CA)	Love	Speier
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Stewart
DeFazio	Lowe	Suozi
DeGette	Lucas	Swalwell (CA)
Delaney	Lujan Grisham,	Takano
DeLauro	M.	Taylor
DelBene	Lujan, Ben Ray	Thompson (CA)
Demings	Lynch	Thornberry
Denham	MacArthur	Titus
DeSaulnier	Maloney,	Torres
Deutch	Carolyn B.	Turner
Diaz-Balart	Maloney, Sean	Valadao
Dingell	Marshall	Veasey
Doyle, Michael	Matsui	Vela
F.	McCarthy	Velázquez
Dunn	McCaul	Visclosky
Ellison	McCollum	Walorski
Engel	McEachin	Wasserman
Eshoo	McGovern	Schultz
Españall	McHenry	Waters, Maxine
Esty (CT)	McNerney	Watson Coleman
Evans	Meeke	Welch
Faso	Meng	Wilson (FL)
Fitzpatrick	Mitchell	Wilson (SC)
Fleischmann	Mooleenaar	Womack
Flores	Moore	Yarmuth
Fortenberry	Murphy (FL)	Young (IA)
Foster	Neal	
Frankel (FL)	Noem	

NOT VOTING—11

Black	Issa	Thompson (MS)
Cooper	Labrador	Tsongas
Cramer	Rush	Walz
Crowley	Smith (TX)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1608

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. HULTGREN, 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. 6157) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

AMERICAN INNOVATION \$1 COIN ACT

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 770) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of American innovation and significant innovation and pioneering efforts of individuals or groups from each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the United States territories, to promote the importance of innovation in the United States, the District of Columbia, and the United States territories, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Beginning on page 6, strike line 8 and all that follows through page 8, line 5, and insert the following:

“(A) ORDER OF ISSUANCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The coins issued under this subsection commemorating either an innovation, an individual innovator, or a group of innovators, from each State, the District of Columbia, or a territory shall be issued in the following order:

“(I) STATE.—With respect to each State, the coins shall be issued in the order in which the States ratified the Constitution of the United States or were admitted into the Union, as the case may be.

“(II) DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND TERRITORIES.—After all coins are issued under subsection (i), the coins shall be issued for the District of Columbia and the territories in the following order: the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

“(ii) APPLICATION IN EVENT OF THE ADMISSION OF ADDITIONAL STATES.—Notwithstanding clause (i), if any additional State is admitted

into the Union before the end of the 14-year period referred to in paragraph (1), the Secretary of the Treasury may issue a \$1 coin with respect to the additional State in accordance with clause (i)(1).

“(iii) APPLICATION IN THE EVENT OF INDEPENDENCE OR ADDING OF A TERRITORY.—Notwithstanding clause (i)—

“(I) if any territory becomes independent or otherwise ceases to be a territory of the United States before \$1 coins are minted pursuant to this subsection, the subsection shall cease to apply with respect to such territory; and

“(II) if any new territory is added to the United States, \$1 coins shall be issued for such territories in the order in which the new territories are added, beginning after the \$1 coin is issued for the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

“(B) ISSUANCE OF COINS COMMEMORATING FOUR INNOVATIONS OR INNOVATORS DURING EACH OF 14 YEARS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Four \$1 coin designs as described in this subsection shall be issued during each year of the period referred to in paragraph (1) until 1 coin featuring 1 innovation, an individual innovator, or a group of innovators, from each of the States, the District of Columbia, and territories has been issued.

“(ii) NUMBER OF COINS OF EACH DESIGN.—The Secretary shall prescribe, on the basis of such factors as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, the number of \$1 coins that shall be issued with each of the designs selected for each year of the period referred to in paragraph (1).

Mr. HENSARLING (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORTH KOREAN HUMAN RIGHTS REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2061) to reauthorize the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “North Korean Human Rights Reauthorization Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In 2014, the United Nations Commission of Inquiry (COI) on Human Rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) found that the grave human rights violations still being perpetrated against the people of North Korea, due to policies established at the highest level of the state, amount to crimes against humanity. Crimes include forced starvation, sexual

violence against women and children, restrictions on freedom of movement, arbitrary detention, torture, executions, and enforced disappearances, among other hardships.

(2) The COI also noted that the Government of the People's Republic of China is aiding and abetting in crimes against humanity by forcibly repatriating North Korean refugees back to the DPRK. Upon repatriation, North Koreans are sent to prison camps, tortured, or even executed. The Government of the People's Republic of China's forcible repatriation of North Korean refugees violates its obligation to uphold the principle of non-refoulement, under the United Nations Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, done at Geneva July 28, 1951 (as made applicable by the Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, done at New York January 31, 1967 (19 UST 6223)).

(3) Estimates from the COI suggest that between 80,000 and 120,000 people are believed to be imprisoned in political prison camps in North Korea. Another 70,000 are believed to be held at other detention facilities. Prisoners in both situations are subject to harsh conditions, limited food, sexual abuse, and in most cases hard labor.

(4) One of the findings of the COI report was the persecution of religious minorities, especially Christians. There is effectively no freedom of religion in North Korea, only worship of the Kim family. Christians are subjected to particularly acute persecution. It has been reported that Christians in North Korea have been tortured, forcibly detained, and even executed for possessing a Bible or professing Christianity.

(5) North Korea profits from its human rights abuses. A 2014 report from the Asian Institute for Policy Studies suggests that there are nearly 50,000 North Korean workers forced to labor overseas, sometimes without compensation, and for as much as 20 hours at a time. Workers that received compensation were not to be paid more than \$150 per month, which is between 10 to 20 percent of the value of the labor they performed. Based on this report, the regime may profit as much as \$360,000,000 annually from just 50,000 laborers.

(6) On July 6, 2016, the United States imposed sanctions on North Korean leader Kim Jong Un and other senior North Korean officials for human rights violations as required by the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-122). This was the first time that the United States had designated North Korean officials for human rights abuses.

(7) The North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-122) requires the President to impose mandatory penalties under United States law on any person that “knowingly engages in, is responsible for, or facilitates serious human rights abuses by the Government of North Korea”.

(8) Although the United States Refugee Admissions Program remains the largest in the world by far, the United States has only resettled 212 refugees from North Korea since the date of the enactment of the North Korea Human Rights Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-333).

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States Government should continue to make it a priority to improve information access in North Korea by exploring the use of new and emerging technologies and expanding nongovernmental radio broadcasting to North Korea, including news and information;

(2) the United Nations has a significant role to play in promoting and improving human rights in North Korea and should press for access for the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in North Korea as well as the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights;

(3) because North Koreans fleeing into China face a well-founded fear of persecution upon their forcible repatriation, the United States should urge China to—

(A) immediately halt the forcible repatriation of North Koreans;

(B) allow the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees unimpeded access to North Koreans inside China to determine whether such North Koreans require protection as refugees;

(C) fulfill its obligations under the 1951 United Nations Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, the 1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, and the Agreement on the Upgrading of the UNHCR Mission in the People's Republic of China to UNHCR Branch Office in the People's Republic of China (signed December 1, 1995);

(D) address the concerns of the United Nations Committee against Torture by incorporating the principle of non-refoulement into Chinese domestic legislation; and

(E) recognize the legal status of North Korean women who marry or have children with Chinese citizens, and ensure that all such children are granted resident status and access to education and other public services in accordance with Chinese law and international standards;

(4) the President should continue to designate all individuals found to have committed violations described in section 104(a) of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (22 U.S.C. 2914(a)), regarding complicity in censorship and human right abuses;

(5) the United States currently blocks United States passports from being used to travel to North Korea without a special validation from the Department of State, and the Department of State should continue to take steps to increase public awareness about the risks and dangers of travel by United States citizens to North Korea;

(6) the United States should continue to seek cooperation from all foreign governments to allow the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) access to process North Korean refugees overseas for resettlement and to allow United States officials access to process refugees for resettlement in the United States (if that is the destination country of the refugees' choosing); and

(7) the Secretary of State, through diplomacy by senior officials, including United States ambassadors to Asia-Pacific countries, and in close cooperation with South Korea, should make every effort to promote the protection of North Korean refugees and defectors.

SEC. 4. RADIO BROADCASTING TO NORTH KOREA.

Section 103(a) of the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004 (22 U.S.C. 7813(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “that the United States should facilitate” and inserting the following: “that the United States should—

“(1) facilitate”;

(2) in paragraph (1), as redesignated by paragraph (1) of this section—

(A) by striking “radio broadcasting” and inserting “broadcasting, including news rebroadcasting,”; and

(B) by striking “increase broadcasts” and inserting “increase such broadcasts, including news rebroadcasts,”; and

(C) by striking “Voice of America.” and inserting the following: “Voice of America; and”;

and

(3) by adding at the end the following: “(2) expand funding for nongovernmental organization broadcasting efforts, prioritizing organizations that engage North Korean defectors in programming and broadcast services.”.

SEC. 5. ACTIONS TO PROMOTE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION.

Section 104(a) of the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004 (22 U.S.C. 7814(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “The President” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President”;

(2) by inserting “, USB drives, micro SD cards, audio players, video players, cell phones, wi-fi, wireless internet, web pages, internet, wireless

telecommunications, and other electronic media that shares information” before the period at the end; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) **DISTRIBUTION.**—In accordance with the sense of Congress described in section 103, the President, acting through the Secretary of State, is authorized to distribute or provide grants to distribute information receiving devices, electronically readable devices, and other informational sources into North Korea, including devices and informational sources specified in paragraph (1). To carry out this paragraph, the President is authorized to issue regulations to facilitate the free-flow of information into North Korea.

“(3) **RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT GRANT PROGRAM.**—In accordance with the authorization described in paragraphs (1) and (2) to increase the availability and distribution of sources of information inside North Korea, the President, acting through the Secretary of State, is authorized to establish a grant program to make grants to eligible entities to develop or distribute (or both) new products or methods to allow North Koreans easier access to outside information. Such program may involve public-private partnerships.

“(4) **CULTURE.**—In accordance with the sense of Congress described in section 103, the Broadcasting Board of Governors may broadcast American, Korean, Chinese, and other popular music, television, movies, and popular cultural references as part of its programming.

“(5) **RIGHTS AND LAWS.**—In accordance with the sense of Congress described in section 103, the Broadcasting Board of Governors should broadcast to North Korea in the Korean language information on rights, laws, and freedoms afforded through the North Korean Constitution, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the United Nations Commission of Inquiry on Human Rights in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, and any other applicable treaties or international agreements to which North Korea is bound.

“(6) **RELIGIOUS MINORITIES.**—Efforts to improve information access under this subsection should include religious communities and should be coordinated with the Office of International Religious Freedom to ensure maximum impact in improving the rights of religious persons in North Korea.

“(7) **BROADCASTING REPORT.**—Not later than—

“(A) 180 days after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Broadcasting Board of Governors, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that sets forth a detailed plan for improving broadcasting content for the purpose of targeting new audiences and increasing listenership; and

“(B) 1 year after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, and annually thereafter for each of the next 5 years, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Broadcasting Board of Governors, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report including—

“(i) a description of the effectiveness of actions taken pursuant to this section, including data reflecting audience and listenership, device distribution and usage, and technological development and advancement usage;

“(ii) the amount of funds expended by the United States Government pursuant to section 403; and

“(iii) other appropriate information necessary to fully inform Congress of efforts related to this section.”

SEC. 6. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON HUMANITARIAN COORDINATION RELATED TO THE KOREAN PENINSULA.

Title III of the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004 (22 U.S.C. 7841 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 306. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON HUMANITARIAN COORDINATION RELATED TO THE KOREAN PENINSULA.

“It is the sense of Congress that—

“(1) any instability on the Korean Peninsula could have significant humanitarian and strategic impact on the region and for United States national interests; and

“(2) as such, the United States Government should work with countries sharing a land or maritime border with North Korea to develop long-term whole-of-government plans to coordinate efforts related to humanitarian assistance and human rights promotion and to effectively assimilate North Korean defectors.”

SEC. 7. REAUTHORIZATION PROVISIONS.

(a) **SUPPORT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY PROGRAMS.**—Section 102 of the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004 (22 U.S.C. 7812(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following: “The President is also authorized to provide grants to entities to undertake research on North Korea’s denial of human rights, including on the political and military chains of command responsible for authorizing and implementing systemic human rights abuses, including at prison camps and detention facilities where political prisoners are held.”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “2017” and inserting “2022”.

(b) **ACTIONS TO PROMOTE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION.**—Section 104 of the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004 (22 U.S.C. 7814) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) by striking “\$2,000,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”; and

(B) by striking “2017” and inserting “2022”; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “2017” and inserting “2022”.

(c) **REPORT BY SPECIAL ENVOY ON NORTH KOREAN HUMAN RIGHTS ISSUES.**—Section 107(d) of the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004 (22 U.S.C. 7817(d)) is amended by striking “2017” and inserting “2022”.

(d) **REPORT ON UNITED STATES HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE.**—Section 201 of the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004 (22 U.S.C. 7831) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “2017” and inserting “2022”;

(2) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

“(b) **NEEDS ASSESSMENT.**—The report shall include a needs assessment to inform the distribution of humanitarian assistance inside North Korea.”

(e) **ASSISTANCE PROVIDED OUTSIDE OF NORTH KOREA.**—Section 203(c)(1) of the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004 (22 U.S.C. 7833(c)(1)) is amended by striking “2013 through 2017” and inserting “2018 through 2022”.

(f) **ANNUAL REPORTS.**—Section 305(a) of the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004 (22 U.S.C. 7845(a)) is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “2017” and inserting “2022”.

SEC. 8. REPORT BY BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Broadcasting Board of Governors shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that—

(1) describes the status of current United States broadcasting to North Korea and the extent to which the Board has achieved the goal of 12-hour-per-day broadcasting to North Korea, in accordance with section 103(a) of the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004 (22 U.S.C. 7813(a)); and

(2) includes a strategy to overcome obstacles to such communication with the North Korean people, including through unrestricted, unmonitored, and inexpensive electronic means.

(b) **FORM.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(c) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(3) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(4) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 9. REPEAL OF DUPLICATIVE AUTHORIZATIONS.

Section 403 of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-122; 22 U.S.C. 9253) is hereby repealed.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2069

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2069.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 5515, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on H.R. 5515:

From the Committee on Armed Services, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. THORNBERRY, WILSON of South Carolina, LOBIONDO, BISHOP of Utah, TURNER, ROGERS of Alabama, SHUSTER, CONAWAY, LAMBORN, WITTMAN, COFFMAN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Messrs. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, COOK, BYRNE, Ms. STEFANK, Messrs. BACON, BANKS of Indiana, SMITH of Washington, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Messrs. LANGEVIN, COOPER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. O’ROURKE, and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.

From Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of title

XVII of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. LATTA, JOHNSON of Ohio, and PALLONE.

From the Committee on Financial Services, for consideration of title XVII of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. HENSARLING, BARR, and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of title XVII of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. ROYCE of California, KINZINGER, and ENGEL.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will announce the appointment of additional conferees at a subsequent time.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 964 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 6157.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1614

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6157) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, with Mr. HULTGREN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today pursuant to House Resolution 961, amendment No. 20 printed in House Report 115-783 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) had been disposed of.

Pursuant to House Resolution 964, no further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in House Report 155-785 and available pro forma amendments described in section 3 of House Resolution 961.

Each further amendment printed in the report shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as 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 except amendments described in section 3 of House Resolution 961, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Wyo-

ming (Ms. CHENEY) for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Chairman, during the previous administration, deep funding cuts as well as budget dysfunction in Congress have allowed a real atrophy of our military readiness in the Department of Defense. We have seen a steep decline in our capabilities while at the same time our adversaries have been making advances and increasing their ability to threaten us.

We now face a situation, particularly with nations like China and Russia, where they are developing capabilities that we may not be able to defend against.

Countering this threat requires funding for the space-based missile defense tracking system in line 117 of the defense-wide RDTE account, funding that was authorized but not included in the appropriations bill.

This capability is absolutely critical to improving our missile defense capabilities, particularly to address the rapidly increasing threat from hypersonic weapons, which our committee has placed particular focus on this year with broad bipartisan support.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, funding was not included in line 92 of the defense-wide RDTE account to continue critical development of laser scaling technologies for boost-phase ICBM missile defense. This technology has the potential that we need and that is crucial to give our warfighters the capability to shoot down missiles while they are still in a boost phase, making our adversaries have to think twice, understanding that missiles they fire at us could be destroyed over their own soil.

Mr. Chairman, funding for both of these capabilities is included in both the House and Senate version of the NDAA.

I have offered amendments, Mr. Chairman, to provide funding for these capabilities consistent with the NDAA and the Missile Defense Agency's revised budget request for fiscal year 2019. In an effort to allay concerns about finding offsets for these, I am willing to withdraw my amendments, and I would ask Chairwoman GRANGER for a commitment to fully support the capabilities during the conference process on the appropriations bill in the Senate.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming for her support of our missile defense programs. I agree with her support for these capabilities. I fully commit to working with her during the conference process to ensure both the missile defense tracking system and the laser scaling technologies for boost-phase ICBM missile defense are funded in the conference report.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's willingness to work with me on this important issue, as well as her tireless work on this critical bill. I will not be offering my amendments.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BARTON). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 115-785.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. 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:

None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to terminate a Reserve Officers' Training Corps program at—

(1) a Historically Black College or University (which has the meaning given the term "part B institution" in section 322 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1061));

(2) a Hispanic-serving institution (as defined in section 502 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1101a)); or

(3) a Tribal College or University (as defined in section 316 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1059c)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, my amendment indicates that no funding in this act shall be used or otherwise made available by this act to end Reserve Officers' Training Corps, ROTC, programs at HBCUs, Hispanic-Serving Institutions, and Tribal Colleges and Universities.

I want to emphasize this program because so many of us have these colleges in our congressional districts. Those ROTC programs provide training to college students to prepare them for future service in the branches in the U.S. military, the Army, Air Force, and Navy.

Coming from the State of Texas, I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, with my interaction with so many in the United States military, those who have said that it is a pathway to leadership and success, I know how important these programs are.

The Army ROTC alone provides \$274 million in scholarship money to more than 13,000 students. It is interesting to take note of the fact, as it relates to African Americans and Hispanics, the leadership that has come from these programs: Andrew P. Chambers, lieutenant general, retired; George A. Alexander; Colonel Claude A. Burnett; Colonel Derrick W. Flowers; Colonel Senodja Sundiata-Walker, currently serving as the chief of program support branch.

These are all individuals who have been the beneficiaries of ROTC programs at HBCUs, Hispanic-Serving Institutions, and Tribal Colleges and Universities.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, but I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, while I will not oppose the amendment, I will urge caution about proposals that limit the department's flexibility to adapt to changes in its need in the ROTC program.

I am prepared to accept the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairwoman for her remarks and concern. I believe that the military has great interest in the ROTC program and particularly in recruitment in HBCUs and Hispanic-Serving Institutions.

Let me also say, however, Mr. Chairman, I want to rise to emphasize my commitment to PTSD funding. I want to ensure as we go forward that we will increase the PTSD funding. I am interested in it being increased in particular by \$5 million, but I know there are other amendments that would increase it even more.

If we know the suffering from those who have PTSD as I have, this is something that I have worked for, fought for, and advocated for. The reason, Mr. Chairman, is I see it every day.

My amendment would focus on the needs of those who want to live a normal life with post-traumatic stress disorder. Our soldiers are still coming back from places like Syria. We know they have come back from Afghanistan and Iraq, but they are still fighting there. And PTSD, recently diagnosed in these wars, to give these people the ability to be with their family, to be able to have positions because the treatment is there, to regain their life because what they have seen from the bloodshed of IEDs and the tragedies of war warrant this support of post-traumatic stress disorder funding.

So I want to make note of that on the RECORD, of my support and the support for the increase. I close by saying I ask for those in support of the Jackson Lee amendment dealing with the ROTC, HBCUs, Hispanic-Serving and Tribal Institutions. It is a valuable program and a valuable use for that program to recruit more people from those communities.

Mr. Chairman, I ask support for the Jackson Lee amendment.

Mr. Chair, I thank the Chair and Ranking Member of the Rules Committee for making this Jackson Lee Amendment in order for consideration of "H.R. 6157, the Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2019."

I also thank Chair KAY GRANGER and Ranking Member PETER J. VISCLOSKEY for their work in bring the Defense Appropriations bill before the House for consideration.

This Jackson Lee Amendment is No. 1 on the Second Rule for H.R. 6157 and provides that no funding in this Act shall be used or otherwise made available by this Act to end Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC) programs at HBCUs, Hispanic Serving Institutions and Tribal Colleges and Universities.

ROTC provides training to college students to prepare them for future service in branches of the U.S. military: the Army, Air Force, and Navy.

The Army, Navy, and Air Force ROTC programs are annual scholarship awards, which combined, are the nation's largest scholarship grantors.

The Army ROTC alone provides \$274 million in scholarship money to more than 13,000 students each year, according to the U.S. Army Cadet Command.

Nationally about 12,000 high school seniors compete for about 2,000 Army ROTC scholarships.

About half of these are three-year scholarships, and the other half are four-year scholarships.

Once students reach college, they can explore specific military branches by enrolling in ROTC programs provided by the Army, Navy, or Air Force.

ROTC programs train future officers to serve in the U.S. Armed Forces.

To students who qualify, the ROTC programs offer scholarships that cover the cost of their education.

In exchange, students make a commitment to maintain academic excellence and later to fulfill active duty services in their chosen branch of the Armed Forces.

ROTC programs reward academic excellence to students attending HBCUs, Hispanic Serving Institutions, and Tribal Colleges by providing a path to military service.

I ask my Colleagues in the House to support this Jackson Lee Amendment to the Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2019.

LIST OF HBCUs WITH NAVY ROTC PROGRAMS

Clark Atlanta University (Georgia)
 Dillard University (Louisiana)
 Florida A&M University
 Hampton University (Virginia)
 Howard University (Washington DC)
 Huston-Tillotson University (Texas)
 Morehouse College (Georgia)
 Norfolk State University (North Carolina)
 Prairie View A&M University (Texas)
 Savannah State University (Georgia)
 Southern University and A&M College (Louisiana)
 Spelman College (Georgia)
 Tennessee State University
 Tuskegee University (Alabama)
 Xavier University (Louisiana)

HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBCUs) WITH ARMY ROTC

Alabama A&M University
 Alcorn State University
 Bowie State University
 Central State University
 Elizabeth City State University
 Florida A&M University
 Fort Valley State University
 Grambling State University
 Hampton University
 Howard University
 Jackson State University
 Lincoln University (Pennsylvania)
 Lincoln University (Missouri)
 Morgan State University
 Norfolk State University
 North Carolina A&T State University
 Prairie View A&M University
 Saint Augustine's College
 South Carolina State University
 Southern University and A&M College
 Tuskegee University
 University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff
 Virginia State University
 West Virginia State University

LEARN HOW PEOPLE HAVE GAINED FROM ROTC LEADERSHIP THAT LASTS A LIFETIME

LTG (Ret) Andrew P. Chambers, Lieutenant General, U.S. Army, Retired

LTG (Ret) Chambers graduated from Howard University and Commission as an Infantry Officer in 1954. After 35 years of service LTG Chambers retired from the Army in 1989. He then held the position of Director of Industry Operations for the Association of the United States Army, later assumed the role of Director of Community Services for AmeriCorps and then served as Vice President of University of Maryland University College Europe, retiring in 2005

LTG (Ret) Chambers passed away on June 3, 2017 (age 86) and was buried with full military honors at Arlington Nation Cemetery.

MG (Ret) George A. Alexander, Former Deputy Surgeon General, Office of the U.S. Army Surgeon General, HQS, Department of the Army

MG (Ret) Alexander is an active alumni and strong supporter of the Howard University Army ROTC Program. He graduated from Howard University College of Medicine in 1977 and was commissioned in 1979.

COL Claude A. Burnett

Currently serving the Chief of the Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology and Acting Chief of the Division of Surgery at Landstuhl Regional Medical Center, Landstuhl, Germany

COL Burnett graduated from Howard University with a BS in Chemistry and received his commission in 1992. He went on to obtain his medical degree from Meharry Medical College in Nashville, TN.

COL Derrick W. Flowers

Currently the G-8/Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Resource Management, Headquarters, US Army Medical Command, for Sam Houston, TX.

COL Flowers received his Bachelor of Business Administration Degree in Accounting and commission as a Medical Services Corps officer from Howard University in 1990.

COL Senodja F. Sundiata-Walker

Currently serving as the Chief of Program Support Branch, Washington D.C.

COL Sundiata-Walker graduated and received her commission from Howard University as a Military Intelligence Officer in 1995.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage the gentlewoman in a colloquy on the importance of the Butler County workforce to Federal background investigation operations. The National Background Investigations Bureau has approximately 1,500 employees and contractors in Boyers, Pennsylvania, which is in my district, who handle the intake and processing of Federal background investigations.

As you know, the NDAA last year split the NBIB between the Office of Personnel Management and the Department of Defense. This misguided move would have disrupted operations and negatively affected the critical workforce.

I applaud the Trump administration for announcing last week that it will be keeping the NBIB intact and shifting it entirely to the DOD. This action will keep all background investigations under the same agency and will retain economies of scale to efficiently perform these critical operations.

On Monday, I met with the DOD officials responsible for the transfer. They assured me that there are no plans to move any jobs outside Butler County. This is good news for my constituents, but more communication is necessary.

These 1,500 people perform an incredible service to our Nation, and these jobs are critical to Butler County. This workforce has the expertise and experience to perform this sensitive work that keeps our Nation secure. Any efforts to reduce backlog in background investigations must utilize this talented and hardworking workforce.

Chairman GRANGER, would you agree that the NBIB workforce in Butler County is integral to our country's background checks operations?

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's commitment to this matter. We respect the dedication and accomplishments of all National Background Investigations Bureau workers, including the hard work of the staff in Butler County, Pennsylvania. There is currently a backlog of more than 700,000 pending security clearance cases.

Air Force Secretary Heather Wilson told my subcommittee that the Air Force has 79,000 people still waiting for security clearances, and that number has almost doubled in the last 18 months. We want to work with your office to make sure we address that as much as possible, and I look forward to your continuing partnership in this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her dedication to this issue. It is important to not lose sight of the significance of this workforce to my district.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. FRANKEL OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115-785.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. 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 8, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$4,000,000) (increased by \$4,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Chair, research shows that when women have a seat at the table, the prospect that peace negotiations will succeed rises significantly.

The Women, Peace, and Security Act enacted into law last year requires the Department of Defense to leverage the unique roles women bring to the table in peace building, conflict resolution, and military operations.

This amendment would build on this law by allocating additional funding for full-time gender advisers, training foreign security forces on how to include women in their security efforts, and research on women's contributions to security at the National Defense University.

Mr. Chair, according to Womankind World, which is a global women's rights organization, women and girls suffer disproportionately during violent conflict. Sexual violence is often used as an instrument of war. Although men and boys also may be abused, it is this way that women and girls are primarily targeted. For example, during Sierra Leone's 11-year civil war, an estimated 250,000 women experienced sexual violence.

The destabilizing effect of conflict on families and communities can mean other forms of violence increasing in intensity, including domestic violence, sexual exploitation, and trafficking. Refugee women and girls are especially vulnerable.

Although they are disproportionately affected by conflict, women seem to be sidelined from formal conflict resolution and peace processes, meaning that postconflict recovery and reconciliation programs often overlook women's specific needs.

Over the last two decades, women accounted for just 9 percent of negotiators at peace tables. Out of 585 peace agreements from 1990 to 2010, only 92 contained any reference to women.

Despite that, women play an essential role in building peace in local communities. However, of course, women face multiple barriers. Even so, evidence shows that formal peace agreements that include women's perspectives are most likely to last.

Mr. Chair, we have an opportunity to make women's voices heard and to make the world a safer place. I urge adoption of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1630

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition, but I don't oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, women have a larger presence in our military today than ever before, with more than 200,000 women serving in Active-Duty military. Women serve as leaders in all jobs and in all branches of the military. Women have served in

every conflict from the American Revolution to the current war on terror.

From their early days as cooks and nurses to the combat roles they fulfill today, the roles of women have evolved with the military. So I am pleased to support this amendment, which will continue to further the growth of our 21st century women warfighters.

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL). The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, I want to speak about the production of the Tomahawk cruise missile.

The Tomahawk is a battle-tested weapon that has been used in combat over 2,300 times. Tomahawks were launched in 2016 and again in April of this year in response to the Syrian regime's use of chemical weapons. The Tomahawk continues to be a credible, standoff weapon that provides lethal effects while keeping American fighting men and women in relative safety.

The 2018 National Defense Strategy prioritizes action against near-peer nations with significant area-denial capabilities. The Tomahawk is the Nation's preferred weapon to carry out this difficult mission. Halting production and devastating the missile's industrial base is ill-advised as the threat of near-peer warfare increases.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's interest in this critical weapons system, and I want to assure him that the committee supports the continued production of Tomahawk missiles.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the committee's support for the program and was encouraged to see additional funding for increased Tomahawk missile production in FY18. I would like to emphasize that this funding was provided at the Navy's request. However, I understand that the Navy recently informed the committee that they intend to utilize this for purchasing support equipment instead of missiles, as the committee intended.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, the gentleman is correct. The committee increased funding for Tomahawk production 2 years in a row. Using this funding for other purposes is contrary to congressional direction, and this is the second year in a row that the Navy has blatantly disregarded our instructions. The action by the Navy led the committee to recommend a rescission of prior year funding for Tomahawks.

Despite this rescission, the committee remains supportive of additional Tomahawk production and is

awaiting a revised plan from the Navy on how they will spend the previously appropriated funding for missile production.

I assure the gentleman from Utah that the committee will revisit this issue in conference, when the Navy indicates affirmatively they will use additional funding solely for missile production.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, I agree with the chairwoman that the Navy's disregard for congressional direction and intent is unacceptable. I appreciate her support for this important war-fighting capability. I look forward to resolving this issue in conference.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 3 will not be offered.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy.

Mr. HECK. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask for the chairwoman's assistance on an impending threat to our national security.

Roads surrounding military installations play an important role in preserving military readiness. Our Armed Forces need to mobilize quickly, and we need functional roads in order to do that. The same is true for other infrastructure supporting defense communities where our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines live and raise their families.

This is a problem all over this country and a severe one, but it is especially acute right outside Joint Base Lewis-McChord in the 10th Congressional District of Washington, which I have the privilege to represent and is the largest force projection base in the Western United States. More than 50,000 people report to work there every day. It is the second most requested location in the Army, second to Hawaii. Still, I am thrilled when they get new things like, recently, the C-17 Weapons Instructor Course and a Security Force Assistance Brigade.

What I am not thrilled about is the frustratingly long wait times at the front gate for JBLM or the heavy traffic diverting through neighborhoods to avoid traffic jams.

My very first term in Congress, I introduced the COMMUTE Act to help address these issues. I have been working on the problem every year since. This year, both the House and Senate authorizing committees acknowledged this need by creating the Defense Community Infrastructure Program, or DCIP. This program builds off the COMMUTE Act and encourages infrastructure projects near military installations that are caused by their presence.

I know being stuck in traffic is not something unknown to most Americans. We are all too familiar with the horrible feeling of approaching an unexpected slow crawl on the road. But when this affects our military's ability to get to the base to do the job and be ready for anything, that is when we can't just sit and sit and wait and wait, as I have, year in and year out, for it to get better.

If servicemembers cannot get on and off base, they may decide to never leave the base. But military bases are not islands in our districts. They are integral parts of the community. Expecting servicemembers to stay behind the force protection of their bases exacerbates the civil-military divide.

It is shortsighted and foolhardy not to consider the infrastructure surrounding and supporting our installations. The Federal Government must play a role in addressing military community infrastructure projects.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the gentleman for raising the issue of off-base infrastructure. I know the gentleman has been working on this issue since his first days in Congress, and I commend his dedication.

I appreciate that the authorizing committee has given us a tool to begin to address this problem. Unfortunately, we don't yet know the full scope of the challenge. Before we can appropriate funds to a program like the Defense Community Infrastructure Program, we need more information to define the priorities and ensure that the most urgent needs are met.

Mr. HECK. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairwoman very much for acknowledging this problem and for her commitment to work to address it.

Over the summer, I will work with relevant stakeholders, including the authorizing committees, the Secretary of Defense, and the Association of Defense Communities, which strongly supports this proposal, to get the gentlewoman and her staff a sense of the scope of this problem.

I look forward to working with the Defense Subcommittee on tackling the problem and finding the resources to update and repair infrastructure around military bases.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, yes, I can commit to working on this issue if the gentleman can give me the details on the scope of what we need to solve.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. ROSEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 115-785.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Chair, I rise as the designee of Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and 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 8, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000) (increased by \$5,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROSEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment No. 4, which I am offering with Congressman HASTINGS, would designate an additional \$5 million for the training and retention of cybersecurity professionals under the defense-wide operation and maintenance account.

We discuss cybersecurity frequently here in Congress because cyberspace touches everything. As a former computer programmer and a member of both the Armed Services Committee and the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, I can tell you that we rely on cyberspace for so much: our military, schools, businesses, State and local governments.

We all understand the importance of prioritizing cybersecurity and the defense of cyberspace, because the challenges we are already facing will continue to grow both at home and abroad.

Actors half a world away are targeting our hospitals, banks, and financial networks, not to mention military installations. Attacks are getting more sophisticated, and they are happening every single day.

Last year, the GAO reported that, between fiscal year 2006 and fiscal year 2015, cybersecurity incidents increased from over 5,500 to over 77,000, an increase of more than 1,300 percent. The report recommended that the Federal Government enhance efforts for recruiting and retaining a qualified cybersecurity workforce and improve cybersecurity workforce planning activities.

As we look to defend ourselves, we need the very best talent. I am particularly aware of the need for expanding partnerships with academia and the private sector, which will create the cybersecurity people pipeline that our government and our private sector businesses need.

Programs like the National Centers of Academic Excellence, jointly sponsored by the Department of Homeland Security and the National Security Agency, for instance, serve as examples of the direction we should be headed.

As U.S. Cyber Command steps up its recruiting efforts, we must ensure that the necessary resources for training the next generation of cybersecurity specialists are made available now, wherever they are needed. This amendment is just a drop in the bucket, but it demonstrates how seriously we take this issue.

I want to thank my distinguished colleague, Congressman ALCEE HASTINGS, for helping to lead this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "yes" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, but I don't oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, the Department of Defense is responsible for defending the homeland and U.S. interests from attack, including attacks that may occur in cyberspace. This is an important mission and one that this bill prioritizes by providing \$8 billion across the entire cybersecurity landscape.

Our Nation's cybersecurity posture starts with our cybersecurity professionals. The gentlewoman's amendment provides an additional \$5 million to ensure that we continue to have the most qualified and highly trained cybersecurity professionals in the world.

Mr. Chair, I am pleased to accept the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROSEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 115-785.

Mr. LYNCH. 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 8, line 15, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(reduced by \$10,000,000 (increased by \$10,000,000))".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chair and the ranking member for their willingness to hear this amendment. I also want to thank the Rules Committee, Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. MCGOVERN, for ruling that this amendment is in order.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would provide an additional \$10 million to the defense POW/MIA Accounting Agency, formerly known as JPAC, for its newly expanded mission to bring home our missing servicemembers in North Korea.

In light of the recent agreement that includes a commitment to recover and repatriate U.S. POW/MIA remains from North Korea, we must ensure that the DPAA will be able to move quickly to take advantage of this unexpected opportunity.

As most Members are aware, nearly 8,000 U.S. servicemembers are still categorized as missing in action and presumed dead from World War II, the Korean war, and the Vietnam war. According to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the remains of about 5,300 of our sons and daughters in uniform are be-

lieved to be in North Korea. Many of them fell in battle near the Battle of Chosin Reservoir in November and December of 1950, the scene of one of the most heroic battles in U.S. military history, and certainly U.S. Marine Corps history.

Mr. Chairman, it has been 65 years since the Korean war ceasefire was put into effect. For those brave Americans and so many American families, to be still missing after so long is a tragedy. These brave servicemembers and their families deserve better.

□ 1645

Mr. Chairman, I have been involved with this issue for the past 8 years. I actually went out with JPAC to the South Pacific and the Philippines, to Vietnam and to Korea to observe their recovery efforts.

I had a chance to visit the headquarters at Hickam Air Force Base at Pearl Harbor where a dedicated group of our forensic pathologists are working tirelessly to use modern techniques to identify each of our brave heroes and return them to their families and their hometowns to receive the dignified and respectful remembrance that they deserve.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very unique opportunity. We have to act quickly. The mitochondrial DNA that allows us to identify our sons and daughters in uniform breaks down over time because of conditions in the soil. If we don't act quickly, we will lose this opportunity.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, but I don't oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, as discussed yesterday on the Allen-Raskin amendment, I support the work of the Defense POW/MIA Accounting Office. They perform tireless work to track, locate, and recover our fallen heroes, and I thank them for their continued efforts.

That is why the base bill already includes \$10 million above the budget request. I supported the Allen-Raskin amendment yesterday, which provides an additional \$10 million above the request. This amendment provides \$10 million, which will support continued efforts to return our fallen heroes home where they belong.

Mr. Chair, I support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY).

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chair, I simply want to join the chairwoman. She has correctly pointed out that there is a significant increase in the bill, but I do support the amendment, as does the chairwoman.

As was pointed out, we do need to act quickly. Most of the 82,000 Americans

that remain missing are from World War II, the Korean war, and Vietnam. With the most recent of those wars ending over 40 years ago, fewer and fewer immediate families of those missing are still alive. I do think we should have a sense of urgency.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's amendment, and I appreciate him yielding.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairwoman for her indulgence and also thank the ranking member. I ask Members to support this amendment to support the DPAA in its efforts to find and repatriate our missing heroes.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. KUSTER OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 115-785.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chair, 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 8, line 15, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

Page 18, line 4, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(reduced by \$2,100,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Hampshire.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chair, my amendment to the fiscal year 2019 Defense Appropriations bill will fund the first-ever study of a subject the Department of Defense has identified as "one of the most significant barriers to sexual assaults being reported."

The amendment carries with it bipartisan support, and I would like to thank Republican Representative MIA LOVE and Democratic Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER for joining me in cosponsoring this amendment, because they recognize its importance.

For far too long, servicemembers have survived sexual assaults only to suffer in silence. They have refused to bring their assailants to justice and receive medical attention not because they fear their attacker, but, rather, they fear a military policy which requires that their commanders punish them for minor violations. These transgressions are brought to light during the investigation of their assault. Consequently, many survivors decide against reporting their attacks and bringing their assailants to justice.

A RAND survey of military members who survive sexual assaults but refuse to report the attacks found that 22 percent feared being punished for collateral misconduct. The list of survivors who have had their military careers ruined because they demanded justice is also lengthy, but the only facts I can offer you are a survey and anecdotal evidence.

Not a single branch of the military systematically tracks this collateral misconduct. Our only previous effort to examine an aspect of the subject came in 2016. The FY 2017 NDAA, which passed with bipartisan support, directed the Pentagon's inspector general to review the cases of survivors who were separated from the service after reporting their assaults.

The IG reported 22 percent of these survivors couldn't have their cases reviewed because their military records had gone missing. Moreover, 67 percent of the records were incomplete.

This funding will support a first-ever study to be conducted by the Defense Advisory Committee on Investigation, Prosecution, and Defense of Sexual Assault in the Armed Services, otherwise known as DAC-IPAD. That study was introduced by my bill required by the fiscal year 2019 NDAA, which the House passed earlier this year. The funds would pay for the lawyers needed to fund a long-overdue, in-depth, and independent review of collateral misconduct.

We know that collateral misconduct is an issue, but we need to know just how pervasive it is and gather information on when and how it manifests to empower our commanders to, hopefully, solve this problem. We owe it to our men and women in uniform to study and review collateral misconduct.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, but I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, the military and society at large must do more to change the stigma of sexual assault so victims are not afraid of retaliation when coming forward and reporting the crime.

This bill provides \$318 million for sexual assault prevention and response programs at the service level and at the Department of Defense Sexual Assault Prevention and Response program. This is \$35 million above the President's request.

I understand this amendment funds a report required by the 2019 House-passed National Defense Authorization Act, to which we do not object.

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

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. GALLAGHER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 115-785.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chair, 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 8, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$23,800,000)".

Page 22, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$23,800,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of this amendment to restore \$24 million for Navy AIM-120 Delta AMRAAM procurement to match House-passed NDAA levels.

When he rolled out the National Defense Strategy, Secretary Mattis was clear: "Great power competition, not terrorism, is now the primary focus of U.S. national security."

Nowhere is this competition more intense than in the Indo-Pacific, where the "fight tonight" mission has never been more urgent, given threats from both great powers and rogue regimes.

Pentagon leaders have been clear: addressing critical munitions shortfalls such as the AMRAAM is a top priority.

During his confirmation, the new Indo-PACOM commander, Phil Davidson, listed critical munitions stockpiles as one of his top two capability and capacity challenges to addressing threats in the Indo-Pacific. Admiral Davidson went on to list advancements in air-to-air munitions—and the AIM-120D in particular—as his top solution to challenges presented by anti-access area-denial capabilities.

Unfortunately, our AMRAAM inventory is currently at only 50 percent of the requirement—50 percent. We cannot afford to cut any further.

It is no surprise, then, that the Statement of Administration Policy on this bill singles out munitions reductions as an area of special concern. To quote the Statement of Administration Policy: "DOD still has shortfalls in preferred munitions needed to achieve successfully the operational plans identified in the National Defense Strategy." And the very first munition mentioned is the AIM-120D AMRAAM.

Let's be clear about the implications here. The NDS is about great power competition. Our ability to win—or, much preferably, deter a great power war—comes down to our ability to execute these plans and impose our will on our adversaries.

These same adversaries are watching American defense spending debates

right now, looking for signs such as failing to address publicly reported shortfalls, that America is not serious about long-term competition. Decisions like this, here and now, may seem small, but they all add up to tell a story that our friends and our foes, alike, receive loud and clear.

Last year, on a bipartisan basis, we were able to help address key Mark 48 torpedo shortfalls in this appropriations bill in order to address a critical war-fighting need. I hope we can build on this success this time around.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to match the House-passed authorization level as well as the administration request, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, this amendment seeks to reverse a justified reduction made by the committee to the request for the AMRAAM missile program.

Both the Navy and the Air Force, historically, overestimate the cost of the missile in their budget request. In the last 5 years, this overestimation has been 12 percent, on average. The fiscal year 2019 request assumes a unit cost that is 16 percent more than the most recent contract.

For several years in a row, Congress has adjusted the budget request for this program to account for these overestimates and other facts of life, such as production delays. In fact, the delivery schedule for this program has been revised 25 times since 2011, and the production of new guidance system components is 21 months behind schedule.

The Department, itself, has frequently sought to take savings from the AMRAAM program for other priorities. For example, the Air Force has, 5 years straight on, sought approval to reprogram a total of \$57 million of this program to other needs. This is in addition to the reductions that have been taken by Congress. It, therefore, defies the facts to claim that this program is being underfunded.

Because of the long time it takes the Department of Defense to put together its budget request, these requests do not always reflect the most current information. The committee takes commonsense reductions when they will do no harm to national security.

I must add that this is precisely the sort of commonsense reduction to the President's budget that enables us to accommodate the priorities of Members of this body. This year we received approximately 6,600 such requests.

The committee will continue to engage with the Navy and Air Force on this program and make adjustments as needed. This amendment, however, would restrict our ability to ensure that the priorities of this body are reflected in the final bill.

Mr. Chair, I, therefore, oppose the amendment and urge its rejection, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chair, may I ask how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chair, I would say I am all for finding efficiencies wherever we can get them, particularly in a very tight budgetary environment. That is why, in structuring this amendment, we need a concerted effort to prioritize the urgent operational requirements faced day in and day out in the Pacific where, notwithstanding any past delays, the balance of power, I would argue, is rapidly shifting against us and where any further shifts could really harm our ability to project power in the future.

We have also provided the Defense Contract Management Agency the flexibility to make modest steps toward finding efficiencies in its budget. Even after accounting for this offset, DCMA O&M would be funded at nearly \$25 million over the House-passed NDAA level.

I would also say, our offset supports House-passed NDAA reductions to bureaucratic overhead in the so-called DOD fourth estate. In line with finding efficiencies, the fourth estate is comprised of the organizations within DOD that do not report to a military service and have proven difficult to manage or oversee, and I think the savings identified will go directly toward critical munitions for the warfighter—in other words, maximizing tooth while minimizing tail—getting as much of the resource as possible out of the bureaucracy in the Pentagon and at the front lines where our warfighters need it most.

□ 1700

I have enormous respect for the chairwoman's position, I appreciate her willingness to consider this, and I appreciate the robust debate.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, in closing, as I have stated, these sorts of commonsense adjustments to the President's budget request must be made to ensure efficient use of taxpayer dollars and accommodate higher priorities, including Member priorities.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GALLAGHER. 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 Wisconsin will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. GALLAGHER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 115-785.

Mr. GALLAGHER. 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 8, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$33,000,000)".

Page 28, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$33,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, as with the preceding amendment, this proposal addresses critical munitions shortfalls, this time by providing \$33 million for Air Force AIM-120D AMRAAM procurement to match the NDAA.

The same argument for Navy AMRAAM procurement apply equally to this amendment as well. In order to support Indo-PACOM's fight tonight mission, we must increase our stockpiles of critical munitions. With our AMRAAM inventory currently at 50 percent of the requirement, we cannot afford to see further cuts.

This amendment would simply restore the House-passed NDAA level for Air Force AMRAAM procurement, and addresses one of the specific concerns outlined in the SAP on this bill.

I understand the argument on finding efficiencies. I just think it is worth remembering, particularly when we look at that region of the world, that aggression in the Pacific has historically caught our country off guard. After all, not only did the attack on Pearl Harbor and the North Korean advance past the 38th parallel come as a surprise, but we were similarly stunned by the rapid Chinese entry into the Korean war.

These mistakes cost American lives and forced our men and women in uniform to play catch-up. And I know that such a level of conflict may seem unthinkable in the post-Cold War world, but history has a way of, if not repeating itself, rhyming from time to time.

While this small investment will not inoculate us entirely against being caught flat-footed once again, it is a small step towards addressing critical munition shortfalls and giving our combatant and commanders the tools they need to deter conflict in the first place; and, if the worst does happen, be ready with the munitions they need.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this proposal, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct in his assertion that his amendment restores the cut

made by the committee of \$23.8 million in this program.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to point out for my colleagues that there is a misimpression of our subcommittee that we simply helter-skelter approve anything that the Department of Defense sends up, but we try to give discrete decisions to each program and to rearrange those moneys. There was a cut from the administration's request, and that money was put into readiness, which is a huge concern for the Department.

And, historically, on the program that the gentleman references, my remarks would very much mirror those of the gentlewoman from his last amendment. Historically, the Air Force, along with the Navy, overestimates that the cost of the missile just discussed, on average, the cost has been overestimated by 12 percent.

For the fiscal year 2019 budget submission, the unit cost is 16 percent more than the most recent contract for production. The budget request for this program has been adjusted for several years now, due to the overestimates submitted and other factors, such as revisions to delivery schedules, and a 21-month delay for components.

The committee works with the military services to ensure the program receives the funding needed to produce this munition, and adjustments are made. The subcommittee did make an adjustment. I believe it is in our Nation's interest to leave that \$23.8 million in readiness.

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. Chairman, I know, to some extent, we always seem to be making choices between near-term readiness requirements and long-term modernization efforts. I would submit, however, that that is a false choice, or perhaps is a choice that has been foisted upon us by bad budgetary decisions that we have made in the past 6 years.

The reality is, if you take a look at the world, we are going to have to do both things at the same time: invest in both readiness and modernization.

So I have enormous respect for those efforts to find efficiencies and make sure we can put dollars where people need them most. I simply, on balance, would like to put money in the hands of warfighters who are dealing with threats on the front lines as much as humanly possible.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I simply close by making the observation: the gentleman talks about choices. The committee did make a choice for readiness as opposed to munition, where we have a 21-month delay in components.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GALLAGHER. 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 Wisconsin will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 115-785.

Mr. HUDSON. 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 8, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

Page 32, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$7,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, which would increase funding for USSOCOM to provide for additional training of Special Operations Forces. Simply put, I never want our men and women in uniform to be in a fair fight. My amendment would allow for an increase in the training budget to ensure, whenever our forces are deployed, they have been fully prepared and are ready to fight, win, and return home safely.

Mr. Chairman, one of the greatest honors of my life is representing Fort Bragg, the epicenter of the universe, and home of the airborne and of the Army Special Operations Command. The units stationed here represent the best of the best and have a vast footprint across our Nation.

As our Nation continues to fight terrorism around the world, while simultaneously preparing for the threats of near-peer adversaries, our training requirements increase and diversify.

As a result, we must ensure that we are ready for any situation at a moment's notice. Readiness cannot be built overnight. A Green Beret cannot be built overnight. In order to conduct their mission set effectively, we must provide them with a steady stream of predictable resources to enable them to train and prepare for the dangerous tasks our Nation asks them to perform.

We must never underestimate the most important asset our military has: the individual. My amendment would ensure that we continue to take care of that asset by providing them every edge, every bit of preparation, and, yes, every bit of training that they require.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairwoman GRANGER for her excellent work on this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, but I don't oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides a modest increase in the training budget for the Special Operations Command. Like my colleague, I want to make sure that our soldiers are able to deal with any contingency that may confront them.

Our Special Forces deploy to some of the most austere and unique environments in the world. We should do all that we can to ensure their success.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 115-785.

Mr. WELCH. 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 8, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,300,000)".

Page 34, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

Page 34, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would increase funding for the Department of Defense health programs by \$1 million to improve coordination between DOD and the VA on research and findings related to toxic exposure to burn pits.

As you know, burn pits were commonly used on U.S. military sites during the Iraq and Afghanistan wars to burn all types of waste from chemicals, paint, and medical and human waste to munitions, petroleum, plastics, and rubber. But, also, as you know, many members of the military, who were exposed to burn pits, are beginning to experience negative health effects from the toxic smoke that they inhaled while on duty.

That is why I am offering this amendment: to increase cross-agency

communication and research so that the Departments can assist those suffering more aggressively and quickly.

On May 7, I met in Vermont with a group of National Guard members, led by Pat Cram, who have been impacted by burn pit exposure. Pat is the wife of Sergeant Major Mike Cram of the Vermont National Guard, who died this past December from prostate cancer, believed to be a direct result of his exposure to burn pits in Iraq and Afghanistan, where he did several tours.

Sergeant Major Cram first deployed to Iraq in 2004 with a group of MPs from the 42nd Infantry Division of the Vermont National Guard. They joined up with the 278th Tennessee National Guard Calvary in Iraq. All 21 soldiers from this group, who deployed together for 18 months, returned home safely, thank God.

But since their safe return, that same group has lost two members from prostate cancer, and another has been treated for it. They believe, and some of the medical professionals believe, that the explanation is that it occurred as a result of exposure to burn pits.

This funding would provide some resources necessary for the VA and Pentagon to work on the issue together effectively so that we can address the direct relationship between burn pits and severe health conditions.

This amendment idea aligns with a June 2018 GAO recommendation that highlighted the need for these Departments to work together to solve this issue. This is reminiscent, potentially, of the Agent Orange situation where, for many years, people were trying to figure out what the cause of the cancers were, and it turned out, after a lot of investigation, that it was directly related to Agent Orange.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman GRANGER, who, on occasion, I have traveled with and whose service I have really respected, and Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY, for their attention to this issue and willingness to help.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the great group of Members who worked with me on this amendment, including Representatives SOTO, BILIRAKIS, GABBARD, WENSTRUP, RUIZ, and ROSEN.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, but I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his concern. This amendment would increase funding in the defense health program account, aiming to improve coordination between the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs, as both agencies study the effects of toxic exposure to burn pits.

It is important to both Departments to be aware of what the other has done

in this important area of research, therefore, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. NOLAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 115-785.

Mr. NOLAN. 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 8, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$6,000,000)”.

Page 34, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$6,000,000)”.

Page 34, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$6,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

□ 1715

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chair, as cochairman with FRANK LOBIONDO in our bipartisan Congressional Lung Cancer Caucus, and FRANK LOBIONDO is a cosponsor of this amendment, I want to begin by expressing our appreciation for making this amendment in order and our additional appreciation for Chairman GRANGER and Ranking Member VISLOSKEY for the tremendous work that they do, and the great respect we also have for the ranking member and the chairman of the committee, who I see here today, RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN.

Simply stated, this measure would add \$6 million to lung cancer research under the Defense Health Program.

In so doing, we would be increasing this amount for this important and worthwhile research from \$14 million back to the original \$20 million figure that had been appropriated back in 2009.

In that regard, it is worth noting that were we to factor this for inflation, we would have to be asking for \$23.5 million to match the buying power of \$20 million that this would bring us up to today.

To put my amendment in perspective, a recent study at Walter Reed Medical Center found that treating lung cancer in active military soldiers and veterans every year costs roughly \$564 million, treating our veterans.

According to that same study, our veterans are 75 percent more likely to develop some form of lung cancer than those people who do not serve in our military.

Clearly, with some additional research to find cures and better treatments for this, there are not only enormous dollars to be saved, but more importantly, lives to be saved. That's an important message to our veterans in how we value their service and the risks, the great risks, that they take in serving and in protecting us.

So I hope my colleagues would agree that a modest increase in cancer research funding to the \$20 million figure next year is more than reasonable. It's a sound and necessary investment in public dollars, and an important message to the men and women who serve in our military.

And make no mistake, those extra funds would make an enormous difference in battling lung cancer, which, by the way, takes more lives than all of the other cancers combined. So it is a disease that obviously, as I said, affects our military, but it kills 159,000 people every year.

As many of you know, my daughter, Katherine, was diagnosed with a very advanced stage IV lung cancer some 3 years ago. I thank all of my colleagues for their prayers. I would also be remiss if I didn't say thank you to the many colleagues on both sides of the aisle, not a day goes by but one of you haven't expressed your concern, asked about her well-being, and told me of your continued prayers and hopes for success. And I am here to tell you she is doing well. We have great hope for her in the future, in no small measure due to the prayers, the careful thoughts, and the advances in research, so many of which are coming down the road, in offering her and so many others so much hope.

So I hope we can give many others that same great hope through these additional research dollars.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for his amendment. I have no objections and am prepared to accept it.

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

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. GABBARD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 115-785.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment on the table.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 34, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 34, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Chair, since 9/11, an estimated 3.7 million veterans and servicemembers may have been exposed to burn pits, a common method of disposing of waste during war.

Now, these burn pits include things like human waste, batteries, plastic, damaged equipment all being dumped into a giant pit, doused with jet fuel, and torched.

Much of the waste burned in these pits is toxic and it gets into our troops' eyes, mouth, throat, and lungs. I know this is true, because I was there and I breathed these toxins in every day.

These burn pits aren't put somewhere very far away from where our troops spend their time. They are usually right next to where they live, work, eat, and sleep. Many burn day and night, some burning around the clock, 7 days a week.

Exposure to burn pits can produce serious and potentially life-threatening health effects, including neurological disorders, rare forms of cancer, lung diseases, and more.

Recently, a widow named Jill Wilkins reached out to my office to share her story.

She told me about her husband, United States Air Force Reserves Major Kevin Wilkins, who was an RN and who deployed to Iraq in the summer of 2006.

After prolonged exposure to the toxic chemicals from burn pits, when he came home, he died from a brain tumor in April of 2008. He was only 51 years old, leaving behind his wife, Jill, to take care of their two children by herself.

Now, despite the millions of brave young men and women who have been exposed to burn pits, people like Major Wilkins, they are continuing to be denied their claims and healthcare through the VA.

The DOD and VA have been hesitant to admit that there is sufficient data to quantify this link and to prove the connection between service-related burn pits exposure and the resulting illnesses that some of our troops and veterans are dying from.

What is most troubling about this is that these burn pits are still being used today.

We cannot continue to repeat the dark stains of our past that we have seen in abandoning our Vietnam veterans who have suffered illnesses due to their exposure to Agent Orange.

Even now, I and many other Members of Congress continue to hear from Vietnam veterans about their battles with

the VA to get the benefits and care they need after their exposure to Agent Orange.

Burn pits are the Agent Orange of our generation of veterans. We cannot let this generation go ignored, without the care and services they desperately need.

Our troops didn't hesitate to raise their hands and volunteer to serve this country and put their lives on the line. We cannot turn our backs on them when they return home.

Passing this amendment authorizes \$1 million in burn pits research, which takes an important step towards fulfilling our Nation's promise to take care of our veterans. We have seen some DOD- and VA-funded studies, but we need to do more to get to the point where the VA does the right thing.

We need to pass the Burn Pits Accountability Act that I have introduced with my friend and post-9/11 veteran, Congressman BRIAN MAST.

We know that there is a correlation between burn pit exposures and these illnesses. This amendment takes a small step toward continuing the research, and serves as a shining light to our post-9/11 veterans that they are not alone and that they have not been forgotten. It builds on this progress to ensure that every servicemember and veteran who was exposed to burn pits gets the care and services that they have earned and deserve.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate Chairwoman GRANGER and Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY for their attention in raising this important issue and in allowing these amendments to come to the floor.

Our veterans care very much to see that Congress is taking action in the absence of leadership, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentlewoman's concerns. The Department is currently funding several research projects related to the potential health effects of open-air burn pits and burn pit exposure, such as pulmonary fibrosis, lung and respiratory issues, and metals toxicology.

I believe this research is important. I don't have any objection to this amendment.

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. DELANEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 115-785.

Mr. DELANEY. 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 8, line 15, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(reduced by \$8,300,000)".

Page 82, line 20, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairwoman and the ranking member for their support of our veterans and for our servicemen and -women. I would also like to thank the cosponsors of this amendment with me, DEBBIE DINGELL of Michigan, DON YOUNG of Alaska, ANN WAGNER of Missouri, DARREN SOTO of Florida, and PETER WELCH of Vermont, for their bipartisan efforts in placing something as important as Fisher House Foundation far above politics.

Fisher House provides 100 percent free lodging for military families, allowing families to stay together while their loved ones are being taken care of in a VA Hospital or military facility.

On any given night, up to 1,000 families are staying in one of the 76 Fisher Houses in districts all across this country, and their need is only growing.

This effort that is the subject of this amendment will help Fisher House build new homes and serve more of our military families.

Fisher House has served over 335,000 families thus far and provided \$407 million in estimated out-of-pocket savings on lodging and transportation to our military families.

Looking ahead, they have eight houses already under construction and have identified 20 more locations in need of their support in their pipeline.

Fisher House is a highly rated nonprofit, having received an A-plus rating from CharityWatch and awarded the Independent Charities Seal of Excellence.

Most importantly, it is a beloved institution throughout our military and veteran communities.

This amendment increases Federal support for Fisher House from \$5 million to \$10 million. It has strong bipartisan support and is a good example of the things we can do if we work together.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this program.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), my friend.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the Fisher House Foundation amendment No. 13.

Often, servicemembers must travel hundreds or even thousands of miles for medical care.

For more than 25 years, Fisher Houses have provided a home away from home for the family members of those who are receiving treatment at a military or VA Medical Center. These houses provide stability, convenience, and one less thing to worry about for families as their husbands, wives, sons, or daughters undergo treatment.

Each time I visit the St. Louis Fisher House at Jefferson Barracks, I witness firsthand the dedication of the staff and the volunteers who assist the families of our veterans and servicemembers.

An increase in funds will allow the construction of more Fisher Houses, providing lodging to thousands of military families. We know that a family's love is the best medicine, and good care makes the tough days bearable.

I look forward to casting my vote in support of this important foundation. Together, we can make the lives of those who heroically serve our country just a little bit easier.

Mr. Chair, I thank the chairwoman for all of her leadership. I thank the gentleman for his cosponsorship and for his yielding me this time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1730

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition, but I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's concern to provide adequate funding for the Fisher House Foundation. The Fisher House Foundation is a nonprofit organization that provides temporary lodging for military family members when confronted with the illness or hospitalization of their servicemember.

The bill already includes \$5 million for the department to grant to the Fisher House Foundation and allows each service to transfer up to \$11 million for Fisher House operations.

I am pleased to accept the amendment to provide additional funding for the Fisher House, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I want them to have one visual in their minds when they think about it. Prior to the Fisher House—which, again, is a public-private partnership; the government money is leveraged with third-party donations—prior to the Fisher House, family members of our veterans who were receiving care often camped out in tents on the grounds of VA hospitals or other military facilities. The Fisher House has solved that problem, which is one of the reasons we should be supporting it.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in House Report 115-785.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, Amendment No. 14.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 30, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 34, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 34, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank Chairwoman GRANGER and Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY for their devotion to the men and women of the Armed Forces who risk their lives to keep our Nation safe.

My amendment, and I appreciate the opportunity in presenting it, is identical to an amendment that I offered and was adopted last year to the Defense Appropriations Act of fiscal year 2018, H.R. 3219. My amendment increases funding for Defense Health Program research and development by \$10 million. These funds will address the question of breast cancer in the United States military.

Mr. Chairman, I am a breast cancer survivor, and the relief of the care and cure is one that you cannot imagine. Just imagine being in the United States military and being diagnosed. These funds are important to increase that research to help our men and women in the United States military.

The American Cancer Society called several strains of breast cancer a particularly aggressive subtype associated with lower survival rates. In this instance, it is triple negative breast cancer. That is one that is deadly, more so than many other types, and I have seen close friends, my neighbor, succumb to triple negative breast cancer.

This increased funding should be and, hopefully, will be utilized to do important research in that area. This was evidenced by an article, “Fighting a Different Battle: Breast Cancer and the Military.”

Breast cancer can affect both men and women. The bad news is that breast cancer has been just about as brutal on women in the military as combat. Breast cancer has been just about as difficult to overcome as well. More than 800 women have been wounded in Iraq and Afghanistan, according to the Army Times; 874 military women were diagnosed with breast cancer, just between the years 2000 and 2011. According to the same study, more are expected as it grows.

The good news is that we have been working on it and, therefore, much progress has been made.

The Jackson Lee amendment will allow the additional research on, as I said, devastating triple negative breast cancer. That research is particularly needed since women are joining the armed services in increasing numbers and serving longer, ascending to leadership.

With increased age comes increased risk and the incidence of breast cancer. Military people, in general, and, in some cases, specifically, are at a significantly greater risk for contracting breast cancer, according to Dr. Richard Clapp, a top cancer expert at Boston University who works with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention on military breast cancer issues.

Dr. Clapp notes that life in the military can mean exposure to a witch’s brew of risk factors directly linked to greater chances of getting breast cancer.

So I ask my colleagues to remember that there are many challenges for those who serve in the United States military. Health is one of them.

I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, but I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, this bill includes \$130 million for the peer-reviewed breast cancer research program. I believe this research is very worthwhile. I do not have any objection to the gentlewoman’s amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, let me thank the chairwoman for acknowledging the importance of the research that is already established. I want to reemphasize that, in the midst of breast cancer research, there will be a focus on many subtypes, if you will, one of them including triple negative breast cancer.

So with the expansion of women in the military, it is extremely important to move forward with this amendment to help ensure that the men and women who risk their lives to protect our freedom can live longer, healthier lives.

I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairwoman GRANGER and Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY for shepherding this legislation to the floor and for their devotion to the men and women of the Armed Forces who risk their lives to keep our nation safe.

Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to explain my amendment, which is identical to an amendment that I offered and was adopted last year to the Defense Appropriations Act for FY2018 (H.R. 3219).

My amendment increases funding for the Defense Health Program’s research and development by \$10 million.

These funds will address the question of breast cancer in the United States military.

As a Member of Congress, a mother, a sister and a spouse, and a breast cancer survivor, I feel a special responsibility to do all I can to ensure every American can win in the fight against all types of breast cancer but especially triple negative breast cancer (TNBC).

Breast cancer can affect both men and women.

The bad news is breast cancer has been just about as brutal on women in the military as combat.

Let me say that sentence again.

Breast cancer has been just about as brutal on women in the military as combat.

More than 800 women have been wounded in Iraq and Afghanistan, according to the Army Times; 874 military women were diagnosed with breast cancer just between 2000 and 2011.

And according to that same study, more are suspected; it grows.

The good news is that we have been working on it, and I want to add my appreciation to the military.

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 14, however, will allow for the additional research.

That research is particularly needed since women are joining the Armed Services in increasing numbers and serving longer, ascending to leadership.

Within increased age comes increased risk and incidence of breast cancer.

Not only is breast cancer striking relatively young military women at an alarming rate, but male service members, veterans and their dependents are at risk as well.

With a younger and generally healthier population, those in the military tend to have a lower risk for most cancers than civilians—including significantly lower colorectal, lung and cervical—but breast cancer is a different story.

Military people in general, and in some cases very specifically, are at a significantly greater risk for contracting breast cancer, according to Dr. Richard Clapp, a top cancer expert at Boston University who works at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention on military breast cancer issues.

Dr. Clapp notes that life in the military can mean exposure to a witch’s brew of risk factors directly linked to greater chances of getting breast cancer.

STATISTICS ON AFRICAN AMERICAN WOMEN AND BREAST CANCER

In 2013, the American Cancer Society Surveillance and Health Services Institute estimated that 27,060 black women would be diagnosed with the illness.

The overall incidence rate of breast cancer is 10 percent lower in African American women than white women.

African American women have a five-year survival rate of 78 percent after diagnosis as compared to 90 percent for white women.

The incidence rate of breast cancer among women under 45 is higher for African American women compared to white women.

Triple Negative Breast Cancer:

Accounts for between 13 percent and 25 percent of all breast cancer in the United States;

Onset is at a younger age;

Is more aggressive; and

Is more likely to metastasize.

Currently, 70 percent of women with metastatic triple negative breast cancer do not live more than five years after being diagnosed.

African American women are 3 times more likely to develop triple-negative breast cancer than White women.

African-American women have prevalence TNBC of 26 percent vs. 16 percent in non-African-American women.

African-American women are more likely to be diagnosed with larger tumors and more advanced stages of breast cancer.

Currently there is no targeted treatment for TNBC exists.

Some researchers theorize that higher rates of triple negative tumors among young African American Women may be explain, to some degree, the poor prognosis of breast cancers diagnosed.

Not knowing if you have Triple Negative Breast Cancer is the biggest threat to health.

Breast cancers with specific, targeted treatment methods, such as hormone and gene based strains, have higher survival rates than the triple negative subtype, highlighting the need for a targeted treatment.

There continues to be a need for research funding for biomarker selection, drug discovery, and clinical trial designs that will lead to the early detection of TNBC and to the development of multiple targeted therapies to treat this awful disease.

The dedication of funding for research into breast cancer is the right track, we're on the right road.

The expansion of women in the military, makes this area of DoD research particularly important to addressing the real breast cancer risk posed to our women in uniform.

Today women make up around 15 percent of all service personnel in the combined branches of the French military.

Women are 11 percent of the Army forces, 13 percent for the Navy, 21 percent of the Air Force and 50 percent of the Medical Corps.

In 2015, All U.S. military combat positions were opened up to women.

The fighting capacity of the military is linked to the health and wellbeing of women throughout the armed services.

We can offer another tool in the work to keep the women of the military healthy and free of breast cancer through development of test that can detect the disease in its earliest stages and treatments that increase survival rates should breast cancer be contracted.

I urge my colleagues to support Jackson Lee Amendment No. 14.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairwoman GRANGER and Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY for shepherding H.R. 6157, the "Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2019," to the floor and for their devotion to the men and women of the Armed Forces who risk their lives to keep our nation safe.

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 14 increases funding for the PTSD by \$5 million.

These funds should be used toward outreach activities targeting hard to reach veterans, especially those who are homeless or reside in underserved urban and rural areas, who suffer from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).

Mr. Chair, along with traumatic brain injury, PTSD is the signature wound suffered by the brave men and women fighting in Afghanistan, Iraq, and far off lands to defend the values and freedom we hold dear.

For those of us whose daily existence is not lived in harm's way, it is difficult to imagine the horrific images that American servicemen and

women deployed in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other theaters of war see on a daily basis.

In an instant a suicide bomber, an IED, or an insurgent can obliterate your best friend and right in front of your face.

Yet, you are trained and expected to continue on with the mission, and you do, even though you may not even have reached your 20th birthday.

But there always comes a reckoning. And it usually comes after the stress and trauma of battle is over and you are alone with your thoughts and memories.

And the horror of those desperate and dangerous encounters with the enemy and your own mortality come flooding back.

PTSD was first brought to public attention in relation to war veterans, but it can result from a variety of traumatic incidents, such as torture, being kidnapped or held captive, bombings, or natural disasters such as floods or earthquakes.

People with PTSD may startle easily, become emotionally numb (especially in relation to people with whom they used to be close), lose interest in things they used to enjoy, have trouble feeling affectionate, be irritable, become more aggressive, or even become violent.

They avoid situations that remind them of the original incident, and anniversaries of the incident are often very difficult.

Most people with PTSD repeatedly relive the trauma in their thoughts during the day and in nightmares when they sleep.

These are called flashbacks; a person having a flashback may lose touch with reality and believe that the traumatic incident is happening all over again.

Mr. Chair, the fact of the matter is that most veterans with PTSD also have other psychiatric disorders, which are a consequence of PTSD.

These veterans have co-occurring disorders, which include depression, alcohol and/or drug abuse problems, panic, and/or other anxiety disorders.

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 14 recognizes that these soldiers are first and foremost, human, who live their experiences.

Ask a veteran of Vietnam, Iraq, or Afghanistan about the frequency of nightmares they experience, and one will realize that serving in the Armed Forces leaves a lasting impression, whether good or bad.

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 14 will help ensure that "no soldier is left behind" by addressing the urgent need for more outreach toward hard to reach veterans suffering from PTSD, especially those who are homeless or reside in underserved urban and rural areas of our country.

I urge all Members to support Jackson Lee Amendment No. 14.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MS. CLARK OF MASSACHUSETTS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in House Report 115-785.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. 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 32, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$14,364,000) (increased by \$14,364,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of this bipartisan amendment, which supports the Pentagon's FY19 budget request for research and development conducted by the Defense Innovation Unit-Experimental, also known as DIUx.

I am grateful to my colleagues, Representatives GALLAGHER of Wisconsin and RUSSELL of Oklahoma, and to my colleague from Massachusetts, Representative TSONGAS, for working with me on this amendment.

American technological innovation is widely renowned as the world's best. Our private-sector innovators are constantly pushing the envelope of the possible, inventing new technologies that revolutionize how people live. However, when it comes to national security, we have a serious problem.

Thousands of our startups have a strong desire to contribute to national security, but over the past two decades, as our cutting-edge innovators have changed the world, government procurement processes have failed to change with them. As a result, in critical areas such as cybersecurity, our top private-sector innovators have no economically viable avenue to pursue government business. The Department of Defense, therefore, has no access to them.

DIUx is the only funding stream in this entire bill that solves this problem. Military services and commanders in the field identify pressing problems that they need solved and bring them to DIUx. DIUx then pairs them with top commanders and top innovators to provide a pilot contract to solve their problems. This has resulted in bids from more than 650 companies in more than 42 States.

Most importantly, DIUx is able to solve these problems, in most instances, in less than 90 days. This is far more flexible, agile, and cost-effective than any other procurement vehicle currently available.

Just one of DIUx's 71 programs now saves the Air Force 400,000 pounds of fuel per day—just one project. That is enough to more than recoup DIUx's entire FY18 appropriation several times over.

If the devastating cuts proposed to this program come to pass, DIUx will lose its critical momentum, capabilities, and talent, jeopardizing the program's future. If we care about protecting our troops, enhancing national

security, and ensuring efficient use of taxpayer funds, I hope we will adopt this amendment, which simply matches the Pentagon's FY19 budget requested by DIUx.

Mr. Chairman, if I may ask how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL).

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, the Defense Innovation Unit-Experimental is a program that leverages brilliant engineers at places like the Silicon Valley or MIT to invent such amazing things as saline cooling to save the lives of badly wounded soldiers on the battlefield or create improved communications.

In just the last year, the DIUx program saved the United States Air Force hundreds of millions of dollars by replacing a whiteboard management system for managing refueling with an integrated app that saved millions of pounds of fuel each week, totaling hundreds of millions of dollars and, ultimately, billions of savings.

This never would have happened without DIUx. It pays for itself many times over. In fact, we would not have things today like Predator or key anti-missile defense systems without it.

Perhaps some big defense contractors might wish to cut DIUx, but only in Washington would we cut a program that integrates Silicon Valley and MIT engineers, develops products in months instead of decades, and saves billions of dollars. This amendment protects that from happening by restoring the \$14 million in funding, something it already saved in fuel in just a couple of days with the United States Air Force.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill, and I thank my colleagues for their work on this bipartisan measure. I urge support.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I am a strong supporter of innovation and bringing fresh ideas to the department. I support efforts that will deliver promising new technologies and provide our troops with a technological edge to prevail. However, I don't support efforts aimed at building empires under the guise of innovation.

The amendment seeks to reverse a justified reduction made by the committee to the Defense Innovation Unit-Experimental, DIUx. For fiscal year 2019, DIUx proposed to double its budget compared to last year without sufficient justification. This proposed increase was aimed at doubling the size of the program office, along with significant increases for office space and a generous travel budget.

I need to better understand how DIUx will fit into the department's new research and engineering organization and how it will maximize innovation for the warfighter before increasing funds for DIUx.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), my ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman for yielding.

I, too, share her sentiment that we ought to encourage innovation, but I join her in opposition to the amendment. I am wary of providing funding for an organization within the department that makes commitments of almost \$1 billion without carefully coordinating some of these activities within the department, as happened this past year with a cloud computing contract.

I am also concerned about the fact that the Defense Innovation Unit has found only a way, basically, to fund innovative activities in limited areas of the country; that is, the East Coast and the West Coast, with rarely anything in between.

I also add my concerns that the Defense Innovation Unit relies on Reserve officers to man their organizations when each of the Reserve chiefs have advised us that they cannot fill their own ranks.

So I do agree with the gentlewoman and her opposition, and I appreciate her yielding.

□ 1745

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I support efforts to bring innovation and new capabilities to the warfighter. However, the DIUx unit appears more focused on building its own program office rather than delivering capability.

I do not believe additional funding for DIUx is justified at this time. I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. 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 gentlewoman from Massachusetts will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. CRAWFORD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in House Report 115-785.

Mr. CRAWFORD. 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 32, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas, the distinguished chair, for her leadership.

The amendment I am offering will support explosive ordnance disposal equipment upgrades and technology enhancements.

When the Department of Defense canceled the EOD/Low Intensity Conflict Program, which formerly developed and delivered capabilities commonly required by each services' EOD tactical units, it was done without transferring this program and the oversight responsibility on EOD research, development, and acquisition to that of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.

It is my understanding that DOD's Combating Terrorism Technical Support Office will now absorb this specific mission set within their Improvised Device Defeat and Explosives Countermeasures program. This program is unique in that it supports the United States Government's Interagency Deputies' Technical Support Working Group to combat terrorism by using a whole-government approach. Specifically, the program leverages the intelligence community, the Departments of Defense, Homeland Security, Justice, and State, as well as State, local, and Tribal levels of government.

There are about 33,000 annual callouts, approximately 4,500 of which are on DOD military munitions. The Improvised Device Defeat and Explosives Countermeasures program develops or improves operational capabilities to neutralize, render safe, and contain blast fragmentation during these emergency response operations and terrorist incidents involving use of IEDs in the homeland. Furthermore, it produces dual-use capabilities on enhancing life-saving technologies for military tactical EOD units and those of public safety bomb squads organized at the State, local, and Tribal levels of government.

Therefore, I encourage the Director of the Combating Terrorism Technical Support Office to appropriately prioritize funding toward delivery of these advanced dual-use capabilities in the IED countermeasures program used by military tactical EOD units and public safety bomb squads.

In closing, this program is critical to the safety and security of America's

citizens. Military tactical EOD units and public safety bomb squads deserve the best tools and equipment we can provide so they are able to neutralize, disable, dismantle, render safe, and exploit improvised explosive devices and explosive ordnance both at home and abroad. My amendment will ensure they receive the equipment upgrades and technology enhancements they need.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, but I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, improvised explosive devices continue to be used by terrorists against our forces, which is why the bill includes \$150 million for technologies to combat terrorism, including investments to counter improvised explosives. The additional funds will be helpful to develop technologies to help protect our troops.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's dedication to this issue, and I also thank him for his previous service in the Army as an explosive ordnance disposal technician.

Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 17 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in House Report 115-785.

Mr. LANGEVIN. 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 32, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$50,000,000) (increased by \$50,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Rules Committee for making my amendment in order, as well as Chairwoman GRANGER and Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY for their hard work on this important Defense Appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this bipartisan amendment with my good friends Mr. CORREA, Mr. LIEU, Ms. SHEA-PORTER,

Mr. RATCLIFFE, and Ms. STEFANIK in order to support the DOD Cyber Scholarship Program.

Since 2001, DOD has funded the Information Assurance Scholarship Program, or ASP, in order to boost the Nation's cyber workforce through scholarship and capacity-building grants. Scholarship recipients are required to fulfill a service obligation by working in a cybersecurity position at DOD upon graduation.

This program has been extremely successful, bringing nearly 600 students into the DOD workforce. However, due to budget constraints, the Department reduced funding for the program beginning in 2013 and stopped recruiting new students. Now, this program received \$7.5 million in 2005, its peak funding level, but for FY 2017, it received a mere \$500,000.

The cybersecurity challenges that we face, Mr. Chairman, are growing every day. This scholarship program will help ensure that students are encouraged to pursue degrees in cybersecurity-related fields and that more of them can then work defending our Nation.

Across every industry, across the public and private and nonprofit sectors, qualified cybersecurity professionals are, indeed, in short supply, and the Department of Defense must compete for this very small pool of candidates. These funds will assist in alleviating the challenges that the Department of Defense is experiencing in recruiting and retaining cybersecurity personnel by providing additional opportunities to develop a qualified cyber workforce and expanding awareness at public educational institutions.

Mr. Chairman, in last year's National Defense Authorization Act, we reinvigorated the funding while simultaneously expanding it to include students pursuing associate's degrees so as to tap into a larger candidate pool.

The committee also made in order a similar amendment in last year's appropriations bill to ensure the newly reauthorized expanded program would be appropriately funded. It was passed by the whole House during amendment consideration, and we aim to do the same this year to finally get this critical program back off the ground.

Cybersecurity, Mr. Chairman, is the national security and economic security challenge of the 21st century, and every armed conflict today and in the future will include a battle in this domain. It is incumbent upon Congress to recognize this fact and appropriately support USCYBERCOM and our other cyber defenders. All the policies in the world, though, are meaningless without personnel to execute them, and this amendment makes vital investments in our human capital.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan effort.

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

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be withdrawn.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Chair understands that amendments No. 19 and No. 20 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in House Report 115-785.

Mr. LANGEVIN. 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 32, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 32, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I spoke a little bit earlier on the cyber scholarship program, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition, but I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I agree that cybersecurity is a very important national security issue. The scholarship program will help in attracting and retaining a cyber workforce. I appreciate the gentleman's dedication to the issue.

Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her support and her work, along with Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY's work on the Defense Appropriations bill, and in particular their support of the Assurance Cyber Scholarship.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. GRANGER. 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. DIAZ-BALART) having assumed the chair, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, 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. 6157) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year

ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 970, INSISTING DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE COMPLY WITH REQUESTS AND SUBPOENAS

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-791) on the resolution (H. Res. 971) providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 970) insisting that the Department of Justice fully comply with the requests, including subpoenas, of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the subpoena issued by the Committee on the Judiciary relating to potential violations of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act by personnel of the Department of Justice and related matters, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 964 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 6157.

Will the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1758

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6157) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, with Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 21 printed in House Report 115-785 offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MS. ESTY OF
CONNECTICUT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 22 printed in House Report 115-785.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. 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 75, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment which would increase funding for the Department of Defense's Sexual Assault Prevention and Response programs.

The men and women of our Armed Forces sacrifice a great deal to serve our country. When they enlist, they do so knowing that they may be sent into violent and dangerous situations to confront an adversary. What they do not sign up for is the violence of being sexually assaulted by one of their own fellow servicemembers.

We need to do better by all those who wear the uniform. I am encouraged that the Department of Defense has established Sexual Assault Prevention and Response program to prevent these crimes from occurring, and to ensure that victims have the resources they need to recover should an incident occur.

But the number of servicewomen and -men who experience sexual assault in the military remains staggering. Last year alone, the Department of Defense received over 6,750 reports of sexual assault involving servicemembers. Meanwhile, DOD estimates that only one in three servicemembers who experience a sexual assault file a report.

Clearly, sexual assault remains a serious issue in the Armed Forces. With over 1 million Active-Duty troops, and over 800,000 serving in the Guard and Reserves at installations all over the world, sexual assault prevention and response programs require our full support and funding. We must provide the best possible care and resources for our servicemembers who are dutifully and honorably serving and defending the United States.

That is why my amendment would increase funding for these worthwhile and vital programs, to ensure that they are there when servicemembers need them.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this important amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment, but I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, sexual assault remains a serious problem in the military and one that we must continue to be addressing. The Department has implemented a number of measures to prevent and reduce sexual assault incidents, prosecute perpetrators, and better respond to victims. Despite this, there is still more to be done.

This bill provides \$318 million, which is \$35 million above the President's request for Sexual Assault Prevention and Response programs at the service level and at the Department of Defense Sexual Assault Prevention and Response program office.

I agree that this is a critical issue that requires attention at the highest

level. All of the military services must continue to address incidents of sexual assault and make clear that the military has zero tolerance for such behavior.

Mr. Chair, I am pleased to accept the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the gentlewoman for her support and the support of the committee as well as the Rules Committee in moving forward this important amendment.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 23 printed in House Report 115-785.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in House Report 115-785.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chair, 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 (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the procurement, the deployment, or the research, development, test, and evaluation of a space-based ballistic missile intercept layer.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, my straightforward amendment would prohibit the misguided use of taxpayer dollars to attempt to develop a space-based missile defense intercept layer.

As the Chair knows, the Senate-passed version of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 tasks the Missile Defense Agency with developing such a concept.

Mr. Chairman, we have been here before. The idea of a space-based intercept layer has gone in and out of fashion for the last 30 years, ever since President Reagan called for defending the United States against a massive first strike by developing a Strategic Defense Initiative system, commonly known as Star Wars.

But every time technologically competent outside experts have looked at this space-based concept, they deem it unworkable, impossibly expensive, vulnerable to simple countermeasures, easy for an opponent to destroy, easy to overwhelm with a small number of enemy missiles, or all of the above.

In fact, the former Director of the Missile Defense Agency, Admiral Syring said in 2016, that he had:

Serious concerns about the technical feasibility of interceptors in space, and its long-term affordability.

In order to reach an incoming ballistic missile during the first few minutes of flight, a large number of interceptors must be stationed in low-altitude orbit where they will be very easy for an enemy to destroy.

A report conducted by the American Physical Society in 2003 concluded that in order to ensure full coverage, a fleet of 1,000 or more orbiting satellites would be required to intercept just a single missile.

To put that in perspective, the United States today currently has slightly more than 800 satellites in Earth's orbit, and that includes commercial, scientific, and military satellites.

The National Academy of Sciences estimated that even an austere and limited network of 650 satellites would cost \$300 billion, or roughly 10 times the cost of a ground-based system.

Setting aside the massive cost, a space-based missile defense system has inherent vulnerabilities that greatly limit its effectiveness. Even with thousands of interceptors deployed, only a few would be within range to target an incoming missile, and those could easily be overwhelmed by the launch of several missiles from one location.

And because interceptors must be stationed in low-altitude orbit, they could easily be detected, tracked, and destroyed. It is these limitations that led Admiral Syring to conclude that:

Essential space-based interceptor technologies have been worked on only sporadically over the years and, consequently, are not feasible to procure, to deploy, or operate in the near or midterm.

There is no doubt that a ballistic missile defense, if technologically feasible and economically justifiable, would be an important priority for our national security. So would be the Star Trek warp drive, or the transporter, if they were not technological fantasies.

But as a scientist, and, in fact, the only Ph.D. physicist in the U.S. Congress, I think that we have to listen to the experts and do our homework before investing hundreds of billions of dollars attempting to develop an unworkable system.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me and vote "yes" on my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, as noted by Secretary of Defense Mattis:

Space is a contested domain by our strategic competitors just like air, land, and sea.

This dangerous amendment would place our country at a disadvantage with our strategic competitors by limiting the work that can be done to continue our efforts in protecting our

dominance in space, and, further, from protecting our homeland from intercontinental ballistic missiles.

With the significant advances being made today by our adversaries in key areas, such as hypersonic weapons and expanding nuclear weapon proliferation, we must not restrict the Defense Department from pursuing options to deploy directed energy in space or any other capability that would result in the possibility of boost-phase capability that could be deployed from space.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, is against even the possibility of investigating and going down this road. House authorizers and appropriators understand the importance of employing a layered missile defense capability, and this dangerous amendment would significantly constrain options for developing critical defensive capabilities in a gap of our current ballistic missile defense system.

A proponent of boost-phase missile defense, General Hyten, the commander of Strategic Command testified this year that:

The day you can actually shoot a missile down over somebody's head and have that thing drop back down on their heads, that will be a good day. Because as soon as you drop it back on their heads, that is the last one they are going to launch, especially if there is something nasty on top of it. I think directed energy brings that to bear, although such weapons do not yet exist in the U.S. arsenal.

Finally, I would also point out that the issue of space-based intercept was debated at length last year, passed with bipartisan support in the House Armed Services Committee, and that the National Defense Authorization Act last year passed with broad bipartisan support on the House floor.

This year, the Senate Armed Services Committee has also provided broad bipartisan support on this critical, technological development area. Now, is not the time to curtail this emerging potential capability.

Mr. Chair, I would urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I spent most of my career as an energy particle physicist and accelerator designer, designing and building complex technical systems. Nothing is less productive as a use of taxpayer money than designing and building a system, attempting to build a system that you know from the outset cannot and will not work.

If there was suddenly a magic new technology, then we can revisit this decision. But the fundamental physics and the fundamental numerology of the attack versus defense balance in this has not changed in the last 30 years as we have examined this issue.

So I think that just because it would be nice if we could magically drop a launch missile back on the enemy's head, if we do not have plausible technology that could accomplish that, doing paper designs of systems that

will not work is a blatant waste of taxpayer money.

Again, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, well, let me just conclude by saying in opposition, if it hasn't been developed yet, you don't know that it doesn't work. We have hundreds or even thousands of bright minds. I appreciate my colleague's credentials, but we have hundreds of scientists and engineers working in the Missile Defense Agency and at the government-sponsored laboratories and in other parts of the defense community in the private sector, and at the Department of Defense in the government sector, and there are possibilities here that are being pursued that have great promise, have great potential.

I think it would just be the height of foolishness to cut it off all right now when there is not even any money being appropriated for this. It is just even the possibility that the gentleman is trying to cut off, when we have potential for something that would be helpful to saving our homeland, and making those who want to rain missiles on us have to suffer the consequences of those missiles coming back down on themselves. So we shouldn't foreclose the possibility and shut the door.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chair, I think this all comes down to technical feasibility. Whenever you are thinking of how to spend taxpayer money, you must make a judgment call as to what things are just way out there and are not going to happen in our lifetimes, and things which have a realistic chance of working on the time scale that we are planning for.

And when all of the experts that you convene to look at this unanimously say that this system makes no sense, then it makes no sense to spend taxpayer money until we get the breakthroughs that might some day make it possible.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chair, 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 Illinois will be postponed.

□ 1815

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague from Illinois for a colloquy.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding.

As the only Ph.D. physicist in Congress, I would like to take a moment to highlight the risks of underfunding both nuclear nonproliferation and detection.

When discussing the dangers of nuclear weapons, we often overfocus our attention on missiles and missile defense. Unfortunately, proliferation challenges are changing significantly, and there are, unfortunately, many ways to deliver a nuclear weapon, for example, the smuggling of nuclear radiological materials into the United States through our maritime ports or borders or through the use of commercial and recreational vehicles to deliver waterborne nuclear devices.

We must focus our resources on developing and deploying technologies that will lead to a substantial improvement in our ability to detect, verify, and monitor fissile material and devices. And we must continue to strengthen our workforce at our national laboratories by continuing to recruit the best and the brightest technical experts.

I note that much of this expertise is the same as will be required to ensure complete, verifiable, and irreversible dismantlement of North Korea's nuclear weapons programs and their nuclear weapons.

We can have the most expensive missile defense system in the world, but unless we address these unconventional threats as well, it is simply a false sense of security.

So it is my hope that, by raising these concerns and rebalancing our spending, we will continue to develop new and innovative ideas to detect and monitor the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons and materials and, ultimately, make the world a safer place.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments and acknowledge his expertise as a fellow member of the Nuclear Security Working Group.

I am grateful that Mr. FOSTER has raised the important subject of nuclear smuggling and for his continued commitment to addressing nuclear security issues. We must be relentless in developing the technologies that will help us identify and counter nuclear smuggling before dangerous materials fall into terrorist hands.

The 2018 Nuclear Posture Review acknowledges the importance of nonproliferation and countering nuclear terrorism. But I do not believe the document is forward-thinking enough when it comes to developing a plan to address future threats. We must continue to invest in research and development of nonproliferation technologies

so we will have the tools that we need to keep our Nation secure in an increasingly complex nuclear environment.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's raising it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGRO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 25 printed in House Report 115-785.

Mr. GALLEGRO. 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 (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to procure, or to extend or renew a contract to procure, any good or service from Zhongxing Telecommunications Equipment Corporation, ZTE Kangxun Telecommunications Ltd., or Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGRO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GALLEGRO. Mr. Chairman, ZTE and Huawei Technologies are owned by the Chinese Government. Time and time again, we have seen that these companies, along with many others, abuse and manipulate their placement in the market to attack sensitive American communications, the technology sector as a whole, and our national critical infrastructure.

There is no partisan disagreement on this point. Congress has been briefed many times on Chinese cyber attacks, espionage, and trade secret theft. We all know this is a problem. It is therefore astonishing, Mr. Chairman, that it is still possible that U.S. taxpayer dollars could be used to buy goods and services from these two bad apples.

My amendment would change that. Put simply—and it is very simple, Mr. Chairman—my amendment would prevent funds under this act to procure any goods or services from these two companies. This should be the start of a larger, coordinated effort to harden our defense supply chain, sensitive communications networks, and critical industries and infrastructure from modern threats, whether they come from China or anywhere else.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to working with my friends and colleagues in both parties in making that a reality, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition, but I don't oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment reaffirms ex-

isting DOD policy and supports the House NDAA, which also includes this provision.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGRO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. WITTMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 26 printed in House Report 115-785.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of amendment No. 26 and seek time to speak in support.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 24, line 1, strike "(CVN 80)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of amendment No. 26 to provide cost-effective funding for the Navy's fourth Gerald R. Ford-class aircraft carrier, CVN-81.

Let me be clear. Amendment No. 26 does not add any additional funding to the carrier replacement program line for fiscal year 2019. None. Not one dollar. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office found amendment No. 26 would not score; it would not change the overall level of budget authority or outlays in the bill in fiscal year 2019. According to the Parliamentarian, this is simply a perfecting amendment to allow for already appropriated funds to be used for both CVN-80 and CVN-81.

I believe it is possible to be both a defense hawk and a fiscal hawk. My amendment supports both positions.

For defense hawks, amendment No. 26 fulfills a critical need for our U.S. Navy. The Navy's most recent force structure assessment identified a need to maintain 12 aircraft carriers to meet combatant commanders' needs and address a growing demand for U.S. presence around the world. However, under the current shipbuilding and ship retirement plans, the Navy would dip below 12 aircraft carriers beginning in 2025 and would atrophy to just 9 aircraft carriers by 2048. This is simply unacceptable.

By procuring an additional aircraft carrier now, we better position the Navy to meet future requirements. By supporting a strong aircraft carrier base, we also show a commitment to the aircraft that operate from the carrier. The F-35 Joint Strike Fighter, the FA-18 E/F Super Hornet, EA-18G Growler, MH-60S Knighthawk helicopter, MH-60R Seahawk helicopter, as well as the E-2C/D Hawkeye aircraft all

require an aircraft carrier to operate in the Navy.

For fiscal hawks, the numbers are clear. A two-ship buy of CVN-80 and CVN-81 saves more than \$1.6 billion in shipbuilder costs when compared to single ship procurements. When government-furnished equipment is included, the total savings are projected to reach \$2.5 billion. Additionally, increasing the build rate encourages the shipbuilder and suppliers to make capital investments that produce production efficiencies and reduce costs for these and future ships in the Ford class.

We already have had great congressional support on this very issue. In December 2017, I led a letter with 131 House signatures to Department of Defense Secretary Mattis in support of this same dual aircraft carrier buy approach. This same provision also was included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019. And H.R. 5515, which recently passed the House by an overwhelming bipartisan margin of 351-66 on May 24 of this year, is a signal of what needs to be done.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, but I do not plan to oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I would like to use my time to express a note of caution to my colleagues. First, I am on record encouraging the Navy to look into constructing two aircraft carriers simultaneously. I understand the Navy is in the process of evaluating potential savings from a two-carrier buy, and I look forward to seeing that report.

Secondly, I support the Navy's fleet. Whatever the correct number may be in the end, the Navy definitely needs to have more ships to meet its mission. However, the construction of ships is very expensive. Even with the potential savings from a two-carrier buy, the expected cost of those ships would probably exceed \$10 billion apiece. We also have a bulge coming up in the Navy's shipbuilding plan, as construction of the Columbia-class ballistic missile submarine gets underway.

I am not opposed to increasing the Navy's shipbuilding budget in future years, but it needs to be done in a manner that is in step with the industrial base and strategic needs of the whole Department of Defense.

Unfortunately, this body and the other body did not waive the last 2 years of the Budget Control Act. So I remind my colleagues that it is terrific talking about building more ships that we don't have the money for. The fact is, next year, this bill, left uncertain, will have \$71 billion less in it, if the restrictions of the Budget Control Act are not changed.

I also would point out that two of my colleagues, who will very briefly be offering another amendment, are also co-sponsors of an amendment that we will consider in a few minutes that will cut the carrier program this year by \$49.1 million.

I also would emphasize to my colleagues who think we are not doing enough that the committee in the bill that is on the floor today has added \$837,330,000 to the shipbuilding program that was recommended by the administration to be \$21,000,871,437. And we have added two additional warships not requested by the administration.

So to imply somehow that we are weak-kneed and not spending adequately on building ships in this country is simply not true. I certainly support the objectives of my colleagues, and that is to look at an expanding Navy. But we also have to consider where we are from a budgetary standpoint today and not necessarily vote later to cut the carrier program in the same year by \$49.1 million.

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to first of all state very clearly that, in my opinion, both the chair and ranking member are strong supporters of our Navy and of a strong national defense, and any push in terms of these amendments is not a criticism of them at all in terms of the great work that they and their staff do putting forward a Defense Appropriations bill.

Again, very quickly, this amendment really just is an opportunity to try to take advantage of the savings that my friend, Mr. WITTMAN, described.

Block buy purchases have been tremendously successful. The last block contract for *Virginia* class, the Block IV, the PEO of submarines, Dave Johnson, was always very proud of the fact that we got 10 submarines for the price of 9 because of using the advantages of bulk purchases, which anyone who shops in Costco knows exactly what he was talking about.

Again, that is a fact, that we achieved great savings by using the block buy purchase mechanism. So I certainly strongly support Mr. WITTMAN's efforts here.

Again, I note that the \$49 million that Mr. VISCLOSKY talked about is in the amendment that is fast approaching, but it was not to cut the program; it was talking to the Navy, a recognition that the change orders that occurred in the last carrier, which is first in class, will not occur to the same extent. So we are really just talking about excess change orders, which, again, as the learning curve improves for carrier production, the Navy and the Armed Services Committee calculated would produce that kind of savings without inefficiencies and without doing harm to the carrier program.

So, again, I thank the chairwoman and the ranking member for supporting

Mr. WITTMAN's amendment. I look forward to working together in terms of both committees to try to achieve the goals of a strong 355-ship Navy.

□ 1830

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana). The gentleman from Virginia has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chair, I will be quick with my closing.

The bottom line is we need these carriers. We need \$26 billion in the shipbuilding budget to reach 355 ships. So the \$21 billion is admirable, but the pathway to get where we need to be of 355 is still out there for us. The challenge that we face ahead must be taken head-on. This is the first step in doing that.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MRS. MURPHY OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 27 printed in House Report 115-785.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. 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 8, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,200,000)".

Page 36, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,000,000)".

Page 36, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bipartisan amendment, which I am proud to colead with Congressman BARR of Kentucky and Congresswoman SINEMA and Congressman BIGGS of Arizona. This amendment would increase funding for the National Guard Counterdrug Program by \$3 million and reduce funding for the operation and maintenance defense-wide account by a corresponding amount.

If the amendment is adopted, the House will provide \$200 million in budget authority for the National Guard Counterdrug Program, which is approximately the amount that the National Guard Bureau indicates it can execute on an annual basis.

My colleagues and I offered this amendment for a simple reason. We believe the National Guard Counterdrug Program is important, that it is effective, and, therefore, that it should continue to receive robust funding. This is

especially true in light of the opioid epidemic that is harming so many communities and tearing apart so many families throughout this country, including in my district in central Florida and in Mr. BARR's district in central and eastern Kentucky.

Under the program, the National Guard Bureau distributes the money it receives from Congress to the National Guards in the States and the territories using a funding allocation model that examines the nature and scope of the drug problem in each jurisdiction. With this funding, National Guards may provide many different forms of authorized assistance to law enforcement agencies and community-based organizations, including analytical, reconnaissance, and training support.

This program is effective because it is targeted and tailored. Each State uses its funding in a way that reflects the drug interdiction priorities of its Governors, the capability of its National Guard, and the needs of its law enforcement partners at the Federal, State, and local levels.

For example, the Florida National Guard receives about \$10 million a year under this program, which it uses to reduce the supply of and demand for illegal drugs in the State. Since 2014, support provided by the Florida National Guard has been instrumental in over 2,000 arrests and the seizure of nearly \$14 billion in illicit drugs, property, and cash. National Guards in other States have their own success stories as well.

In conclusion, I hope my colleagues will support this bipartisan amendment, which is vital to our Nation's effort to disrupt and dismantle drug trafficking organizations and to protect our communities and our children from drug-related violence.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, but I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, this amendment increases funding for the National Guard's Counterdrug Program. We are very supportive of the counterdrug program. The bill in front of us increases funding at the same level that passed the House last year.

That being said, I understand this program is very important to many Members, and I support this amendment to provide a modest increase.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's support for this amendment, and I would just reiterate my view that the National Guard Counterdrug Program is important. I would respectfully ask my colleagues to support this amendment, which will help ensure this program is fairly funded.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY). The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands amendment No. 28 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. COURTNEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 29 printed in House Report 115-785.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chair, 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 22, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,500,000)".

Page 24, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$49,100,000)".

Page 24, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,001,435,000)".

Page 24, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$246,510,000)".

Page 24, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$20,000,000)".

Page 24, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$685,825,000)".

Page 26, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$386,325,000)".

Page 27, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$30,900,000)".

Page 29, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$73,000,000)".

Page 32, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$26,100,000)".

Page 32, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$159,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, this is a bipartisan, straightforward amendment that funds long-lead materials to boost construction of Virginia-class submarines to three per year, starting in 2022.

This amendment comes in response to the adamant, persistent warnings of our combatant commanders in testimony before Congress—Admiral Harris of the Pacific Command and General Scaparrotti of the European Command—that submarines are their number one unfilled priority.

This appropriations bill, unlike the NDAA, which passed 351-66, unfortunately, does not give the Navy the tools to answer that demand signal.

Here is the reality: Today, the fleet has 52 subs. The two per-year build rate in this bill will result in a drop to 42 submarines in 2028, as shown on this chart from official numbers straight from the Navy, because subs are aging out faster than the two-per-year build rate can replace.

My amendment does answer the demand signal of the COCOMs, raising the build rate to three per year at the earliest possible window, based on Navy analysis of industrial base capacity that was submitted to Congress last February.

Mr. Chairman, right now, in real time, the next 5-year block contract is being negotiated, which will determine the Nation's submarine construction until 2023. If this amendment fails, Members should be crystal clear that our Nation cannot get that time back to magically add subs later. It takes 5 years to build an attack sub, and this year's bill coincides with block negotiations in a make-or-break moment.

The offsets to pay for this amendment were part of the NDAA that a bipartisan majority of us just passed on May 24 and do not—I repeat, do not—cut a single ship or plane from the base bill, despite some of the claims that are flying around regarding this amendment.

In particular, a last-minute DOD letter out yesterday about out-year impacts is pure speculation. We will talk about this more later.

I am proud to say that my amendment is supported by some of America's most distinguished Navy officers, the last two CNOs, Admirals Roughead and Greenert; the former Fleet Forces Commander, Admiral Robert Natter; and the former Commander of Sub Forces, Admiral Michael Connor; as well as the Navy League and the metal trades of the AFL-CIO.

Mr. Chairman, they understood the urgency expressed by other COCOMs. Now the question is whether Congress will rise to the challenge they threw down.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, it really is this compelling argument: Are we, as a nation, willing to make the commitment to ensure our future national security?

Here is the deal: We are losing submarines at a breakneck pace because we are not building them fast enough to replace the ones that are retiring.

In 2020, the Chinese—just the Chinese—will have 70 submarines. They are building them at a rate of six per year. So, by 2029, when we have 42, they will have 124.

Are we willing to do that as a nation? Are we willing to take that risk? Are we willing to look at our children and grandchildren and tell them that, when we had a chance to do something, we didn't do it?

At 5:48 today, the United States Naval Institute news released an article that says: "Congress Faces Last Chance to Add 2 Virginia-Class Attack Subs to the Next Block Buy." Last chance.

Here is our chance to do what is right for the Nation. Here is our chance to do what is right for national security. Here is our chance to look at our children and grandchildren and tell them we did the right thing. We saw what was coming and we stood strong, and we built the submarines necessary to defend this Nation.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGOS).

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support just as strongly as my friend from Virginia in support of the amendment from my good friend from Connecticut.

Mr. Chairman, we have a serious strategic issue with respect to submarines. This amendment would give the Navy the option—just an option, Mr. Chairman, not a requirement—to procure submarines at a faster rate than it is currently planning right now.

As we face bigger threats from China, from Russia, and in force projection in general, we need to look at all options, all especially when we are routinely briefed, as we all are on the Armed Services Committee, on the strategic deficiencies that we find right now.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out and make sure everyone knows I have zero shipyards in Arizona. We do not build any ships in Arizona. We are landlocked.

I support this amendment not just because I am a marine and because I am a patron; I think it is in the best interests of our country and national defense.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment.

We have an opportunity that doesn't come around all that often, thank God. Apparently, there are people who think this isn't important to our national defense.

I went up to an electric boat just 2 months ago. This is the most complicated machine ever designed, ever built in the history of the world. You don't turn this on and off like a spigot of water.

This is about saving our country. You heard the chairman talk about how we are falling behind as a country. How can we sit by and let this go? We must come together. We have to build this now or we are putting our country at risk.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Connecticut has 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend both Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. WITTMAN for their tireless effort on the Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee.

As they have already stated, our Navy is being squeezed and desperately needs more ships, especially submarines. Numerous civilian and military officials, including Secretary Mattis, have testified about the need for these submarines.

The goal of this amendment to ensure the Navy has the necessary resources in 2019 so that they can officially pursue and negotiate the multiyear contract is extremely important.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Connecticut and my colleague from Virginia for their hard work.

Mr. Chair, following are my remarks in their entirety:

I would like to commend both Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. WITTMAN for their tireless work on the Seapower Subcommittee on the House Armed Services Committee supporting our nation's Navy and our shipbuilding industrial base. As I have the honor of representing Newport News, Virginia, home to thousands of shipbuilders, I appreciate their work and commitment to this issue.

As Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. WITTMAN have already stated, our Navy is being squeezed and desperately needs more ships, especially Virginia-class attack submarines. Numerous civilian and military officials, including Defense Secretary Mattis, have testified before Congress that we need more submarines. And that's the goal of this amendment—to ensure that the Navy has the necessary resources in FY2019 that they would need in order to efficiently pursue and negotiate the next multiyear block contract in the early 2020.

Specifically, this amendment provides funding for a submarine reactor, industrial base support and other critical items. The amendment does not bind Congress or the Navy into any specific course of action. If the Navy opts not to pursue the option to purchase additional submarines, that reactor and other material purchases with these funds will be absorbed into submarines that the Navy has already contracted to buy.

Our shipbuilding industrial base is critical to our national security. Making these investments today will both save money for our Navy and provide more certainty for our shipbuilders. This amendment is supported by unions, the Navy League, and retired flag officers.

Mr. Chair, we have heard warnings for years that our submarine fleet is at risk of dropping to levels that would make it incredibly difficult for the Navy to achieve its mission. This amendment guards against that from becoming a reality.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment so that Congress can preserve the option for the Navy to build as many submarines as possible, and as cost-effective as possible, in the next five-year block contract.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD letters from Admiral Greenert, Admiral Roughead, and the two most recent CNOs, Admiral Natter and Vice Admiral Connor.

JUNE 2018.

Hon. MAC THORNBERRY,
Chairman, House Armed Services Committee.

Hon. ROBERT WITTMAN,
Chairman, Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee.

Hon. ADAM SMITH,
Ranking Member, House Armed Services Committee.

Hon. JOE COURTNEY,
Ranking Member, Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee.

DEAR CHAIRMEN THORNBERRY AND WITTMAN, AND RANKING MEMBERS SMITH AND COURTNEY, Thank you for your leadership in passing another timely and insightful NDAA for 2019. In my opinion your respective committees have led the way in Congress in proposing strategic and coherent defense related legislation.

I want to pass along my belief in the importance of this bill's provision regarding the expansion of our undersea capabilities—particularly the submarine fleet.

During my 40-year career, including my tenure as CNO, our Navy "owned" the Undersea domain. Navy's superiority in the undersea domain has been unchallenged, predominantly due to the excellence of the submarine force. This is no longer assured. Real threats are emerging—fast.

Our industrial base builds the finest submarines in the world. Combatant Commanders consistently request a robust submarine presence. And, the demand for submarine presence has grown even more since I retired in 2015. Navy's recent Force Structure Assessment, embraced by the Executive and Legislative Branches, validates a need for 66 submarines. The need is real and urgent. However, without near term additional legislative action our fleet is on track to reach 41 attack submarines by 2029. This will leave our future civilian and military leaders woefully short of a key platform to meet emerging challenges in the undersea (and surface) domain.

The House 2019 NDAA recognized that sustaining an SSN build rate of two-per-year would not arrest, and reverse, the decline in the undersea fleet. Authorizing additional resources for increased SSN production, specifically preserving the option to use available industrial capacity in 2022 and 2023 to reach a three-per-year build rate, is exactly the kind of thoughtful and tangible legislative action, and messaging, we need. Again, your respective committees are leading the way. As Congress continues its work on defense authorization and appropriation in the near term, I would urge your colleagues to see the opportunity and flexibility inherent in this option—and support the plan laid out in the 2019 NDAA passed by the House.

Our undersea superiority is being challenged. The recent acknowledged loss of intellectual property (Sea Dragon) is a recent example. I urge the Congress to embrace this unique opportunity presented by the House 2019 NDAA. Our security depends on this sort of bold and innovative action.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN W. GREENERT,
Admiral, USN (Retired).

JUNE 17, 2018.

Hon. MAC THORNBERRY,
Chairman, House Armed Services Committee.

Hon. ADAM SMITH,
Ranking Member, House Armed Services Committee.

Hon. ROBERT WITTMAN,
Chairman, Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee.

Hon. JOE COURTNEY,
Ranking Member, Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee.

DEAR CHAIRMEN THORNBERRY AND WITTMAN AND RANKING MEMBERS SMITH AND COURTNEY: I appreciate your Committee's and Subcommittee's support of the U.S. Navy reflected in your markup of the 2019 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA).

The National Security Strategy, National Defense Strategy and your NDAA address and articulate the realities of once again confronting peer adversaries. In that regard, our undersea dominance will be challenged aggressively and simultaneously in several geographic regions. Whoever controls the undersea domain and sea lanes vital to us and our allies will have the upper hand in crisis and conflict history bears that out and our time is no different. Investments in capabilities (sensors, communications, weapons and quiet propulsion, etc.) will matter greatly but submarine capacity, the number of submarines we have to dominate in dispersed geographic areas, is vital. In confronting peer

adversaries at sea we must acknowledge and anticipate high-end, complex maritime warfare will result in some loss of capital assets which cannot be replaced quickly. Our submarines, because of their lethality, will be aggressively hunted and we must anticipate losses in that force. The Navy's recent Force Structure Assessment (FSA) validates the need for 66 attack submarines (I believe that number should be 72) yet we are on a path to 41 in 2029. The House 2019 NDAA recognizes this shortfall and thoughtfully and prudently seeks to enable increasing the Virginia Class submarine build rate to three ships per year in 2022 and 2023 by authorizing expenditures to that end.

Our peer adversaries are investing in research, technology and capacity. This is not what we think they will do, it is what they are doing. Our submarines and the industrial base that produces them are superior but we will need more of them and it in the coming years. We must continue to maintain our dominance and I urge your committee and your colleagues in the Senate and those on the House and Senate Appropriation Committees to definitively provide for at least three submarines in fiscal years 2022 and 2023. The gap in submarine capacity between the U.S. and our peer competitors is growing to our disadvantage. Proactive investments must be made now to arrest that growing disparity in submarine force structure and avoid the consequences of being, for the first time in decades, at a disadvantage under the sea.

Sincerely,

GARY ROUGHEAD,
Admiral, U.S. Navy (Retired).

JUNE 12, 2018.

Hon. MAC THORNBERRY,
Chairman,
House Armed Services Committee.

Hon. ROBERT WITTMAN,
Chairman, Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee.

Hon. ADAM SMITH,
Ranking Member,
House Armed Services Committee.

Hon. JOE COURTNEY,
Ranking Member, Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee.

DEAR CHAIRMEN THORNBERRY AND WITTMAN, AND RANKING MEMBERS SMITH AND COURTNEY: I am Robert J. Natter, Admiral, US Navy Retired. I am submitting to you my personal views and strong endorsement in support of one particular 2019 NDAA provision regarding our nation's submarine fleet. Firstly, I want you to know that I am not a submariner (I was a surface warfare officer); I am not a constituent; I do not live in a State that builds our nation's submarines; and I do not consult for or represent in any way our two major submarine building shipyards.

I do address this important issue from my perspective as a former Seventh Fleet Commander dealing with, among other challenges, North Korea, China, Freedom of Navigation operations around Taiwan and in Southeast and East Asia waters, and the readiness and combat planning associated with US Navy forces throughout Asia and Indian Ocean waters. I was also Commander of US Fleet Forces Command for three years and in that capacity was responsible for training, equipping and deploying all US-based Navy forces in response to national tasking.

Since I left the service, threats to our nation and our potential adversaries' capabilities have increased significantly. In the meantime our forces, while improving technologically, have diminished in numbers while being tasked at a level not seen since Cold War days. The Navy's recent Force

Structure Assessment clearly validates the need for increased ship and aircraft numbers to meet our defense needs. It also clearly validated the need for a MINIMUM of 66 attack submarines (SSNs). Having said that, we are now on a dangerous build slope of having only 41 SSNs by 2029. The House 2019 NDAA agreed that the current build rate of two submarines per year would not reverse the decline of our undersea fleet.

Authorizing additional dollars for increased SSN production to reach a three-per-year build rate addresses our national security disadvantage while reducing the unit cost of these valuable assets. As you and your Committees work with the Appropriators I encourage all your fellow members to embrace and support the build plan called for in the 2019 House NDAA with its increased build rate for our SSN fleet. In my view, if there is sufficient funding for only one more weapon or ship system, that ship should be an SSN. This is due to its inherent survivability, flexibility (anywhere on the globe) and effectiveness against the highest end threats.

I urge you and your fellow Congressional leaders to convince your colleagues that this provision is necessary, cost effective, and the right thing to do for our country. Thank you for your continuing service to our nation and strong leadership in Congress on behalf of our defense needs.

Most sincerely,

ROBERT J. NATTER,
Admiral, US Navy Retired.

JUNE 12, 2018.

Hon. MAC THORNBERRY,
Chairman,
House Armed Services Committee.

Hon. ROBERT WITTMAN,
Chairman, Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee.

Hon. ADAM SMITH,
Ranking Member,
House Armed Services Committee.

Hon. JOE COURTNEY,
Ranking Member, Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee.

DEAR CHAIRMEN THORNBERRY AND WITTMAN, AND RANKING MEMBERS SMITH AND COURTNEY: Thank you for passing the National Defense Authorization bill for FY2019 out of the House, especially the bill's provisions relating to the needed expansion of our undersea fleet.

Submarines are critically important to national security. During my time as Commander of the Submarine Force from 2012 to 2015, I struggled to pace the growing undersea needs of combatant commanders around the world. Many high priority missions can only be accomplished by submarines because peer competitors improved their anti-access technology and long-range strike capability. Submarine demand continues to grow. The most recent force structure assessment that increased the attack submarine requirement from 48 to 66.

Without additional action, our undersea fleet will drop to 41 attack submarines in 2029. This reduced fleet size will leave our civilian leaders and military commanders without the tools they need to keep ahead of changing threats and challenges around the globe. Mitigating this decline in the undersea fleet should be a top priority for the Navy, the Congress, and our nation.

The 2019 NDAA as passed by the House last month recognizes that simply sustaining the two-a-year production rate of Virginia-class submarines will not arrest the decline in our undersea fleet. By authorizing additional resources for increase submarine production, the bill preserves the option for utilizing available capacity in 2022 and 2023 to achieve a three-submarine build rate in those years.

This will reduce the looming shortfall we face in the coming decade and help alleviate the mis-match in submarine demand and resources.

As Congress continues its work on the defense authorization and funding measures in the weeks ahead, I would urge your colleagues to support the plan you have laid out in the 2019 NDAA passed by the House. At a time when our nation's leading edge in the undersea domain is being challenged by competitors around the world, this is an opportunity that we cannot afford to miss.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL J. CONNOR,
Vice Admiral (ret), U.S. Navy.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, again, I want to thank Mr. VISCLOSKEY and Ms. GRANGER for the courtesy and, again, having parity in terms of the time. I realize this is an extraordinary situation. They have a lot of folks who want to take the opposite position, but this is a really good comity in terms of the field.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank the ranking member for his work on this Defense Appropriations bill as well as Congresswoman GRANGER. In particular, I want to thank my colleague, Mr. COURTNEY, for his tireless work as the ranking member of the Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee and Mr. WITTMAN for his tireless work.

Our submarines are the true unsung heroes of our naval fleet, and I know from firsthand experience because much of the critical fabrication work of these amazing submarines is done by my constituents in my home State of Rhode Island.

Admirals continuously tell us that they cannot get enough submarines, which are desperately needed across the globe to protect the interests of the United States. In fact, they are only able to meet some 60 or 65 percent of the demands of the requests of the combatant commanders for the use of these submarines.

Despite this urgent need, the number in our fleet is actually dropping. By 2028, it has been reported the number of submarines will drop from 52 to 42. So how can we support this near 20 percent drop when we have the ability to do something about it?

Thankfully, there is a plan to close at least some of this gap by procuring additional submarines in 2022 and 2023. But we can't increase our sub production by 50 percent on a dime. We need to make investments today if we are to be in a position to help reduce the bottling out of our sub fleet.

The hardworking employees of our defense industrial base need to build additional capacity now. We need to act immediately if we are going to be in a position to provide more submarine reactors in the out-years.

□ 1845

This amendment will ensure that we have the flexibility going forward. That is why we included similar language in this year's National Defense Authorization Act, which overwhelmingly passed this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, the urgency is particularly evident because our adversaries are not standing still. DOD has estimated that China will have an estimated between 69 and 78 submarines in 2020, and the CSBA has estimated that they will have between 80 and 100 submarines somewhere between 2022 and the 2030 time frame. We cannot, in good conscience, ignore the startling growth of this adversarial fleet.

Mr. Chair, subs not only deter our adversaries, but they also build up our allies and ensure a more prosperous, secure world. Funding our Virginia-class and Columbia-class programs must remain an absolute priority. Anything less is an affront to our national security.

This amendment continues our practice of robust investment in our submarine fleet, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, may I ask the Chair how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana has 1¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chair, having been pretty close to this issue over the last 12 years, I would like to add just a little bit of perspective in terms of this initiative which, again, started at the Seapower Subcommittee.

The last two times block contracts were being negotiated was in 2007 and in 2012. In both instances, the Congress plussed up the budget for submarine construction exactly the same way we are doing it in this amendment: by funding long-lead materials; advanced procurement; purchase of a reactor, which will be built in Ohio, by the way. That gave the Navy the tools to increase their block buy.

It was done, incidentally, over the objection of the Department of Defense. I was there with Mr. Murtha and Mr. YOUNG who, again, decided to override that objection at the time. That is when we went from one-sub-a-year to two-subs-a-year production.

In 2012 we had a similar situation where the White House, the Obama administration, only requested nine subs in the next block contract, the block 4. Again, the two committees working together boosted that block authority in

appropriations to get to 10 a year. Again, that was over the objections of the Department of Defense.

I realize we are going to hear a lot from my colleagues, my good friends, about Mr. Shanahan's letter that objects to my amendment. I would just say that that is not the first time we have heard that. Luckily, we have leadership in Congress which withstood those arguments. Otherwise, we would be in a worse predicament than we are today.

Again, follow past precedent. The 23 bipartisan amendment cosponsors and I strongly urge adoption of this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank both the chair and the ranking member for the time they have allotted.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, this amendment increases funding for the Virginia-class submarine program by \$1 billion, at the expense of other critical Navy and Air Force programs.

The Department of Defense, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of the Air Force, and the National Coast Guard Association of the United States all oppose this amendment.

In fact, the Deputy Secretary of Defense sent a letter detailing the harmful effects this amendment has on multiple critical National Defense Strategy programs. His quote: "disrupt multiple critical National Defense Strategy programs."

These are must-have programs, like the DDG 51 guided-missile destroyer, the *Nimitz*-class aircraft carrier, the Global Hawk, and the TAO fleet oiler, just to name a few.

I have also received a letter from the National Guard Association opposing this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD the letters I received from the Deputy Secretary of Defense and the National Guard Association.

DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,

Washington, DC, June 26, 2018.

Hon. KAY GRANGER,

Chairwoman, Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM CHAIRWOMAN: The Department of Defense (DoD) objects to the proposed amendment by Representatives Courtney and Wittman that cuts over \$1 billion from the Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 President's Budget. The FY 2019 cuts disrupt multiple critical National Defense Strategy (NDS) programs, including the carrier program and Air Force research and procurement. Combined with the out-year cost of finishing the incrementally funded submarines, the Department would be required to cut over \$6 billion from multiple programs such as reducing, the buys of Arleigh Burke-class destroyers, oilers and fast frigates.

The FY 2019 President's Budget request supports a robust, balanced shipbuilding program, providing \$23.7 billion for ten combat ships and eight support ships, including, two Virginia-class submarines. DoD is com-

mitted to growing the size of the Navy, investing over \$20 billion per year across the Future Years Defense Program. Consistent with the NDS, Dolls request balances ship procurement with readiness and other systems to be a more lethal joint force and meet future capabilities.

The Virginia-class submarine provides crucial capabilities to the joint warfight. The current Navy fleet faces known shortfalls in attack submarine inventory in future years. However, in the FY 2019 President's Budget we balanced the investment in this capability against other critical capabilities in areas such as space and cyber, and in emerging areas such as autonomy and artificial intelligence.

The Department appreciates Congressional support for growing the Navy's fleet and ensuring robust future capabilities. Working together we will find solutions that make us stronger and safer.

PATRICK M. SHANAHAN.

NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION OF
THE UNITED STATES, INC.,

Washington, DC, June 27, 2018.

Hon. KAY GRANGER,

Chairwoman, Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM CHAIRWOMAN: On behalf of the 45,000 members of the National Guard Association of the United States (NGAUS), I write today to express our opposition to the proposed amendment by Representatives Courtney and Wittman which provides funding for long lead time materials to construct additional Virginia-class submarines in FY 2022 and FY 2023.

We share the concerns of the Department of Defense as outlined in their June 26th letter of objection. Primarily, our concern centers on the fact that while programmatic adjustments are identified for the beginning of the program, this change will create an unfunded liability across the multi-year procurement cycle. As you know, the National Guard is often supplemented with Congressional assistance from your committee and I worry that creating such a large additional requirement will unduly force cuts in other critical defense funding over the next several years.

I thank you and your staff for your efforts in writing this expansive and important piece of national security legislation. Thank you, as always, for your continued support of the men and women of the National Guard. My staff and I stand by to assist in any way, and I look forward to continuing our great work together.

Sincerely,

J. ROY ROBINSON,

Brigadier General (Ret.),

President, NGAUS.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, not only does this amendment cut \$1 billion from vital programs in FY19; it will leave future Congresses with at least a \$6 billion shortfall. That is not the appropriate way to spend our taxpayers' dollars.

The Navy is not committed to funding these two additional submarines in the future. In fact, the Statement of Administrative Policy on the House-passed NDAA specifically objects to adding two additional submarines above what is currently in the President's budget.

This amendment takes \$346 million that has been set aside for the reactor core for the last *Nimitz*-class carrier refueling overhaul. Delaying this procurement for yet another year hurts

this program and creates serious production gaps. This will directly impact the ability of the manufacturer to provide *Columbia*-class core reactors in a timely manner, and it introduces risk to the schedule for the *Columbia*-class submarine program. That is unacceptable.

The amendment takes \$315 million from other shipbuilding programs, funds that will have to be repaid in future years. It takes more than \$245 million from the DDG 51 guided-missile destroyer program, a critical missile-defense-capable ship that is deployed throughout the world.

This amendment is asking Congress to fund \$1 billion now but create a bill for the future, a bill that will not be paid due to the imminent threat of the return of sequestration.

Some Members have asked if we can just fix this amendment in conference. Let me be very clear on that point. The answer is no. We will not be able to fix the damage this amendment causes in conference. Should this amendment pass, all cuts will be included in the conference report.

I received a letter today from Representative COURTNEY and Representative WITTMAN asking me to reconsider my position on their amendment. Their letter says that this amendment doesn't lock the Congress or Department into any course of action. That is not true.

Who will pay for these subs, and where will they find the money? Cutting \$1 billion out of critically important programs so the Navy can have options in future negotiations of additional submarines is also irresponsible, especially when the Navy has neither requested nor budgeted them.

Since when is it acceptable to give \$1 billion to someone so they can have options?

Their letter also claims they have not heard of any concerns about the proposed first-year offsets. This is not true. In May of this year, the Navy warned that any reductions to the DDG 51 destroyer program will affect the ability of the Navy to achieve any—any—multiyear procurement savings.

Mr. Chair, I will continue to oppose this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. I strongly urge my colleagues to reject this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I would emphasize that I am strongly opposed to this amendment and join with the chairwoman.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I thank the ranking member of the subcommittee, with whom I feel very privileged to work, for allowing me this time. I rise tonight in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chair, first I want to say, I have the utmost respect for the many sponsors of this amendment, and particularly Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. COURTNEY. They have shown tremendous bipartisan support and leadership in their tireless support of the Navy. They are excellent in their roles on their committees, and I consider them both great colleagues and friends.

However, this amendment is the wrong way to support our Navy. The amendment would cut \$1 billion in funding from a variety of extremely important Navy and Air Force programs to fund advanced procurement for two *Virginia*-class submarines.

While they have made an excellent case about how important strategically those submarines are—and I agree with them on that—the problem is that one of them will be the DDG 51 program, which is supported at Bath Iron Works.

I am proud to be from Maine and to have Bath Iron Works and their excellent workforce in my district. The men and women of Bath Iron Works have been proving the adage “Bath Built is Best Built” for decades, and I oppose any efforts to cut from the DDG 51 program.

My colleagues have said that this amendment is funded by potential multiyear procurement savings in future years in the targeted the programs and, therefore, we should take that funding from these programs now. But the rationale ignores critical military and defense needs and the budgets that have been agreed upon.

The amendment will abandon several agreed-upon key national defense priorities, including increasing the ships in our Navy, a critical priority. Ships that I am proud to say are being manufactured, designed, and engineered by many hardworking men and women in my district.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment, which would add \$1 billion in advanced procurement for two additional *Virginia*-class submarines in FY 2022/23.

The Navy has a substantial plan for submarines. It achieves the mission of a 355-ship Navy by 2050 and does it in a way that is fiscally responsible and provides for stability of the industrial base.

In a letter from the Secretary of the Navy to Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, the Secretary states: “The FY 2019 President’s budget provides sufficient funding to procure the ships included in the FY19-FY23 Future Years Defense Program.”

An advanced procurement amendment of \$1 billion in FY19 and, by the way, an additional \$6 billion tail, would take from much-needed programs that have already been considered by the committee. Additionally, it would jeopardize the future programs and assume risk in other areas.

Mr. Chair, I certainly urge a “no” vote on this, and I will remind my Members, as my friend from Indiana mentioned, we have a cliff coming in 2020. Making a commitment to spend an additional \$7 billion, which we don't have, is not a good idea. We ought to be working on trying to resolve that cliff issue.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chair, the chairwoman, the ranking member, and I wholly support the U.S. Navy and, also, the Navy's plan to get to the 355-ship number.

This bill already supports the purchase of 12 new ships, including two new *Virginia*-class attack submarines. However, this amendment for an additional two more *Virginia*-class subs will wind up cutting, as you heard, much-needed money from other vital programs. The Department of Defense estimates that it would cut \$7 billion from other programs over the next 5 years, by the way, impacting military readiness and other vital equipment procurement.

So, again, while we must obviously pursue an aggressive shipbuilding program, it must be balanced. The *Virginia*-class sub is absolutely a critical national security capability, but we do not want to sacrifice other equally critical capabilities while we do that.

Mr. Chair, I would respectfully urge a “no” vote on this amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. Chair, I would again emphasize, first of all, that the committee recognizes the needs of the United States Navy, and in the underlying legislation we have increased—increased—the administration's request.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, we have increased the underlying budget request by \$837 million, and we have added two ships.

The best description for the amendment before us is shortsighted cannibalism. It eats other important Navy and Air Force programs in 2019 to feed the *Virginia*-class submarine. In doing so, it creates a myriad of problems in the out years.

The chairwoman mentioned a number of the programs that were cut in this proposal. I mentioned one in a previous amendment. I would emphasize that some of the gross numbers that have been mentioned include a cut of \$10.5 million from weapons procurement from the United States Navy. It does, I emphasize, cut from carriers \$49.1 million. It takes \$20 million from fleet oilers. It takes \$26.1 million from our research and development from the Navy and \$262.9 million from the Air Force.

This is not new money. This is not free money. We are taking money from programs that need it in 2019.

Mr. Chair, I would also point out that Mr. COURTNEY mentioned two letters that were referenced by the chairwoman. I would also reference two other letters. The suggestion was made that we hear from the administration all of the time.

□ 1900

Well, Chairman MCCAIN, in the Senate, on May 30, 2017, heard from Admiral Richardson relative to the Navy's unfunded priority list for fiscal year 2018. Admiral Richardson, who is Chief of Naval Operations, mentioned 38 priority items for the United States Navy. It did not include this item. It included a request for an additional \$4,796,000,000. It didn't include this item.

Mr. Chairman, I have a letter that was sent to Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN on February 22 of this year from Admiral Richardson for the Navy's unfunded priority list for this year, 2019. It includes 25 items. I have been scanning this with my bifocals, looking for this item of importance to the United States Navy, and I have not been able to find it in their request for an additional \$1,502,270,000.

The sponsors' claim that this gives the Navy the option to construct two additional *Virginia*-class submarines during the next 5-year block contract, cutting \$1 billion for useful programs this year, to give the Navy an option to do something in 4 years, does not make a bit of sense to me.

The sponsors say that this amendment sets the Navy up well for a multiyear procurement agreement, and I might not be able to argue that, in particular. However, in their quest to set that up, they are, in fact, damaging the ability of the United States Navy to set up a multiyear procurement program for the DDG-51 program.

Mr. Chairman, for all of these reasons, I am strongly opposed to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I urge the rejection of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. COURTNEY. 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 Connecticut will be postponed.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, earlier in this debate, we thanked all the members of the staff who made this great bill a reality through their good efforts: the professional staff, associate staff, and all those who work in our personal offices. Again, I would like to do that on all of our behalf.

Mr. Chairman, I especially thank Chairwoman GRANGER and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for their leadership, and the involvement of all those on the floor in the production of this bill. But, at this time, I would like to offer special recognition to one in particular: the late Stephen Sepp, the Appropriations Committee's resident budget expert.

Sepp, as he was known by all, died earlier this month, but he left his mark on this bill and on our committee. His funeral was held today at St. Peter's Catholic Church, in Olney, Maryland, and attended by hundreds of Members and his friends from Capitol Hill and the appropriations family.

Among many things, Sepp was the caretaker of the all-important 302(b) sub-allocations. Through his careful work from his desk in the Capitol, upstairs here, and from home, in the final months of his illness, he ensured that the Congress provided adequate funding—may I say well over \$1 trillion—not just for the Department of Defense, but for all 12 Appropriations bills.

This, of course, required a deep understanding of the policy and budgetary needs of each and every aspect of these bills, and a base of knowledge and situational awareness of all the various political factors at play. He expertly maneuvered this huge responsibility with skill, savvy, and an immense amount of poise.

Sepp embodied strength, facing both professional and personal challenges equally with grace and fortitude. In short, he made a difference in the lives of all he touched—literally millions—as well as the lives of Americans in every part of the country.

We extend our love to his wife, Diem; his two children; and family. We will always remember him.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to follow the chairman's remarks, and associate myself with his remarks relative to the staffer who has been lost.

The chairwoman was kind enough in the general debate to mention the staff and the Members who have been so instrumental in this work product, and I would be remiss if I did not conclude by again thanking the full committee chairman, as well as Mrs. LOWEY.

I can't thank Chairwoman GRANGER enough. This has just been a pleasant and productive experience, and I appreciate her leadership very much. I ap-

preciate the work of all of the members of the subcommittee, as well as all of our staff. That includes our clerks, Jennifer Miller and Rebecca Leggieri, as well as Walter Hearne, Brooke Boyer, B.G. Wright, Allison Deters, Collin Lee, Matthew Bower, Jackie Ripke, Hayden Milberg, Bill Adkins, Sherry Young, Barry Walker, Jennifer Chartrand, Chris Bigelow, Johnnie Kaberle, Jonathan Fay, Joe DeVooght, and Christie Cunningham. I can't thank them enough.

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

Ms. GRANGER. 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. WITTMAN) having assumed the chair, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, 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. 6157) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2385. An act to establish best practices for State, tribal and local governments participating in the Integrated Public Alert and Warning System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; in addition, to the Committee on Homeland Security for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on June 27, 2018, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 2229. To amend title 5, United States Code, to provide permanent authority for judicial review of certain Merit Systems Protection Board decisions relating to whistleblowers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 931. To require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a voluntary registry to collect data on cancer incidence among firefighters.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 28, 2018, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5320. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31195; Amdt. No.: 3801] received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5321. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31196; Amdt. No.: 3802] received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5322. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; Greenwood, MS [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0994; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ASO-21] received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5323. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Flint, MI, and Establishment of Class E Airspace; Owosso, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0020; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AGL-28] received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5324. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace, Duncan, OK [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0100; Airspace Docket No.: 18-ASW-3] received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5325. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace and Establishment of Class E Airspace; Norman, OK; and Amendment of Class E Airspace; Oklahoma City, OK [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0825; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ASW-12] received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5326. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0907; Product Identifier 2017-NM-069-AD; Amendment 39-19274; AD 2018-09-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5327. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Direc-

tives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1246; Product Identifier 2017-NM-086-AD; Amendment 39-19297; AD 2018-11-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5328. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1175; Product Identifier 2017-NM-087-AD; Amendment 39-19300; AD 2018-11-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5329. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0413; Product Identifier 2018-NM-061-AD; Amendment 39-19283; AD 2018-10-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5330. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0776; Product Identifier 2017-NM-062-AD; Amendment 39-19264; AD 2018-09-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5331. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0779; Product Identifier 2017-NM-040-AD; Amendment 39-19301; AD 2018-11-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5332. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1421; Product Identifier 2014-NM-177-AD; Amendment 39-19302; AD 2018-11-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5333. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1421; Product Identifier 2017-NM-093-AD; Amendment 39-19296; AD 2018-11-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5334. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0117; Product Identifier 2017-NM-104-AD; Amendment 39-19298; AD 2018-11-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law

104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5335. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1245; Product Identifier 2017-NM-099-AD; Amendment 39-19266; AD 2018-09-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5336. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0071; Product Identifier 2017-NM-063-AD; Amendment 39-19280; AD 2018-10-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5337. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1245; Product Identifier 2017-NM-099-AD; Amendment 39-19266; AD 2018-09-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5338. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0492; Product Identifier 2018-NM-083-AD; Amendment 39-19303; AD 2018-11-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5339. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0490; Product Identifier 2018-NM-018-AD; Amendment 39-19299; AD 2018-11-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5340. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; CFM International S.A. Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0443; Product Identifier 2018-NE-14-AD; Amendment 39-19286; AD 2018-10-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5341. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Aircraft Industries a.s. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0462; Product Identifier 2018-CE-017-AD; Amendment 39-19292; AD 2018-11-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5342. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1063; Product Identifier 2017-SW-088-AD;

Amendment 39-19291; AD 2018-11-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5343. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3883; Product Identifier 2014-SW-029-AD; Amendment 39-19289; AD 2018-11-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5344. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0874; Product Identifier 2015-SW-082-AD; Amendment 39-19282; AD 2018-10-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5345. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Limited (Bell) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0667; Product Identifier 2016-SW-053-AD; Amendment 39-19281; AD 2018-10-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5346. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1163; Product Identifier 2017-CE-041-AD; Amendment 39-19260; AD 2018-09-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5347. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Safran Helicopter Engines, S.A., Turboshift Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0838; Product Identifier 2017-NE-33-AD; Amendment 39-19275; AD 2018-10-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5348. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Safran Helicopter Engines, S.A., Turboshift Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0838; Product Identifier 2017-NE-33-AD; Amendment 39-19275; AD 2018-10-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5349. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0373; Product Identifier 2018-CE-009-AD; Amendment 39-19278; AD 2018-10-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5350. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0372; Product Identifier 2018-CE-011-AD; Amendment 39-19279; AD 2018-10-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 5905. A bill to authorize basic research programs in the Department of Energy Office of Science for fiscal years 2018 and 2019; with an amendment (Rept. 115-787). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 5907. A bill to provide directors of the National Laboratories signature authority for certain agreements, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-788). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 5346. A bill to amend title 51, United States Code, to provide for licenses and experimental permits for space support vehicles, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-789). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 5729. A bill to restrict the department in which the Coast Guard is operating from implementing any rule requiring the use of biometric readers for biometric transportation security cards until after submission to Congress of the results of an assessment of the effectiveness of the transportation security card program; with an amendment (Rept. 115-790, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 971. Resolution providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 970) insisting that the Department of Justice fully comply with the requests, including subpoenas, of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the subpoena issued by the Committee on the Judiciary relating to potential violations of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act by personnel of the Department of Justice and related matters (Rept. 115-791). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. NORTON, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. DANNY K.

DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SOTO, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SIRES, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 6236. A bill to require the reunification of families separated upon entry into the United States as a result of the "zero-tolerance" immigration policy requiring criminal prosecution of all adults apprehended crossing the border illegally, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 6237. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2018 and 2019 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BEYER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SCHRAEDER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 6238. A bill to secure the rights of public employees to organize, act concertedly, and bargain collectively, which safeguard the public interest and promote the free and unobstructed flow of commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. MICHELLE LUJÁN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. NADLER, Ms.

NORTON, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SIREN, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TONKO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. NEAL, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HECK, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. BERA, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WALZ, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BASS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. HOYER, Mr. KIND, Mr. LAMB, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. CORREA):

H.R. 6239. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, Super PACs and other entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Financial Services, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York (for himself and Mr. CARTER of Georgia):

H.R. 6240. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for certain user fees under the 340B drug discount program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 6241. A bill to prohibit certain business concerns from receiving assistance from the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. COOK (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 6242. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to clarify the authority of tribal governments in regard to the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 6243. A bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to eliminate the repatriation loan program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EMMER (for himself, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 6244. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 300 South Fourth Street in Minneapolis, Minnesota, as the "Diana E. Murphy United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas:

H.R. 6245. A bill to require access to Federal facilities by Member of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico (for herself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SOTO, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. BACON, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. YOHO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. TROTT, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. TAYLOR):

H.R. 6246. A bill to enable the admission of the territory of Puerto Rico into the Union as a State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HULTGREN:

H.R. 6247. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce the minimum age at which a widow or widower may remarry and remain eligible for benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 6248. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require radio and television broadcasters to provide free broadcasting time for political advertising, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. JONES, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Ms. PINGREE):

H.R. 6249. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to treat certain foreign-owned corporations and business organizations as foreign nationals for purposes of the ban on campaign activity, to prohibit foreign-affiliated section 501(c)(4) organizations from making contributions to super PACs or disbursing funds for independent expenditures or electioneering communications, to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 to reform the procedures for the registration of agents of foreign principals under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. POSEY, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY):

H.R. 6250. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for lifelong learning accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. ESPALLAT, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 6251. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permanently appropriate funding for the administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, Rules, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCEACHIN (for himself and Mr. FASO):

H.R. 6252. A bill to amend the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act to provide for additional procedures for families with children under the age of 6, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H.R. 6253. A bill to prohibit the Department of Health and Human Services from using any Federal funds to conduct or support a video contest on the Internet or by means of other media; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELCH, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SARBANES, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 6254. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to promulgate regulations to ensure access to voice service in order to facilitate communications between, and reunification of, alien guardians and alien children, to provide for certain requirements relating to inmate calling services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SOTO (for himself and Mr. GAETZ):

H.R. 6255. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish measures to combat invasive lionfish, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself, Mr. POCAN, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SOTO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 6256. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Health and Human Services to allow Members of Congress to tour detention facilities that house foreign national minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.J. Res. 136. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States waiving the application of the first article of amendment to the political speech of corporations and other business organizations with respect to the disbursement of funds in connection with public elections and granting Congress and the States the power to establish limits on contributions and expenditures in elections for public office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. BUCK, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BRAT, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. GRIFFITH):

H. Res. 970. A resolution insisting that the Department of Justice fully comply with the requests, including subpoenas, of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the subpoena issued by the Committee on the Judiciary relating to potential violations of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act by personnel of the Department of Justice and related matters; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. HULTGREN introduced a bill (H.R. 6257) for the relief of Judge Neringa Venckiene, who the Government of Lithuania seeks on charges related to her pursuit of justice against Lithuanian public officials accused of sexually molesting her young niece; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. BASS:

H.R. 6236.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This resolution is enacted pursuant to the power granted in Congress under Article I, Section 1.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 6237.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States government are carried out to support the national security interests of the United States, to support and assist the armed forces of the United States, and to support the President in the execution of the foreign policy of the United States.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States provides, in pertinent part, that "Congress shall have power . . . to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States"; ". . . to raise and support armies . . ."; "To provide and maintain a Navy"; "To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces"; and "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested in this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 6238.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 6239.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 6240.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 6241.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 6242.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 6243.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 6244.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, 7 & 18; Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas:

H.R. 6245.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Miss GONZALEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico:

H.R. 6246.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution

"New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the Jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the Junction of two or more States, or Parts of States, without the Consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress."

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution

"The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

By Mr. HULTGREN:

H.R. 6247.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18. To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other power vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 6248.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 6249.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 4 of Article I

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 6250.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 6251.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Clause I of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Mr. MCEACHIN:

H.R. 6252.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. NORMAN:

H.R. 6253.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 6254.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution. That provision gives Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 6255.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:

H.R. 6256.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. HULTGREN:

H.R. 6257.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution provides that Congress shall have power "to establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States."

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.J. Res. 136.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 50: Mr. PETERSON.
 H.R. 154: Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 173: Mrs. BLACK.
 H.R. 184: Mr. GIANFORTE.
 H.R. 237: Mr. POLIQUIN.
 H.R. 569: Mr. HECK.
 H.R. 592: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
 H.R. 754: Mr. JORDAN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mrs. COMSTOCK.
 H.R. 930: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, and Ms. HANABUSA.
 H.R. 959: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 972: Mr. GOMEZ.
 H.R. 1150: Mr. LAHOOD.
 H.R. 1204: Mr. POLIQUIN.
 H.R. 1247: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 1318: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
 H.R. 1337: Mr. ROSKAM.
 H.R. 1409: Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 1511: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 1606: Mr. LANGEVIN.
 H.R. 1683: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
 H.R. 1734: Mr. LAHOOD.
 H.R. 1789: Mr. BANKS of Indiana.
 H.R. 1874: Mr. SERRANO and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
 H.R. 2272: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 2345: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. CORREA.
 H.R. 2416: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 2591: Mr. MARSHALL.
 H.R. 2598: Mr. CLAY and Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 2719: Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 2871: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.
 H.R. 2895: Mr. SOTO.
 H.R. 2976: Mr. HASTINGS.
 H.R. 3309: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
 H.R. 3310: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
 H.R. 3378: Mr. KIHUEN.
 H.R. 3593: Mr. WESTERMAN.
 H.R. 3923: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CORREA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 4099: Mr. FASO.
 H.R. 4704: Mr. FOSTER.
 H.R. 4737: Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 4843: Ms. SINEMA.
 H.R. 4940: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
 H.R. 4969: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 4985: Mr. HURD.
 H.R. 5004: Ms. MENG.
 H.R. 5011: Mr. VEASEY.
 H.R. 5058: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 5105: Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 5107: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. GRIFFITH.
 H.R. 5145: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. RASKIN.
 H.R. 5160: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.R. 5191: Mr. AGUILAR.
 H.R. 5248: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 5270: Mr. SHIMKUS.
 H.R. 5359: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 5385: Mr. UPTON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. PETERS.
 H.R. 5460: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida and Mr. SMUCKER.
 H.R. 5521: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROSS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. DAVIDSON, and Mrs. LESKO.
 H.R. 5574: Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 5576: Mr. CURTIS.
 H.R. 5595: Mr. ABRAHAM.
 H.R. 5634: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 5648: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 5671: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RUPERSBERGER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. WALDEN.
 H.R. 5814: Mr. YARMUTH.
 H.R. 5819: Mr. MEEKS.
 H.R. 5855: Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 5898: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 5905: Mr. ABRAHAM.
 H.R. 5906: Mr. ABRAHAM and Mr. CULBERSON.
 H.R. 5907: Mr. ABRAHAM.
 H.R. 5922: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
 H.R. 5948: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. MARINO, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
 H.R. 5949: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. MARINO, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
 H.R. 5988: Mrs. NOEM and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
 H.R. 6012: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 6014: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. REED, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. POE of Texas.
 H.R. 6048: Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. BARRAGAN, and Mr. TAKANO.
 H.R. 6062: Mr. MARCHANT.
 H.R. 6075: Mr. CICILLINE.
 H.R. 6103: Mr. YARMUTH.
 H.R. 6114: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 6121: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Mr. LAMALFA.
 H.R. 6174: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
 H.R. 6178: Mr. ROKITA.
 H.R. 6180: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SIRES, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. SOTO, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. VELA, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CORREA, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
 H.R. 6190: Mr. GALLAGHER.
 H.R. 6193: Mr. COHEN, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 6197: Ms. TITUS and Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 6207: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 6222: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SOTO, and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 6223: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SOTO, and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 6225: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.J. Res. 33: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. SINEMA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. COSTA.
 H.J. Res. 48: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Ms. PINGREE.
 H.J. Res. 53: Mr. LANCE.
 H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. COFFMAN.
 H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H. Con. Res. 72: Mr. CORREA.
 H. Res. 318: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
 H. Res. 673: Mr. COOK and Mr. SESSIONS.
 H. Res. 914: Mr. EMMER.
 H. Res. 927: Mr. O'ROURKE.
 H. Res. 944: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. COOK, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H. Res. 960: Mr. TAKANO.
 H. Res. 962: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BRAT, and Mr. YOHO.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 2069: Mr. KHANNA.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 27, 2018

No. 108

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, this day our hearts rise up to meet You, and our lips extoll Your wonderful works on the Earth. Great is Your faithfulness.

Today may Your peace go with our lawmakers wherever You lead them, enabling them to feel the wonder of Your sacred presence. Lord, give them the wisdom to find true life in serving others, becoming Your ambassadors to our Nation and world. Inspire the hearts of our Senators to obey Your precepts, as they discover the delight of doing Your will. Help them to see that their well-being is inextricably bound to the well-being of their neighbors. Inspire them to share compassion, patience, and courage.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The majority leader is recognized.

HONOR FLIGHT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, it is my privilege today to welcome a special group of visitors to Washington. Thanks to Honor Flight Bluegrass, more Kentucky veterans are touching

down today in our Nation's Capital. They are coming to remember fallen comrades and to visit the memorials dedicated to their own service.

Earlier this month, I was lucky enough to spend time with a flight of World War II veterans who arrived in time for the 74th anniversary of D-Day. Today's flight includes veterans of World War II, along with Korea and Vietnam. On behalf of the Commonwealth and all Americans, I am proud to thank them for their service.

Next week, we celebrate our Independence Day. So let's not forget that the freedoms we enjoy come at a cost. Let's take time to thank the heroes who have paid it and those who continue to pay it today.

FARM BILL

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today the Senate will continue our work on the farm bill. The bipartisan collaboration of Chairman ROBERTS and Ranking Member STABENOW has given all Senators the opportunity to review and consider this important legislation.

Now we start the amendment process. Ideas from many of our colleagues have already been included in the Roberts substitute amendment, but the bill managers are open to considering additional amendments.

We will start with the Thune amendment regarding the Conservation Reserve Program and go on from there, but it remains our intention to finish consideration of the bill this week. This bill is too important to let it languish. This is our chance to support the farm families, producers, and rural communities on whom our Nation depends. Make no mistake about it. They need that support.

American farmers are staring down falling commodity prices and unstable markets and living under the constant threat of droughts, floods, or other natural disasters. They are looking for

certainty and predictability. This farm bill delivers.

"The fact is, without the solid foundation of the farm bill and the certainty it provides, many farmers and ranchers would not be able to get operating loans to farm for another year."

Those are the words of the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which passionately supports this bill. So do the agricultural equipment manufacturers. So do the National Association of Counties. So do many other groups dedicated to agriculture, business, hunger prevention, and the health of rural America.

That is because this legislation provides the immediate assistance and stability that farmers count on to keep feeding and supporting this country right now and because it will empower our farmers and ranchers to invest for the future.

Chairman ROBERTS described this perfectly yesterday. Here is what he said: "It takes the government providing tools and then getting out of the producers' way."

On the latter point, I am most excited about a provision in this bill that will clear the way for the legal farming of industrial hemp by removing current roadblocks that prevent farmers, in Kentucky and around the country, from capitalizing on this promising crop.

Since the 1970s, except in a few limited cases, American farmers have not been able to grow industrial hemp in their fields. That doesn't mean consumers aren't buying hemp—far from it. Hemp is in everything from health products to home insulation. The global market for hemp is estimated to consist of more than 25,000 products. According to one estimate, back in 2016, U.S. retail sales of hemp products totaled approximately \$688 million. Last year alone, Kentucky hemp recorded more than \$16 million in product sales through the State's pilot program.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S4459

So American consumers are buying hemp, but thanks to heavy-handed regulations, the only option at scale is importing hemp from foreign producers.

Enough is enough. Industrial hemp is a completely different plant than its illicit cousin. It is time we get Washington out of the way and let American farmers meet the growing demand of American consumers.

In the last farm bill, I championed a hemp pilot program that opened the door to some exploration. I recently heard from a fifth-generation Kentucky farmer from Garrard County who participates in the program. Here is what he said: "We had no idea what it would turn into." He said: Growing hemp has been "career-defining for me, beyond anything I'd ever imagined."

At a time when the farm economy is struggling, it is encouraging to hear such enthusiasm for a new potential cash crop.

Another farmer from Marion County wrote and asked Congress to "continue your efforts until we can grow, research, and market this crop freely without undue restriction. We have barely scratched the surface of the countless benefits that come from this plant."

Hemp will be a bright spot for our future. It is full of economic potential in Kentucky and the Nation. So we should pass the farm bill without delay. Let's address farmers' immediate needs. Let's give them new tools to help secure their future. Let's get Washington out of the way in the cases where outdated policies are holding them back.

The bill before us is a prime example of the good that can come when we work together. I look forward to the Senate passing it for Kentucky's farm families. So let's continue our work to get it done.

TAX REFORM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, this week I have been discussing how the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is creating breathing room in family budgets. Yesterday I focused on the tax cuts themselves. Lower rates, a doubled standard deduction, a bigger child tax credit add up to serious savings for middle-class families.

Today I want to discuss the permanent pay raises, bonuses, and new benefits that tax reform has enabled U.S. businesses to provide for their workers. Remember, this is exactly what our Democratic colleagues insisted tax reform would not—would not—bring about. To quote my friend, the Democratic leader, right here on the Senate floor in December: "There is nothing about this tax bill that is suited to the needs of the American worker."

Well, Republicans knew better. We listened to the economists who explained in an open letter that "the question isn't whether workers will be helped by a corporate tax rate reduction—it's how much" they will be helped.

The reason is simple. American workers can only thrive if the American businesses that employ them are given the tools to compete and win on the world stage. Here is what they need to compete: a 21st century tax code.

Most economists agree that the real impact of tax reform on workers' wages is a long-term proposition. The wage gains will roll in over the months and years ahead, but it is remarkable how quickly a number of American businesses made immediate investments in their workers.

At Charter Communications, which employs 95,000 people Nationwide, the base wage has already risen to \$15 per hour because of tax reform.

Beginning in April, CVS implemented a new, fully paid parental leave program for full-time employees because of tax reform.

Educational opportunities are expanding for nearly 400,000 McDonald's employees across the country, after tax reform allowed the company to ramp up tuition assistance.

Tax reform has enabled LHC Group, a major healthcare employer with more than 50 locations and 3,600 employees in Kentucky alone, to expand raises for its employees and to grow the 401(k) options the company sponsors.

Workers at businesses of every shape and size are being helped all across our country: bonuses at a grain merchandiser in Chester, MT; a quarter-million-dollar expansion plan that creates 20 new jobs at a roofing company in Massillon, OH. It appears tax reform is very well-suited to the needs of American workers after all.

It is well-suited to the needs of hard-working parents who pocketed thousand-dollar bonuses to help with grocery bills and summer camp costs. It is well-suited to the needs of young Americans on the first rungs of the economic ladder, whose employer can now offer more help with continuing education.

This might come as a surprise to our Democratic friends who opposed tax reform at every turn. It certainly doesn't surprise those of us who fought for the American people.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2018—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 2, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 483, H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2018

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 3224

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute.)

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I call up the substitute amendment No. 3224.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] proposes an amendment numbered 3224.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 3134 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3224

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I call up the Thune amendment No. 3134.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCONNELL], for Mr. THUNE, proposed an amendment numbered 3134 to amendment No. 3224.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify conservation reserve program provisions)

In section 2103, strike subsections (b) and (c) and insert the following:

(b) SPECIFIED ACTIVITIES PERMITTED.—Section 1233(b) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3833(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (5);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (4) as subparagraph (C) and indenting appropriately;

(3) by inserting before subparagraph (C) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(B) harvesting, grazing, or other commercial use of the forage, without any reduction in the rental rate, in response to—

“(i) drought;

“(ii) flooding;

“(iii) a state of emergency caused by drought or wildfire that—

“(I) that is declared by the Governor, in consultation with the State Committee of the Farm Service Agency, of the State in which the land that is subject to a contract under the conservation reserve program is located;

“(II) that covers any part of the State or the entire State; and

“(III) the declaration of which under subsection (I) is not objected to by the Secretary during the 5 business days after the date of declaration; or

“(iv) any other emergency, as determined by the Secretary;”;

(4) in the matter preceding subparagraph (B) (as so designated), by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”;

(5) in paragraph (1) (as so designated)—

(A) by inserting before subparagraph (B) (as so designated) the following:

“(A) consistent with the conservation of soil, water quality, and wildlife habitat—

“(i) managed harvesting and other commercial use (including the managed harvesting of biomass), in exchange for a reduction in the annual rental rate of 25 percent for the acres covered by the activity, except that in permitting those activities, the Secretary, in consultation with the State technical committee established under section 1261(a) for the applicable State, shall—

“(I) develop appropriate vegetation management requirements;

“(II) subject harvesting to restrictions during the primary nesting season for birds in the area, as determined by the Secretary, in consultation with the State technical committee;

“(III) not allow harvesting to occur more frequently than once every 3 years on the same land; and

“(IV) not allow more than ½ of the acres covered by all of the conservation reserve program contracts of the owner or operator to be harvested during any year; and

“(ii) grazing, in exchange for a reduction in the annual rental rate of 25 percent for the acres covered by the activity, except that in permitting that grazing, the Secretary, in consultation with the State technical committee established under section 1261(a) for the applicable State, shall—

“(I) develop appropriate vegetation management requirements and stocking rates, based on stocking rates under the livestock forage disaster program established under section 1501(c) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9081(c)) (referred to in this subsection as the ‘livestock forage disaster program’), for the land that are suitable for continued grazing;

“(II) identify the periods during which grazing may be conducted, taking into consideration regional differences, such as—

“(aa) climate, soil type, and natural resources;

“(bb) the appropriate frequency and duration of grazing activities; and

“(cc) how often during a year in which grazing is permitted that grazing should be allowed to occur;

“(III) not allow grazing to occur more frequently than once every 3 years on the same land;

“(IV)(aa) in the case of a conservation reserve program contract that covers more than 20 acres, not allow more than ½ of the acres covered by all of the conservation reserve program contracts of the owner or operator to be grazed during any year; or

“(bb) in the case of a conservation reserve program contract that covers less than or equal to 20 acres, allow grazing on all of the land covered by the contract at 25 percent of the stocking rate permitted under the livestock forage disaster program; and

“(V) allow a veteran or beginning farmer or rancher to graze livestock without any reduction in the rental rate; and”;

(B) in subparagraph (C) (as so redesignated), by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) RESTRICTIONS AND CONDITIONS.—Paragraph (1)(A) shall be subject to the following restrictions and conditions:

“(A) SEVERE OR HIGHER INTENSITY DROUGHT.—Land located in a county that has been rated by the United States Drought Monitor as having a D2 (severe drought) or greater intensity for not less than 1 month during the normal grazing period established under the livestock forage disaster program for the 3 previous consecutive years shall be ineligible for harvesting or grazing under paragraph (1)(A) for that year.

“(B) DAMAGE TO VEGETATIVE COVER.—The Secretary, in coordination with the applicable State technical committee established under section 1265(a), may determine for any year that harvesting or grazing under paragraph (1)(A) shall not be permitted on land subject to a contract under the conservation reserve program in a particular county if harvesting or grazing for that year would cause long-term damage to the vegetative cover on that land.

“(C) STATE ACRES FOR WILDLIFE ENHANCEMENT.—The Secretary, in consultation with the State technical committee established under section 1261(a) for the applicable State, may allow grazing or harvesting in accordance with paragraph (1)(A) on land covered by a contract enrolled under the State acres for wildlife enhancement program established by the Secretary or established under section 1231(j) through the duration of that contract, if grazing or harvesting is specifically permitted under the applicable State acres for wildlife enhancement program agreement for that contract.

“(D) CONSERVATION RESERVE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM.—The Secretary, in consultation with the State technical committee established under section 1261(a) for the applicable State, may allow grazing or harvesting under paragraph (1)(A) to be conducted on land covered by a contract enrolled under the conservation reserve enhancement program established by the Secretary under this subchapter or under section 1231A, if grazing or harvesting is specifically permitted under the applicable conservation reserve enhancement program agreement for that contract.”

(c) HARVESTING AND GRAZING.—Section 1233 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3833) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) HARVESTING AND GRAZING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the State technical committee established under section 1261(a) for the applicable State, may permit harvesting and grazing in accordance with subsection (b) on any land subject to a contract under the conservation reserve program.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary, in coordination with the applicable State technical committee established under section 1261(a), may determine for any year that harvesting or grazing described in paragraph (1) shall not be permitted on land subject to a contract under the conservation reserve program in a particular county, or under a particular practice, if harvesting or grazing for that year in that county or under that prac-

tice, as applicable, would cause long-term damage to vegetative cover on that land.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I rise today as the Senate considers legislation on an issue that is critically important to our Nation—the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, the farm bill.

The goal, the responsibility, the absolute requirement is to provide farmers, ranchers, and growers—everyone within America’s valued food chain—certainty and predictability during these very, very difficult times. We are, indeed, in a rough patch with regard to agriculture.

Many of my colleagues have introduced legislation over the last year that addresses priorities and stakeholders in their States. The bill that passed the Agriculture Committee with a strong 20-to-1 vote earlier this month addresses many of those concerns. In fact, the Ag Committee-passed product includes portions of 65 stand-alone bills, and an additional 73 amendments were adopted in the committee. We have also included 18 amendments in today’s substitute amendment.

Needless to say, we have worked to include as many priorities from Members both on and off the Ag Committee, and we want to continue to work with Members to address their concerns. That is why we are here.

We are endeavoring to craft a farm bill that meets the needs of producers across all regions and all crops. All of agriculture is struggling, not just one or two commodities. We must have a bill that works across all of our great Nation. That means, with bipartisan support, we must do our job. We must pass a bill that provides our farmers, ranchers, and rural communities the much needed certainty and predictability they deserve.

I appreciate the bipartisan support that we have had to date of those on the Ag Committee who voted to report a bill in such a strong manner—and other Members of the Senate—and I look forward to working with my colleagues on continuing to move this process forward. I will not say that it is an emergency, but we have to move this bill to provide farmers certainty and predictability during the very tough times they face.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I want to concur with the comments of our chairman, Senator ROBERTS. All together, I believe we have 91 amendments between the work of the committee on a bipartisan basis and the work we have put into the substitute. We have listened and worked together with colleagues on both sides of the aisle and put forward a package of bipartisan amendments that will allow us to move forward in a way that will provide certainty for our farmers and ranchers, as well as our families.

Now we will take the next step, and we look forward to working with colleagues to move this forward to get to a final vote this week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I wish to list the amendments that are included in the substitute that my distinguished colleague Senator STABENOW and I and our diligent staff have been working on. They are as follows: Senator JONES, No. 3081; Senator SMITH, No. 3082; Senator KENNEDY, No. 3097; Senator MURKOWSKI, No. 3110; Senator HATCH, No. 3125; Senator MERKLEY, No. 3147; Senator TESTER, No. 3148; Senator GILLIBRAND, No. 3154; Senator GARDNER, No. 3157; Senator MORAN, No. 3159; Senator COLLINS, No. 3160; Senator PETERS, No. 3164; Senator SHAHEEN, No. 3172; Senator FEINSTEIN, No. 3177; Senator CORNYN, No. 3186; Senator CANTWELL and Senator CRAPO, No. 3209; and Senator GARDNER, again, No. 3218; and Senator GRASSLEY.

I wish to note that this represents 18 amendments put in the substitute—extremely bipartisan. I have read “Republican,” “Democrat,” “Democrat,” “Republican” all through these 18 amendments. We have proceeded that way in committee. We are proceeding this way on the floor. I urge Members to bring their amendments to the floor for consideration, and, hopefully, the amendments will be of a nature that we can consider them without controversy. I know people have strong concerns about whatever amendment they submit.

Again, the ultimate goal is to do this quickly and to provide farmers certainty and predictability during this difficult time they are going through. I hope Members will keep that in mind with regard to any amendment they may be considering.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FAMILY SEPARATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last night, in the San Diego Federal District Court, U.S. district court judge Dana Sabraw made a critical ruling that will affect the lives of thousands of people who have been the focal point of America's attention over the last several weeks.

Judge Sabraw was appointed to the Federal bench by President George W. Bush. In reading about him online, he is a Japanese American whose background was in private practice law before he assumed the Federal bench.

He was given the responsibility of ruling on the Trump administration's zero tolerance policy. You will remember that policy. It started in April. It

was a decision by the Trump administration and Attorney General Sessions to separate children from their mothers and parents if they attempted to enter the United States without having legal authorization. The net result of that policy was the separation of thousands of children from their parents.

It has been on the news almost every day for weeks now. A firestorm of opposition has come about on both political sides of the aisle. Democrats and Republicans have said this is unfair; that it is not right. Even the First Ladies—Democrats and Republicans—have come together in an unusual show of unanimity in their opposition to President Trump and Attorney General Sessions' zero tolerance policy.

Attorney General Sessions defended the policy and said he had a Biblical defense for what they were doing. President Trump made it clear he was behind the policy as well. Yet the opposition grew and grew in its intensity to the point at which there were statements made by the Pope, as well as by an evangelical supporter of the President, Franklin Graham, when they called the administration's decision immoral.

Late last week, President Trump issued an Executive order that said he was ending this family separation, but that order didn't contain one word about what was going to happen to these children. There was no resolution of the whole question of reuniting these children with their parents.

I learned about this matter months ago—well, several weeks ago, at least—when we learned that a mother from the Congo had made it through South America and Central America to our border in California. She presented herself with her 6-year-old daughter and asked for asylum because she feared persecution and death back in her home country. That happened over 6 months ago. They removed her 6-year-old daughter from her custody and flew the girl 2,000 miles to Chicago. So the mother remained in San Diego, and the daughter was in Chicago. That was when we learned about it in my office.

We started pursuing it. After we brought it to the attention of those at the Department of Homeland Security, they said that was not the policy, and they were going to work on it. They did reunite the mother and child, but the separation of this family led to this lawsuit, the lawsuit Judge Sabraw ruled on last night.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the opinion of the court be printed in the RECORD.

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

Judge Sabraw's order begins as follows: “Eleven weeks ago, Plaintiffs leveled the serious accusation that our Government was engaged in a widespread practice of separating migrant families, and placing minor children who were separated from their parents in government facilities for “unaccompanied minors.” According to Plaintiffs, the practice was applied indiscriminately, and

separated even those families with small children and infants—many of whom were seeking asylum. Plaintiffs noted reports that the practice would become national policy. Recent events confirm these allegations. Extraordinary relief is requested, and is warranted under the circumstances.

On May 7, 2018, the Attorney General of the United States announced a “zero tolerance policy,” under which all adults entering the United States illegally would be subject to criminal prosecution, and if accompanied by a minor child, the child would be separated from the parent. Over the ensuing weeks, hundreds of migrant children were separated from their parents, sparking international condemnation of the practice. Six days ago on June 20, 2018, the President of the United States signed an Executive Order (“EO”) to address the situation and to require preservation of the “family unit” by keeping migrant families together during criminal and immigration proceedings to the extent permitted by law, while also maintaining “rigorous[]” enforcement of immigration laws. See Executive Order, Affording Congress an Opportunity to Address Family Separation §1, 2018 WL 3046068 (June 20, 2018). The EO did not address reunification of the burgeoning population of over 2,000 children separated from their parents. Public outrage remained at a fever pitch. Three days ago on Saturday, June 23, 2018, the Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”) issued a “Fact Sheet” outlining the government's efforts to “ensure that those adults who are subject to removal are reunited with their children for the purposes of removal.”

Plaintiffs assert the EO does not eliminate the need for the requested injunction, and the Fact Sheet does not address the circumstances of this case. Defendants disagree with those assertions, but there is no genuine dispute that the Government was not prepared to accommodate the mass influx of separated children. Measures were not in place to provide for communication between governmental agencies responsible for detaining parents and those responsible for housing children, or to provide for ready communication between separated parents and children. There was no reunification plan in place, and families have been separated for months. Some parents were deported at separate times and from different locations than their children. Migrant families that lawfully entered the United States at a port of entry seeking asylum were separated. And families that were separated due to entering the United States illegally between ports of entry have not been reunited following the parent's completion of criminal proceedings and return to immigration detention.

This Court previously entered an order finding Plaintiffs had stated a legally cognizable claim for violation of their substantive due process rights to family integrity under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution based on their allegations the Government had separated Plaintiffs from their minor children while Plaintiffs were held in immigration detention and without a showing that they were unfit parents or otherwise presented a danger to their children. See *Ms. L. v. U.S. Immigration & Customs Enf't*, 302 F. Supp. 3d 1149, 2018 WL 2725736, at *7-12 (S.D. Cal. June 6, 2018). A class action has been certified to include similarly situated migrant parents. Plaintiffs now request classwide injunctive relief to prohibit separation of class members from their children in the future absent a finding the parent is unfit or presents a danger to the child, and to require reunification of these families once the parent is returned to immigration custody unless the parent is determined to be unfit or presents a danger to the child.

Plaintiffs have demonstrated a likelihood of success on the merits, irreparable harm, and that the balance of equities and the public interest weigh in their favor, thus warranting issuance of a preliminary injunction. This Order does not implicate the Government's discretionary authority to enforce immigration or other criminal laws, including its decisions to release or detain class members. Rather, the Order addresses only the circumstances under which the Government may separate class members from their children, as well as the reunification of class members who are returned to immigration custody upon completion of any criminal proceedings."

Judge Sabraw went on to explain why an injunction was needed despite the Trump Administration's claims that it was unnecessary. He said:

"[T]he Court addresses directly Defendants' argument that an injunction is not necessary here in light of the EO and the recently released Fact Sheet. Although these documents reflect some attempts by the Government to address some of the issues in this case, neither obviates the need for injunctive relief here. As indicated throughout this Order, the EO is subject to various qualifications. For instance, Plaintiffs correctly assert the EO allows the government to separate a migrant parent from his or her child "where there is a concern that detention of an alien child with the child's alien parent would pose a risk to the child's welfare." EO §3(b) (emphasis added). Objective standards are necessary, not subjective ones, particularly in light of the history of this case. Furthermore, the Fact Sheet focuses on reunification "at time of removal[.]" stating that the parent slated for removal will be matched up with their child at a location in Texas and then removed. It says nothing about reunification during the intervening time between return from criminal proceedings to ICE detention or the time in ICE detention prior to actual removal, which can take months. Indeed, it is undisputed "ICE has no plans or procedures in place to reunify the parent with the child other than arranging for them to be deported together after the parent's immigration case is concluded." Thus, neither of these directives eliminates the need for an injunction in this case."

Judge Sabraw went on to say:

"The Executive Branch, which is tasked with enforcement of the country's criminal and immigration laws, is acting within its powers to detain individuals lawfully entering the United States and to apprehend individuals illegally entering the country. However, as the Court explained in its Order on Defendants' motion to dismiss, the right to family integrity still applies here. The context of the family separation practice at issue here, namely an international border, does not render the practice constitutional, nor does it shield the practice from judicial review."

The judge went on to discuss the shameful lack of planning that has characterized the Trump Administration's zero-tolerance policy, saying:

"[T]he practice of separating these families was implemented without any effective system or procedure for (1) tracking the children after they were separated from their parents, (2) enabling communication between the parents and their children after separation, and (3) reuniting the parents and children after the parents are returned to immigration custody following completion of their criminal sentence. This is a startling reality. The government readily keeps track of personal property of detainees in criminal and immigration proceedings. Money, important documents, and automobiles, to name a

few, are routinely catalogued, stored, tracked and produced upon a detainees' release, at all levels—state and federal, citizen and alien. Yet, the government has no system in place to keep track of, provide effective communication with, and promptly produce alien children. The unfortunate reality is that under the present system migrant children are not accounted for with the same efficiency and accuracy as property. Certainly, that cannot satisfy the requirements of due process."

He also discussed the Trump Administration's problematic treatment of those seeking asylum:

"Asylum seekers like Ms. L. and many other class members may be fleeing persecution and are entitled to careful consideration by government officials. Particularly so if they have a credible fear of persecution. We are a country of laws, and of compassion. We have plainly stated our intent to treat refugees with an ordered process, and benevolence, by codifying principles of asylum. The Government's treatment of Ms. L. and other similarly situated class members does not meet this standard, and it is unlikely to pass constitutional muster."

Judge Sabraw concluded his order as follows:

"The unfolding events—the zero tolerance policy, EO and DHS Fact Sheet—serve to corroborate Plaintiffs' allegations. The facts set forth before the Court portray reactive governance—responses to address a chaotic circumstance of the Government's own making. They belie measured and ordered governance, which is central to the concept of due process enshrined in our Constitution. This is particularly so in the treatment of migrants, many of whom are asylum seekers and small children. The extraordinary remedy of classwide preliminary injunction is warranted based on the evidence before the Court. For the reasons set out above, the Court hereby GRANTS Plaintiffs' motion for classwide preliminary injunction, and finds and orders as follows:

(1) Defendants, and their officers, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, and all those who are in active concert or participation with them, are preliminarily enjoined from detaining Class Members in DHS custody without and apart from their minor children, absent a determination that the parent is unfit or presents a danger to the child, unless the parent affirmatively, knowingly, and voluntarily declines to be reunited with the child in DHS custody.

(2) If Defendants choose to release Class Members from DHS custody, Defendants, and their officers, agents, servants, employees and attorneys, and all those who are in active concert or participation with them, are preliminarily enjoined from continuing to detain the minor children of the Class Members and must release the minor child to the custody of the Class Member, unless there is a determination that the parent is unfit or presents a danger to the child, or the parent affirmatively, knowingly, and voluntarily declines to be reunited with the child.

(3) Unless there is a determination that the parent is unfit or presents a danger to the child, or the parent affirmatively, knowingly, and voluntarily declines to be reunited with the child: (a) Defendants must reunify all Class Members with their minor children who are under the age of five (5) within fourteen (14) days of the entry of this Order; and (b) Defendants must reunify all Class Members with their minor children age five (5) and over within thirty (30) days of the entry of this Order.

(4) Defendants must immediately take all steps necessary to facilitate regular communication between Class Members and their children who remain in ORR custody, ORR

foster care, or DHS custody. Within ten (10) days, Defendants must provide parents telephonic contact with their children if the parent is not already in contact with his or her child.

(5) Defendants must immediately take all steps necessary to facilitate regular communication between and among all executive agencies responsible for the custody, detention or shelter of Class Members and the custody and care of their children, including at least ICE, CBP, BOP, and ORR, regarding the location and well-being of the Class Members' children.

(6) Defendants, and their officers, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, and all those who are in active concert or participation with them, are preliminarily enjoined from removing any Class Members without their child, unless the Class Member affirmatively, knowingly, and voluntarily declines to be reunited with the child prior to the Class Member's deportation, or there is a determination that the parent is unfit or presents a danger to the child.

(7) This Court retains jurisdiction to entertain such further proceedings and to enter such further orders as may be necessary or appropriate to implement and enforce the provisions of this Order and Preliminary Injunction."

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me read some of the words Judge Sabraw wrote last night in his order, in his conclusion, about the zero tolerance policy of separating children from their parents.

The unfolding events—the zero tolerance policy [the judge writes] serve to corroborate Plaintiffs' allegations. The facts set forth before the Court portray reactive governance—responses to address a chaotic circumstance of the Government's own making. They belie measured and ordered governance, which is central to the concept of due process enshrined in our Constitution. This is particularly so in the treatment of migrants, many of whom are asylum seekers and small children. The extraordinary remedy of classwide preliminary injunction is warranted based on the evidence before the Court. For the reasons set out above, the Court hereby GRANTS Plaintiffs' motion for classwide preliminary injunction, and finds and orders as follows.

It goes into detail, and I will not read it in its entirety since it is now going to be printed in the RECORD, but it reads, clearly, that the court is enjoining the government—the Trump administration—from separating minor children from their parents.

It goes on to read that it also orders the Trump administration to reunify all class members with their minor children who are under the age of 5 within 14 days of the entry of this order, and defendants must reunify all class members with their minor children who are aged 5 and older within 30 days of the entry of the order. Defendants must immediately—and this is the government—take all steps necessary to facilitate the regular communication between class members and their children.

The court went on to say that within 10 days, the government—the defendants—must provide parents telephonic contact with their children if the parent is not already in contact with his or her child.

Last Saturday, the Department of Health and Human Services issued

what I consider to be a rosy and misleading press release about how much information they had about the parents and their children and how much telephone communication was taking place. I will tell you, in having contacted various people who are well aware of the situation, they have really overstated the contact information as well as the context between parents and children. Now they are being tested. The court has told them to return these children to their parents.

Last Friday, I was in Chicago at one of the agencies that was the custodian for 66 of these children who have been the victims of President Trump's zero tolerance policy. It was an experience I still remember and will not ever forget—of seeing six little children walk into a conference room, where I was sitting—little kids—and learning that two of them, who I thought might be twins because they had similar hairdos, were, in fact, as one of them said to me, “just amigas,” friends. One was 5 years old, and one was 6 years old.

As a father, it is hard for me to remember my kids at that age, but I can sure visualize my grandkids for a moment, who are now 6, 7, and 8, if they were to be separated from their parents by thousands of miles for weeks at a time. That was the policy of zero tolerance—to put pressure on those who consider seeking protection or asylum in this country.

I just left a meeting downstairs with a person whom I admire greatly. His name is King Abdullah of Jordan. I admire him for so many things—his efforts to find peace in the Middle East—but especially because that tiny Kingdom of Jordan, in the Middle East, has done something which should be a lesson to the world. That nation of 7 million Jordanians has accepted 3 million refugees. It is at their political peril for them to have that large of a population within their borders. Yet, time and time again, refugees have presented themselves to Jordan and have been given not only humane treatment but good treatment under the circumstances.

The United States and many other nations have helped, and I am glad we have, for it is the right thing to do. Compare what we have done in the United States when it comes to refugees. Historically, we have accepted 75,000 to 100,000 refugees a year after careful screening, inspection, and vetting. In some cases, we have gone way beyond that.

When the Cubans came over and said they wanted to escape Castro's communism, we opened our doors. Thank goodness, we did, as they have made a great addition to America. Three Members of the U.S. Senate are Cuban Americans, and I am sure they are very proud of their family heritage. We opened our doors to Cuban refugees. We opened our doors to refugees as well from the Soviet Union and to people who wanted to practice their Jewish religion and felt they were being dis-

criminated against. We opened our doors for them. We opened our doors for the Vietnamese to come here after the war and to become part of America because they had been on our side and had fought for freedom in their country and had run the risk of being killed. Time and again, the United States has opened its doors.

What has happened under this administration? First, the President announced last year that he was reducing the number of refugees to 45,000 a year who would be allowed in America—a dramatic cutback. How many have been accepted so far this year as we are well over the halfway point of this fiscal year? There have been less than 16,000 refugees. After careful screening, there have been less than 16,000.

I believe we can do better. I believe there are those who are in need of help. I believe this is the definition of who we are as Americans—the way we treat the people at our borders. If we are humane, if we are civilized, if we are caring, it is a message to the world. If we are the opposite, it is also a message to the world. Right now, we have to look at the scoreboard. The kids have won, and zero tolerance has lost.

I hope now we can sit down and come up with a rational, reasonable approach. America cannot accept every person who wants to live here. I wish we could, but we can't. We have to have an orderly process, and we must have border security, but we need to do it with clarity and with humanity. We need to follow our Constitution, which the President, I hope, is reminded of after this decision last night.

This decision reads that due process is a part of the Constitution and that the chaotic governance of this administration is not consistent with the Constitution and its principles. It is time now for the President to understand that and to reunite these children under the age of 5 within 14 days. Within 30 days, those under the age of 18 need to be reunited as well. Then we can move forward and put this sad chapter in American history behind us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I understand that the Democratic leader may be on his way, and I will yield the floor when he comes, but I do want to respond to the comments that have been made by my friend, the Senator from Illinois, the Democratic whip.

I think what he is proposing is a false choice. He says we need to do away with zero tolerance when it comes to enforcing our immigration laws. Basically, what that means is an argument for the nonenforcement of our immigration laws. We can actually enforce our immigration laws and keep families together. Indeed, we have a proposal, which I know he is very familiar with, to do precisely that—proposed by Senator TILLIS and Senator CRUZ. I know he and Senator FEINSTEIN are talking to them, and hopefully they

can come up with a bipartisan solution. Yet the argument that somehow this is a new phenomenon is just not borne out by the facts.

We all remember 2014, when the vast wave of unaccompanied children who came across the border from Central America was called a humanitarian crisis by President Obama. It was because we simply were not prepared to deal with the medical and other needs, feeding, housing, and taking care of these tens of thousands of children who were streaming across the border.

Central America, basically, has some very serious problems which result in there being people who flee from those countries and seek, in many cases, asylum in the United States. Yet the idea that President Trump started something new when he decided to enforce the law or that this phenomenon of children coming across the border is something new is simply not the case. It has been happening for a long time.

Back when President Obama was detaining families and was separating families, on some occasions when the accommodations were not available to deal with them together, we didn't hear a peep out of our friends on the other side of the aisle. When 1,500 unaccompanied children from Central America—those placed with sponsors here in the United States who were not American citizens, who were not even family members, and who had not had criminal background checks—were unaccounted for, as reported in a New York Times story recently, that was as a result of the flawed policies of the past in dealing with this humanitarian crisis.

We do agree on one thing; that is, that families ought to be kept together, and the President has said as much. Yet what every single Democrat across the aisle has agreed to is a bill by our friend from California Senator FEINSTEIN, which, simply goes from zero tolerance, when it comes to violating the immigration laws, to zero enforcement.

What that bill would result in is a return to the flawed catch-and-release policies of the past because, if you can't enforce the law—if you don't have the immigration judges, if you don't prioritize these family cases—then you will have to give people notices to appear at some time in the future. Of course, most of them will not show up for their court hearings, and the cartels and human smugglers, whose business models depend on their ability to exploit these gaps in American law, will win. They will win because they will have successfully circumvented the enforcement of America's immigration laws. Those are the people who benefit the most from this.

I am very sympathetic to the circumstances of these children and their families living in Central America, but as my colleague said, we simply can't accept anybody and everybody who wants to come to the United States under any and all circumstances. That

is why we have a legal system of immigration. That is why we have due process to consider asylum claims, which should be considered and should be expedited, in my view, while these family units are detained, and not simply say that we are going to go from zero tolerance of immigration law violations to zero enforcement and return to a catch-and-release policy, which is associated with huge surges in additional illegal immigration. According to Manuel Padilla, the Rio Grande Border Patrol Chief, who I was with this last Friday, that is a big mistake.

The American people understand that we need to enforce our immigration laws. They are as compassionate as we all would hope to be about keeping these families together as much as we can, but at some point we need to enforce our laws. In this case, that means family units need to be detained in a secure, safe, and humane facility, but then they need to present those claims to an immigration judge on a prioritized basis. If they don't meet the legal criteria, then we simply don't have any alternative but to return them to their home country. That is the law of the land.

So 83 percent of the children in U.S. custody now came unaccompanied because their parents sent them from Central America by themselves. Only 17 percent came as part of a family unit. This is a longstanding problem, and we need to fix it. We have legislation that can do that, and we need to pass it this week in my view.

I see the distinguished Democratic leader here.

Mr. SCHUMER. I am not—keep going.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. CORNYN. Sure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to make one point and then ask a question.

When President Obama, who was my friend and colleague in the Senate, came up with family detention policies under his administration, I objected, as well, and I can show the Senator from Texas the objection.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I am sorry; I did not mean to suggest that the Senator from Illinois didn't object back then, but my point is that Senator Obama—President Obama had the same policies that are now being objected to under President Trump.

Mr. DURBIN. The question I have for the Senator from Texas is this: If our goal is to make sure that the person presenting himself or herself actually appears as scheduled for the required hearings to be considered for eligibility under American law, if that is our goal, I would like to suggest to the Senator from Texas—and I think he can find in his own State evidence of this—over 90 percent of those in that circumstance appear at a hearing, as required, if they have one of three things: legal counsel;

second, case management, which is the counsel of groups like Catholic Charities or Lutheran family services; or in some circumstances, ankle bracelets, where the government can monitor where they are. Over 90 percent show up, as required, for a hearing. It costs as little as \$4 or \$5 a day. It costs over \$300 a day to detain a family. It is certainly not in the best interests of taxpayers to spend an amount that is unnecessary. Wouldn't the Senator agree that we ought to look for alternatives to detention that would also guarantee the appearance of individuals?

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would respond to my friend from Illinois that I think alternatives to detention are a reasonable thing to look at, but the point is that people need to show up for their court hearings because right now, without detention, based on catch-and-release policies, these people simply fade away into the landscape and basically win the lottery when it comes to immigrating illegally to the United States without making a legitimate asylum claim.

I would say on the representation issue that I certainly support pro bono legal counsel being allowed to represent the asylum seekers, and I believe that is the practice now. I would be reluctant to ask an American taxpayer to fund a lawyer for every immigrant who shows up at the border and makes a claim for an immigration benefit. I think that might be a bridge too far. But I do think that pro bono legal counsel makes a lot of sense.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I thank my friends from Illinois and Texas for yielding the floor to me amidst that interesting debate.

FAMILY SEPARATION AND ASYLUM PROCESSING

Mr. President, yesterday a Federal judge ordered the Trump administration to immediately reunify the families who were separated by the administration's policy. It certifies what we in the Congress already expect—that the administration will expend all resources at its disposal to immediately reunite the over 2,000 families who have been separated. This should be the President's first order of business to undo the harm he has caused through his chaotic and cruel family separation policy.

In addition to this effort, Democrats believe we should start addressing the root cause of the migrant crisis, attacking the disease as well as the symptoms. We believe that Central American countries should conduct asylum processing within their own countries. We believe the United States should help governments in Central America crack down on the ability of gangs and cartels to operate freely and ruthlessly in their countries. And we believe we should go after the drug cartels, smugglers, and drug traffickers with increased penalties and sanctions. There were robust efforts during the

last administration to do exactly that, and they were showing progress. But President Trump, in shortsighted fashion, proposed significant cuts to the aid and resources used to fight the cartels and stop the violence in Central America. This is not only dangerous, but it also shows a basic lack of understanding.

There is a pretty simple reason people are fleeing Central America. It is the impunity of these gangs and cartels and the brutal violence they spread. Many of the young people who want to escape being killed are then forced to use smugglers and other coyotes and carry drugs into this country through no fault of their own. We should stop this there in ways that we have been successful in Colombia, and that would greatly reduce the number of people coming to the border. That would make things easier for our country, but it would also make their lives a lot better and safer if they could file an asylum claim in their own country and get it adjudicated quickly. This is what many Democrats are going to propose in about an hour. There are other things we can also do, but we are addressing this issue today.

President Trump needs to end the inhumanity and chaos at the border. We have to develop a real strategy to go after the gangs and cartels in Central America, curbing the violence that sends migrants to our borders in the first place. Later today, I will be joining with several of my colleagues to discuss how we believe the United States should go about this.

CHINA AND TRADE

Mr. President, on China, I have long argued that the best way to make progress in our trade relationship with China is to be consistently tough until real concessions are won.

China has flagrantly abused international trade rules and norms for more than a decade, stealing our intellectual property and know-how, illegally dumping artificially cheap goods into our markets, and denying blue-chip American companies access to their markets unless those companies sign away their know-how and intellectual property.

Previous attempts to force China to change its behavior have been faulty and milquetoast, at best. Unsurprisingly, these efforts have largely failed.

While we disagree on a lot of things, I was happy to hear President Trump talk as if he had learned from the lessons of the past. President Trump has, at times, pursued a tough, aggressive course of action against China, and I have applauded him when he has. But President Trump seems unable to consistently keep pressure on China. Every time I think he is going down the right path, he turns around and gives China a pass on something.

Take the Chinese telecom giant ZTE, for example. Out of the blue, President Trump relaxed penalties on ZTE and loosened the restrictions on its sales in

the United States, despite the fact that it has been labeled a national security threat by our military. Why? It seemed to no end other than to placate President Xi, hardly our friend on economic issues.

This morning, after threatening a tough new approach to limit China's ability to invest in the United States where national security was concerned, the Trump administration has once again backed off, it seems. Instead, the President seems to be endorsing a bill here in Congress to expand the authority of CFIUS, the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States. That is a good provision in the NDAA. It passed with a filibuster-proof majority. An endorsement of the provision hardly means much because it is going to pass. Many of us wanted it to go further. Expanding CFIUS is not just for military and national security, but for economic security as well. But it is not sufficient—not sufficient.

Mr. President, you are backing out again. President Xi is outfoxing you and outplaying you again. Once again, we get the tough talk and no action.

This happens over and over and over again with this President and this administration. Why are we waiting to impose real pressure on China for its efforts to undermine our Nation's economic wellspring? It is another example of President Trump starting down a tough path with China and then just veering off course for reasons unexplained, sometimes on a whim.

It appears there is a total war in the administration over just how strong the President should be with China. One week he is pulled in one direction, and the next, the opposite. If we are going to convince the Chinese Government we are serious, the United States must be strong, tough, and consistent. Otherwise, the President's approach will not succeed in changing China's behavior—or convincing President Xi that he means business—to the detriment of American workers, American businesses, and the economy for generations to come.

SUPREME COURT RULINGS

Mr. President, there is one final topic, on the Supreme Court and what they did yesterday and today.

Yesterday, the Supreme Court ruled that California was violating the First Amendment by requiring crisis pregnancy centers to provide information to their patients about abortions.

It comes alongside a rule to affirm the President's travel ban in which the majority also bent over backward to accept President Trump's position. You would have to be living with your head in the sand over the past 2 years not to see a racial and religious animus behind the President's decision to ban travel into the United States from Muslim-majority countries.

Unfortunately, both cases were decided 5 to 4. Five conservative judges ruled against California law and the travel ban. Anyone watching the Bench at the moment ought to be shaking

their heads at the political polarization of the Court.

The abortion case makes it even worse. As Justice Breyer pointed out in his dissent, in 1992, there was a California case where the Supreme Court upheld a Pennsylvania law requiring a doctor to provide information about adoption services. In other words, clinics performing abortions, helping women, had to provide alternative information.

Now the shoe is on the other foot. California passed a law that said that clinics that try to dissuade women from having abortions, which is their right, also had to provide information about abortion.

The majority ruled one way in the one case and the opposite in the other case. If free speech works in the one case, why doesn't it work in the other? If the government can compel a doctor in Pennsylvania to provide women information about adoption, why can't the government compel someone in California to provide information to a woman about abortion? There is a total contradiction.

The majority somehow argued there was a glaring difference between the two cases, but it is plainly sophistry. In fact, there was little to no difference between these two cases.

Let me state it again exactly. If an abortion clinic should be required to give information about alternatives, why shouldn't an anti-abortion clinic be required to do the same exact thing? Why does free speech apply to one and not the other? Why does lack of free speech fit one and not the other?

Many Americans see this Court in a much more negative light than they used to. Chief Justice Roberts famously claimed in his confirmation hearings that he would "call the balls and strikes" as he sees them. Here we have the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court leading a majority departing from a clear precedent to affirm a conservative ideology, an anti-choice ideology. No one can see Chief Justice Roberts' decision in the California case as calling balls and strikes; instead, it is a wild, political pitch. And I would say to the Chief Justice: You are demeaning the Court you seek to uphold, in this type of contradiction, and the dissenting opinion showed its outrage at it.

Just a moment ago, the Court ruled on the Janus decision. In the Janus decision, the Court said people had a First Amendment right not to join a union. That is a crazy idea cooked up by the conservative anti-labor movement and pursued relentlessly until a favorable collection of Judges would accept such a harebrained theory. The First Amendment and the right to organize are two totally separate things, but somehow the hard right first pays for these think tanks, which come up with these ideas, and then they assemble enough people in the Court who see things politically—not constitutionally, not legally, not ideologically—to affirm this decision.

Unions are only 6 percent of private sector America. They are declining in membership, and it is a reason the middle class doesn't make more money even in this prosperous economy. This is an awful decision. It is going to increase economic polarization in this country. It is going to make it harder for middle-class people to earn a decent living. And sooner or later, people are going to get so angry that Lord knows what will happen.

The American people are now seeing the results of a coordinated political campaign by deep-pocketed conservative interests to influence the bench all the way up to the Supreme Court. Justice Gorsuch, of course, and the current conservative majority on the Court are the capstone of these efforts, the result of an appalling decision by Senate Republicans to refuse President Obama a Supreme Court pick.

Alongside the California ruling, the Roberts' Court affirmed a plainly discriminatory travel ban, unleashed a flood of unlimited, dark money in our politics, and scrapped a key pillar of the Voting Rights Act—all goals of the hard right, all having little to do with the Constitution or reading the law, all making America a more polarized, economically divided country.

Opponents of these decisions and the President's policy should focus on the Supreme Court, whose thin majority will once again hang in the balance this November.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, today, Wednesday, is day 83,723 since the Senate first achieved a quorum and started work. No grand celebration there. That is 229 years, 2 months, and 22 days. In that time, this body has deliberated over some of the most difficult issues of our time—of any time—slavery, war, voting rights. They have all been difficult issues that our Nation has debated in this building.

But lately it seems we have less and less debate and more and more empty-Chamber quorum calls. For the people who watch the debate in this room and watch an empty room and think "Where is the debate happening in the Senate?" I can assure you there is work being done. There is a lot happening in committee hearings right now. There is a lot happening in different offices on trying to work through the issues.

Our days are busy and full, but for some reason, we are not getting to some of the biggest debates of the moment that need to be done and completed. We had a real push in the nomination process. We spent 100 days in

the last 18 months just on a quorum call waiting for a nomination to come up. That didn't happen in the last five Presidents combined. There have only been 25 requests for additional time for any nominee in five Presidents. This time, in 18 months, there have been 100. It is slowing down the body. We have to fix that.

We have to fix our budget process. Our appropriations process is working a little better this year, and that is good. We moved three bills last week. That is the first time that has happened in a decade in the Senate. That is good progress, but we have to complete the process so we don't end up with omnibus bills. That is going to take some reform. There are 16 of us—8 Republicans and 8 Democrats—who are meeting consistently to work on how to reform the process of our budgeting to make sure that we can fix that.

So there is some work that needs to be done. There is also some reform that needs to be done. But as we deal with things like the farm bill this week—so far, we have not had amendments and votes on it—we have to reform the process on how we get through the farm bill, how we get through our appropriations process, and how we get through nominations.

We also need to work through things that are difficult, things like immigration. I have been in this body multiple times to talk about this issue, and I will continue to come back to this body to raise it. The challenge we have with immigration is that there seems to be no deadline to solve it, so Congress just delays actually working on immigration. When a deadline comes, Congress finds a way to get around it, or the courts step in and make some change and say: We are going to make some ruling, which delays a decision here, and it just gets delayed again.

The Nation is once again looking at the issue of immigration because of what we are watching happen with families on the border. Americans are people of great compassion. We do not want to see families separated. But we also understand the basics of the law. So how do we deal with all these things together?

I would say first, this body has to learn how to focus on solving the issue of immigration rather than just complaining about the issue of immigration. We can't have it come up every once in a while when it is in the news and then work on something else when the news stops focusing on it. We have to solve this issue.

Last February, we had four different bipartisan bills that came before the Senate. All four of them failed. You would think that there would have been work to say: Let's combine them. Let's find the common ground between the four different bills, form a final bill, and pass it in the Senate. Instead, the Senate got distracted with something else and walked away.

We have to solve the issues on immigration. What is currently separating

families is not a new issue. Some people believe it might be, but it is not new. This comes out of the Flores decision from 1997. Every single President has struggled under this Flores decision from a court in California. That court said that you can only detain children for 20 days. Well, it takes 35 days to do a hearing. So the court set up an impossible situation where it takes 35 days to do a hearing and you can only hold children for 20 days. So every administration has had the same problem: Do I release people into the country and tell them to show up for what is called a notice to appear at a future court date so their family can stay together, or do I separate families?

Previous administrations have said: I will just release people into the country and will tell them to show up at a hearing at a future date. Well, there are a couple of problems with that. One is that thousands upon thousands of those individuals never show up for their first hearing, the notice to appear. The vast majority beyond that, after they show up for their first hearing, are given what is called a notice of removal, which says: You don't qualify to be in the country legally, so you need to leave. The problem is that 98 percent of those individuals then don't leave. Once they get that notice of removal, they find a way to disappear into the country. They move to a new city, and they are gone.

This administration is struggling with that, saying: Well, what we have created is an incentive to come into the country illegally. If you cross the border and bring your family, you will be released into the country, and then you can just disappear, and no one will ever try to find you.

That is a problem with the legal system, period.

I am not cold to immigration. Quite frankly, I am grateful we are one of the most open immigration countries in the world. We have 1.1 million people a year who become legal citizens of the United States, going through the process the right way. I just spoke at a naturalization ceremony in Oklahoma City. If you ever come to one—and I encourage every American to go to one of the naturalization ceremonies, but take Kleenex with you. They are incredibly moving events—watching people from all over the world stand and raise their right hand and take their oath to become an American citizen, say the Pledge of Allegiance for the first time as an American, hold the little American flag and wave it, and seeing their family cheer them from the audience, saying: We are Americans together. It is incredibly moving to see that. There are 1.1 million people a year who do it the right way.

Let me add one more number. Half a million people a day legally cross our southern border. Let me run that past this body again. Half a million people a day legally cross our southern border. We are not a nation that is closed to

immigration. We are a nation that is open to immigration. Half a million people a day legally go through that process of crossing the border back and forth. That is just coming from the south to the north; that is not counting the people going from the north back to the south, back into Mexico.

We are an open nation for immigration, but we have real issues that need to be resolved. Let me run through a couple of these.

We have to solve the Flores issue. We shouldn't have an impossible situation to say: You can either release people into the country whom we know, by and large, will never show up for a court hearing or detain them and separate families. That is intolerable. This body can fix that, but no one has since 1997. It is time for us to be able to take ownership of that and to be able to fix that. We should not separate families, but neither should we just release them into the country and give them a notice to appear.

Many people in this body may not know, but right now, if you called our Department of Justice and DHS and asked them: In the regions of the country, when is the next available court date for an immigration hearing for a notice to appear? They will tell you—because we have just checked—that the next available court date—if you are crossing the southern border right now, they will hand you a notice to appear for August of 2022—August of 2022. They will release you into the country on your own recognizance, hoping you will show up 4 years and 2 months from now at the next available court hearing. That is intolerable.

So what do we do? Let's start with some basics. Can we agree that we should add more immigration judges? We have 350 immigration judges in the country. Last year, this body agreed and voted to add another 150. It is still not close to what is needed. We have a backlog of 700,000 immigration cases right now. It is not possible for that group of immigration judges to actually get through all of that.

Can we agree to add more immigration judges so individuals get due process but don't have to wait 4 years to get due process? We should be able to agree on that.

We should be able to agree on reforms to the process. It takes over 700 days to hire a new immigration judge. That is a broken process for hiring. Can we agree that process needs to be fixed?

Can we agree on basic southern border security? That used to not be a controversial thing. In 2006, this body passed something called the Secure Fence Act. It added 650 miles of fence and border onto our southern border. That vote passed with overwhelming support from this body, Republican and Democratic. Outspoken conservatives, such as CHUCK SCHUMER, Joe Biden, and Senator Barack Obama, voted for the Secure Fence Act in 2006. This used to not be a partisan issue that we would

just have basic border security. So 650 miles of fencing is now on our southern border today because of the bipartisan Secure Fence Act that passed with overwhelming support from this body in 2006. Can we still agree that securing our southern border is a good thing or is that still a partisan issue? I hope it will not be. That should be a basic principle of trying to secure our southern border. Every Nation just wants to know who is coming in and out of our borders.

Even for asylum seekers—there has been much in the news about asylum. Asylum seekers who go to the port of entry have not violated any law. They are going to a port of entry and saying: I request asylum. What is interesting from that is even if I go back to, let's say, 2016, the last year of the Obama administration, of the people who came to the border requesting asylum, after they got into the country, only 40 percent of them actually filed paperwork for asylum. Of that 40 percent who actually filed paperwork for asylum, only 13 percent of them actually received asylum, and that is in the last year of the Obama administration.

We should allow for asylum, but they should come to the ports of entry. That is the right spot to do it, not skip around the ports of entry, and when they are arrested for coming between the ports of entry, then claim: Now I want asylum.

Those folks, the vast majority of them who claim they want asylum, never actually file the paperwork to get it. Once they are released into the country, they never follow through with the actual request. We should be able to fix some of those issues.

We should also be able to fix the DACA issue. I have raised this in this body multiple times, and I have talked about it often at home. We have a couple of million kids who have grown up in this country whose parents illegally crossed the border when they were infants and children at the time and who have grown up in this country. They don't know another country. Now, their parents violated the law. Those kids did not violate the law. What do we do with them?

The most simple principle, and that is what I hope we can agree on common ground is, let's secure the border. Let's take a couple years to make sure we secure the border, but let's also give a shot to those kids who are here with the DACA Program to be naturalized, to become citizens of the United States in the only country they have ever known.

This shouldn't be that controversial either. Quite frankly, that opinion is agreed upon by President Obama and by President Trump.

Back in February, over 70 Members of this body voted for a bill that allowed for naturalization of individuals in the DACA Program. We had four bills we voted on. None of them got 60 votes, but if you count up each of the people who voted for them on a bill

that included naturalization of those kids, over 70 people voted for that in this body on some level.

We have common agreement that we should do that. We can't seem to finish the work to actually do it though. We should be able to resolve it. We should be able to fix the issues of family separation. We should be able to solve basic border security issues. This is doable stuff, but we need this body to focus and to actually get it done.

Every issue we debate is controversial. Some of them are louder and more controversial than others—I get that—but that is our job, to go through the difficult issues, read the Constitution, and talk to the people at home to deal with the issue and make a decision.

I encourage this body to finish the work. We should be able to secure our border. We should deal with this issue of family migration. We should keep families together but actually go through the legal process, not just release them into the country for a hearing 4 years from now, for which they probably will not show up. We should do this and find that common ground.

Let's work together. Let's finish the task that needs to be done on this and actually get this resolved.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX REFORM

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I rise today to highlight the 6-month anniversary of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. I would like to illustrate what it has meant to the people of West Virginia since President Trump signed this into law. I will speak in a larger sense, as well, regarding what a difference it has made in this country.

We see it in the news every single day, and the benefits are really undeniable. Since Congress passed tax reform, we have seen incredible job creation—more than 1 million jobs, to be exact. We have seen unemployment drop to historic lows and wages are on the rise. Our small businesses and their employees are feeling optimistic again.

When I travel throughout the State and visit our small businesses, there is a real hop in the step of those small business owners and those who work there because of their increased business, because of their ability to expand, and other things that they have wanted to do for years. So it really has been an incredible transformation.

Only a few days ago, a "CNBC News" survey showed that 54 percent of Americans say the economy is "good or excellent"—good or excellent. That is the highest percentage that has ever been recorded in the 10 years that CNBC has been doing the survey.

But even more important are the number of stories that I have heard of what has transpired since we did tax reform. In letters, in meetings, and everywhere around town, I have heard from West Virginians who are feeling the positive effects of tax reform. Our small businesses have been able to expand and hire new employees. They have been able to give back to their employees, whether in the form of bonuses or reaching out to their communities with more charitable donations. Others have been able to create jobs and hire more workers.

Just this month, I received a letter from a constituent, Chris from Charleston, who owns an eye consulting business. Chris wrote that the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is "legislation that has benefited small business owners all across the country and our folks back here in West Virginia." He said that as a result of the tax cuts, small businesses have hired more people, raised employee wages, and expanded opportunities and operations.

He continued to talk about the other aspects of the tax cuts. He said:

That doesn't sound like a tax cut that only caters to the rich and powerful. As each week passes, more and more of our fellow Americans support the new tax code. I hear it from my patients in the office all the time.

Chris isn't alone. I have heard from families who are better able to cover expenses and invest in their children's education. When President Trump traveled to West Virginia this spring, we spoke to one family, the Ferrell family from Huntington. Thanks to tax reform, the Ferrells were able to open a 529 savings account for the first time to help support their children in their education.

I have heard from families who have been able to afford high-speed internet for the first time. That might sound like a little thing to a lot of people, but it is a big thing to a family and to a child who comes home from school and can't do their homework because they don't have connectivity. Because of that change, one more student in our State is able to complete their homework at home. They no longer have to feel left behind when they get back to school. That is a powerful thing.

But it is not just West Virginia's small businesses and working families who are benefiting from tax reform. In our State, these benefits are helping to improve entire communities.

During President Trump's roundtable—again, in West Virginia—we also heard from Tony, who is a rural mail carrier. Tony and his wife Jessica live in Hurricane, WV, with their two sons. Tony explained that because of tax reform, their family was not only able to make home improvements, but they were also able to make more charitable contributions.

Specifically, they took extra money that they are seeing in their paychecks and gave it to their church, specifically for the faith-based initiative that has

been a very successful resource in fighting the opioid epidemic that we see throughout our State. It is no secret that this opioid epidemic is severely damaging and having devastating consequences in our State with our communities and our families. But because of tax cuts and Tony and Jessica's generosity, at least one community has extra support that can be used to fight back against the drug crisis.

I know this is not an isolated incident. It is one that illustrates a very important point: Tax reform is making real and meaningful changes in West Virginia and across the country. That is certainly not crumbs to us in the Mountain State.

Just think that it has only been 6 months—only 6 months—and already 4 million workers have received bonuses across the country. Consumer confidence is at an all-time, 18-year high, and 102 utility companies have cut their rates. Think of what that does for the folks at the lower end of the economic scale. When your power bill is \$50 or \$100 less or even \$25 less a month, that makes a difference. That makes a real difference. And more than 8,000 low-income communities have been designated as opportunity zones.

I am excited to see what else is ahead for the State of West Virginia and for all Americans thanks to the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. I am excited to continue building on the incredible momentum that we have created, and I am excited to continue delivering pro-growth solutions that will help to improve lives all across this country.

TRIBUTE TO DENNIS FRYE

On another note, Mr. President, I was just visited by Dennis Frye, who is a retiring park ranger in Harpers Ferry. He has been a good friend to me. He is a historian of the highest degree on the Civil War and the critical battles that were fought in and around Harpers Ferry and in that region of our State and in Virginia and Maryland.

I want to thank him for his service, for his 42 years, 32 of those in the Park Service. He is a public servant who will never be forgotten in our region. I know he is going to continue to give back to the community.

So I want to say thank you to Dennis for his depth of knowledge, for his appreciation for our history, and for his appreciation of what we can really learn about our future if we look back at our history.

So thank you to Dennis Frye.
With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I rise to address an amendment that I worked on with my colleague Senator CORKER from Tennessee. It is an amendment that I hope we are going to get a vote on today because I think it is timely, it is important, and it is really a measure that would simply restore to Congress a responsibility that the Constitution assigns to Congress.

So what am I talking about? I am talking about the amendment that we have crafted that would simply require that before a President—this President or any other President—can invoke section 232 of our trade law, which is the provision that grants the President special powers when the national security of America is threatened or is at risk and gives him the power to impose tariffs in that situation, what this amendment would do is that it would say that when a President makes the determination that he wants to impose tariffs because it is essential for the security of our country, he could do so as long as he has the assent from Congress. It would require an expedited process and a simple majority vote. It couldn't be dragged out. It couldn't be filibustered, but it would ultimately be congressional responsibility.

Now, why do I say that this would be restoring to Congress its constitutional power? Well, it is because the Constitution is very unambiguous about this. Article I, section 8, clause 1 states that "the Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises."

It goes on from there. Duties are tariffs, and I don't think anybody disputes that. So article I, section 8, clause 1 assigns that responsibility to Congress.

Clause 3 goes on further to make it clear that this is Congress's responsibility, by stating that the Congress shall have the power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations." Well, the imposition of duties clearly is an exercise in regulating commerce with foreign nations.

Now, over time the Congress has ceded authority in this area—unwisely, in my view—to the Executive, and that has been going on for decades. There is no question about it. The Executive now has a lot of authority under powers that Congress has delegated to the President. Frankly, it is part of a broader trend of congressional powers that are being delegated to the executive branch, to regulators, agencies, and to the Cabinet. I think it is a mistake. I think this is a congressional responsibility. We ought to take that responsibility, and we ought to take it seriously.

Why do I think it is important in this particular case? Because, in my view, this section 232 provision is being misused. It is meant to ensure that our Defense Department can procure defensive materials needed in time of war. That was the real motivation behind creating this power for the President to block foreign trade in the event that our national security depended on it. What do we have instead? We have this provision being invoked as a way to impose tariffs on some of our closest allies, our closest friends, and most important trading partners—in fact, the Canadians, the Mexicans, and the European Union—over very small amounts of steel that we import. In the case of Canada, it is really quite amazing. Do we have a closer ally than our next-

door neighbor, Canada, the country that sends troops to fight alongside ours whenever we have a need to do that, a country with whom we have massive amount of trade in both directions, a country with whom we have a balance of trade overall, a country where we actually have a surplus in steel? What we are doing is we are imposing taxes on Americans, taxes on my constituents if they choose to buy steel from Canada, and we are saying that is necessary for national security purposes. Of course, it is not. It has nothing to do with national security, and the Secretary of Commerce admitted as much before our committee last week when he said what it is really about is getting the Canadians to agree to the changes the administration wants to make in NAFTA. Well, I don't agree with those changes in the first place.

So we are misusing a national security element of our law to punish American consumers for products that originate from one of the friendliest countries on the planet with respect to our country, and I think this is a problem. By the way, it is not the first time that we have had really dubious trade policy from the administration. I totally disagreed with the Mexican sugar deal that was negotiated. It is a protectionist bill that treats domestic sugar growers very, very well. They get an artificially high price for their sugar, and all of us who are consumers of sugar pay too high a price. Then we had tariffs imposed on solar panels and washing machines. We now are finding that, first, we had tariffs on Canadians, Mexicans, Europeans, and South Koreans. Then, there was relief. But, then, that expired, and now the tariffs are back.

We have gone too far down the road. This has become very disruptive. This is bad for our economy, it is bad for my constituents, and, fundamentally, it is a responsibility that we have. It is in the Constitution. It says so.

So what this amendment does is that it simply says: Look, the President can invoke 232; the President can invoke national security if he sees fit, but he has to come back to Congress for an expedited up-or-down vote.

Frankly, that is exactly what our responsibility is. This bill is relevant. The ag community is more adversely affected by the retaliation against these ill-conceived tariffs than any other sector of the economy I can think of. This is the bill that addresses ag policy. This is the right moment to have this debate and to decide whether we want to take the responsibility that the Constitution assigns to us or not.

By the way, I get that not everybody agrees with what Senator CORKER and I and others are trying to do, but I hope everybody acknowledges that the role of the Senate is to debate and vote on tough issues. That is part of what we are sent here to do—to decide what our policy will be—and that necessarily includes having a debate and having a vote.

So I think my colleague from Tennessee is going to make a request that we be able to consider this amendment and vote on this. I wholeheartedly support this effort. I think it is very, very important.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President I want to thank my friend from Pennsylvania for his comments and for his leadership on issues relative to free trade and other important issues to our Nation. I just want to reiterate for a minute, before I ask for this amendment to be called up, the fact that this particular amendment, No. 1, is cosponsored by 14 people of various ideologies, on both sides of the aisle. Senator FLAKE, who is here on the floor, is a cosponsor of this amendment. It is probably one of the most supported amendments we are going to vote on as it relates to the farm bill.

Is the farm bill the right place? Absolutely. Farmers around our country are being hurt by this administration's trade policies, and more than 20 farm bills could help them. So it is very important for us to address this issue now.

Some of my friends on the other side of the aisle—by the way, we have many people on the other side of the aisle supporting this legislation, this amendment—have said: Well, we don't want to hurt our ability to impose tariffs on China.

This has nothing to do with that. As the Senator from Pennsylvania mentioned, the President has used section 201 of the Trade Act to put in place tariffs on solar panels and on washing machines. He did that in January. The additional tariffs that he is putting in place on China are under section 301.

What this amendment narrowly focuses on is the abuse of authority that the administration is utilizing to put tariffs in place on Canada, Mexico, and on many of our allies, especially in Europe, and what he is doing is citing national security. It is dubious. All of us know that it has nothing whatsoever to do with national security, but the reason the President is using this is that he doesn't have to prove anything to use it. Under the other sections, you have to deal with the WTO or the ITC, and you have to actually make a case for what it is you are doing.

When you use section 232, no case has to be made. He can just do it. Therefore, because of this abuse of authority, that is the reason we believe the President ought to be free to negotiate these.

Sure, he is the leader of our Nation, but once he completes those negotiations, if he is going to use section 232 of the Trade Act, we believe he should come to Congress, as was laid out by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

With that, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up amendment No. 3091.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object.

My colleague raises concerns about the effect of retaliatory tariffs on our farmers and others. I couldn't agree more, but we should not pit farmers against steelworkers. Only a few days after Candidate Trump became President-elect Trump, my first correspondence with him was about how we do trade policy in the next few years. One of the conditions—one of the admonitions, if you will—was that you don't play off one industry against another. You don't play off agriculture against autos or steel or chemicals or anything else. I think my colleagues agree that it benefits all Americans if we stop China cheating, if we force them to play by the rules.

I would say to my colleagues today—to Senator TOOMEY and Senator CORKER—that I understand they have some bipartisan support on this, but I would say that probably the worst thing you do for America's farmers is to jeopardize passage of the farm bill today. I have spoken with Senator ROBERTS and Senator STABENOW about that, and that is exactly what this amendment would do.

The amendment would gut, most importantly, one of our trade enforcement tools, a tool Congress passed and enhanced in the Finance Committee just in the last couple of years to ensure we protect the industries necessary to defend our country.

I know my colleague from Tennessee generally opposes the President's trade agenda. I think he does that from an intellectually honest position, but that is not justification for completely undoing a decades-old statute that is one of the few tools we have to defend national security interests against distortions in the global market.

The steel and aluminum tariffs the President has put in place are long overdue actions to defend against the further shrinking of two sectors critical to national defense. Senator TOOMEY knows this in the western part of his State, as I know it in mine. I know my colleagues agree that excess steel production capacity in China is troubling. We are talking about a country that now has the capacity to produce half of the world's steel, close to half of the smelt, and half of the world's aluminum. It has affected the global market. It has made steel overcapacity a global problem.

We know that China puts people to work because they can't afford to have tens of millions of young men unemployed in the country. They subsidize their energy, water, capital, and land. They have dozens of government-owned enterprises. They want to keep their people at work. They cheat when they do. That is very simple. We have an administration now that is finally willing to take action and defend our highly competitive steel industry and steel workers.

I know what a competitive steel plant looks like. I was at ArcelorMittal

in Cleveland, 7 miles from my house, only a week ago. That is the first steel mill in the world that has been able to produce raw steel with one person-hour of labor. Think of that, a ton of steel produced by one person-hour. That tells you how productive our plants are, but against China cheating and subsidizing nearly all of the components—we simply can't do that.

The State of Tennessee, perhaps, has been lucky to avoid the devastation brought to steel towns, like Steubenville, Yorkville, Martins Ferry, Warren, and Lorain, all cities in Ohio, up and down the Mon River in Pennsylvania—Senator TOOMEY said the same thing—all as a result of China's excess capacity.

The shuttered steel mills and thousands of steel workers in Ohio who lost their jobs are constant reminders for my State that this trade enforcement action by the President was long overdue. We have to have steel and aluminum sectors in this country to defend ourselves. It is that simple. We will not have these critical sectors if our steel and aluminum producers can't keep their doors open.

This section of the statute, 232, was Congress's way, some time ago, of acknowledging there are connections between trade and national security. Imports can undermine our national security. Congress has recognized that for years. There should be ways for the President to take action when that is the case.

The Corker amendment fundamentally rejects that idea and hamstringing the President's ability to protect America's national security interests. Even worse, the Corker amendment would immediately remove the 232 steel and aluminum tariffs, including those on China. Why would any colleagues vote to let China off the hook?

Just look at the bipartisan effort to pass the Foreign Investment Risk Review Modernization Act, which passed down the hall, I believe, with only two "no" votes. There is broad bipartisan support also for ensuring that the President take a tough stance with ZTE, which he has not been wild about doing. But for some reason, when it comes to aluminum and steel, it is OK to let China off the hook. It makes no sense.

I know some of my colleagues who support this amendment will say that they would support the President's actions if they were targeted just to China. They think the Corker amendment is necessary because the President has applied these tariffs to our allies. But steel overcapacity is a global problem. It needs a global solution. If we don't take a more comprehensive action, China will cheat their way into those other markets. Ask ArcelorMittal, ask Nucor, ask AK Steel, ask U.S. Steel, just to name a few domestic producers we have in my State. They have all seen the tricks China uses to work around our anti-dumping and countervailing duty laws.

Look at the findings of Ambassador Lighthizer's recent report on China's intellectual property theft. He found that China was stealing about \$50 billion of intellectual property from the United States every single year. The evidence is clear.

I don't even particularly fault China because they are acting in their national interests. Maybe we should try to do the same thing. China is determined to gain U.S. market share in technological advances, and they will stop at nothing to get it.

I agree that we should work with our allies, and this administration, to a degree, has. They have negotiated agreements with South Korea, Brazil, Argentina, and Australia. Some of our colleagues are concerned, rightly, about Canada and Mexico being covered by the tariffs. I share that concern. But gutting trade enforcement is not the way to fix that.

I have worked with the administration to reach a solution through negotiations; I encourage my colleagues to do the same. I spoke to Ambassador Lighthizer again late last night. We are in a holding pattern with NAFTA talks until Mexico's elections, in about a week. But soon after that, NAFTA talks will pick right up. Steel and aluminum tariffs will be part of that dialogue, as they should be. Because Canada and Mexico have such close proximity to our market, they are primary targets for Chinese transshipment. We have to guard against that or the section 232 tariffs simply will not be effective.

I am confident an agreement with our NAFTA partners can be reached. I hope it is reached soon. Canada and Mexico are important parts of the North American steel supply chain. They are important partners in making sure our efforts to address steel overcapacity are effective.

The tariffs have been effective. Just yesterday, Republic Steel announced that one of its rolling mills in Lorain, OH, will restart in September. In Granite City, IL, 800 steelworkers were called back to work. The Corker amendment would threaten these new jobs and would thwart other announcements of steel mills restarting in the United States.

To summarize, the Corker amendment would permanently undermine a longstanding section of statute that makes sure the United States has the industries necessary to defend itself. It would let bad actors, like China, off the hook, able to flood our markets with unfairly traded steel. It disregards ongoing negotiations with our NAFTA partners. It threatens the improvements seen in our steel and aluminum industries since the tariffs were imposed.

For all those reasons, I object. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Objection is heard.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, I don't even know where to start. The

Senator from Ohio is a friend of mine. We came in together at the same time. He has written books on labor and trade, and I respect the fact that he knows a great deal about the topic. We serve together on the Banking Committee, and I respect him.

Much of what he just said was focused on China. I have never heard of a trade policy where you have a country like China, which is, in fact, dumping steel around the world because it is in their interest—I have never heard of a trade policy where you punish your friends in order to get at someone who is doing something to you. So we are punishing Canada and Mexico.

We are fortunate to live in the neighborhood we live in, to have the neighbors we have. We are punishing our European allies, who have been with us for centuries, in order to get at China. It makes no sense.

As a matter of fact, I haven't heard a person who has gone to the White House to talk about what they are putting in place—a trade policy—come back over here and be able to articulate anything coherent about that policy. I haven't heard a single soul be able to explain to me why we would punish our allies in Europe and our neighbors next door in order to get at China.

Section 232 has nothing to do with China. That is absolutely not true; it has nothing to do with China. China is being punished by 201 and 301, and we are punishing our allies by abusing a national security section called 232. So I don't know what to say.

Mr. TOOMEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORKER. Let me finish one more thing before I yield, and I will gladly yield.

People in our Nation are being hurt today. People are being hurt. We saw the Harley-Davidson issue, where they are going to move some of the jobs overseas to avoid these tariffs. Other companies are going to be doing the same.

Right now, farmers are being hurt around our country. On July 1, a whole other set of countermeasures is coming in from other countries. On July 6, there will be a whole other set of countermeasures coming in.

I just want the record to be clear. The Senator from Ohio, my friend, will not even allow us to vote. If he disagrees with this policy, he can vote against it. He is not even allowing us to vote on something that could ease and stop the pain that is being inflicted on our country by a trade policy that is not coherent, that is being made up on a daily basis, and that has nothing whatsoever to do with what China is doing with steel and aluminum.

I don't know what this body has become when you can't even vote on an issue that is current, that is damaging farmers more than 20 farm bills could make up for.

With that, I yield the floor to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Tennessee.

I will put aside how stunned I was to hear that my colleague from Ohio has suggested that maybe we want to emulate the Communist-managed economy of China as a good model for economic development. That is just breathtaking to me. But I really want to stress the point that the Senator from Tennessee made, and that is the fact that this amendment has nothing to do with China.

We can go on all day about how outrageous some Chinese behavior is in the trade space. It is true; there is really bad behavior, and, by the way, we need to address that.

We would be better able to address things like the theft of intellectual property and porous technology transfer if our allies were working with us to address that outrageous behavior. But it is harder to get your allies to work with you when you are hitting them with tariffs and the excuse is national security.

Let me just put a little bit of scale to this. Our colleague suggested how important it is that these industries survive. I completely agree. Domestic producers produce 75 percent of all the steel we consume. We import about 25 percent of it. Do you know how much of that comes from China? About 2 percent of the 25 percent. We don't import steel from China; that is the reality.

We do import a little bit of steel. The No. 1 source is Canada, which buys more steel from us than we buy from them.

So that is our national security threat; that is why we need to hit my constituents with a tax when they choose to buy those kinds of steel the Canadians happen to specialize in and Americans don't. This makes no sense at all.

Finally, my last point is this: We have sincerely held differences of opinions on this. Why can't we vote? Isn't that what the Senate is here for? Let's debate this, let's consider this, and let's have a vote. I didn't think the purpose of the Senate was to avoid votes that people think are tough or challenging or that they even disagree with. I fully accept disagreement. I don't expect unanimous agreement on the outcome, on the policy. But why in the world is this a body that can't have a debate and vote about something as timely, important, and relevant as this?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, I will be very brief. I know the Senator from Ohio wants to speak, and the Senator from Wyoming has been waiting.

People in our Nation are being hurt today. Americans are being taxed heavily. A tariff is a tax on the American people. What the Senator from Ohio is doing is saying that the Senate should not even vote on a measure to alleviate the pain that Americans are going to feel and the jobs that are going to be

lost over the next couple of months as this trade war continues.

I am just disappointed. I cannot believe it. With the zeal with which we both came to the Senate 11½ years ago to debate and deal with the big issues of our Nation and to have an amendment that is supported in a bipartisan way when people know that the trade policy being put forth by this administration is being made up on a daily basis and they know that jobs are going to be lost and farmers are already hurt, we cannot even vote, even though we may disagree, on an amendment.

So on this day, June 27, let it be known that on a bill that is very relevant because of the pain that farmers are going through, we were kept from voting on a measure that would have alleviated an incoherent policy from continuing as it relates to trade.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I appreciate Senator CORKER's comments. I appreciate a little less those of Senator TOOMEY, who tried to say that I was thinking that the People's Republic of China has an economy we should emulate.

What I actually said—and I have seen him do this before. What I actually said is that China's Government fights for its national interests by putting people to work, and our trade policy, for 25 years—since NAFTA, since PNTR, since CAFTA, since South Korea, many of them pushed by Presidents whom I have stood up for—has undermined American national security and domestic security. So I just reject that.

But I appreciate Senator CORKER's comments about voting on this. This is a major change in policy, with no legislative hearings, with no real discussion or debate. It is a bit rich when the majority party talks about our not allowing votes when, to start with, there was the Supreme Court nominee of 3 years ago and all the times we tried to do a transportation bill, important in our Banking Committee, as Senator CORKER knows. He wasn't really part of the obstruction, but I just find it a bit rich.

The reason is that Senator HATCH has already said he wants to do hearings to really understand what it would mean to roll back years of having these trade remedies, like 232. What would it mean?

We have lost 7,000 jobs in the steel industry in my State. I don't know the number in Western and Central Pennsylvania—in Senator TOOMEY's State—but I want to move quickly on having these real discussions and real debates. Having a vote on a bill that nobody really understands, except it is reacting to the President's sometimes bungled positions and attempts on trade enforcement—I share that frustration. I am his ally on this, but I have been frustrated, too, with the back-and-

forth on which countries are in and which countries are out.

Fundamentally, tariffs are a temporary tool. They are not a trade policy used by the President, in this case to force a discussion and a real policy about what to do with China's excess capacity, where half the world's steel can be made in one country, and they put people to work and undermine international trade laws by doing it. People in my State have paid the price, as they have all over the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, this amendment has nothing to do with China. This amendment deals with Canada, Mexico, our European allies, and other countries. I guess when we go back home this week and we talk to our constituents and they talk to us—I had a member of the UAW write a letter to the editor thanking me for these efforts that are underway to stop these tariffs that are killing the automobile industry or will kill the automobile industry that exists in Ohio and Tennessee. But I guess what I will tell him is, well, we couldn't vote on a simple measure that would allow Congress to vote up or down on tariffs the President negotiates. But what we are going to do, while you lose your jobs, while you pay 25 percent more for steel and aluminum, while these industries go away, I will tell them: Well, we are going to have hearings.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I am so glad that you are presiding at this time because I know you are part of the Joint Select Committee on Budget Reform. I want to address that a little bit.

Earlier this week, the Senate passed its version of the fiscal year 2019 Energy and Water, Legislative Branch, and Military Construction and Veterans Affairs spending bills. Prior to this week, the last time the Senate had passed its version of a regular appropriations bill—not a supplemental or an omnibus bill—was more than 2 years ago.

I commend Chairman SHELBY and the members of the Appropriations Committee for their work in getting us this far and for their commitment to restoring a more regular process for the consideration of appropriations measures. I hope that in the weeks to come, we will be able to process more such measures in a similarly productive manner.

It was a long road getting to this point. Last February, after a brief government shutdown that followed an immigration policy dispute and a year-long stalemate on appropriations, Congress and the administration agreed to legislation establishing new discretionary spending caps for this fiscal year and the next and providing a process for budget enforcement—something

normally done by the Budget Committee.

This latest budget agreement follows a string of 2-year budget deals, each reached under the threat of a shutdown. In fact, frustration with the current process has grown so great that through the February legislation, Congress created the Joint Select Committee tasked with improving our broken budget and appropriations process. I commend the Joint Committee and its leaders, Co-Chairman WOMACK and Co-Chairwoman LOWEY, for their work on this subject. Our budget and appropriations process is clearly in need of reform, and I wish them success in this effort.

Today, I rise to share some of my thoughts and experiences on this subject, having led bipartisan efforts in the Senate Budget Committee to explore and reform the budget process.

As my colleagues know, the Senate Budget Committee sets the top-line spending levels that the Appropriations Committee then divides each year among the various departments and accounts. The Appropriations Committee does the specific spending. While there are many potential improvements we could make in this process, I will focus my remarks at this time on just three points.

First, the annual spending process will never truly improve so long as we are willing to hold it hostage to larger ideological or political battles. Both sides have been guilty of this in the past, and until we are willing to say "no more," no process reform will succeed. I am hopeful that the progress we are seeing now on fiscal year 2019 appropriations bills is a sign that we have reached a tipping point and are willing to work together, as the American people expect us to do.

The second topic I want to address is the need to move to a biennial funding cycle. I have been pleased to hear some members of the joint committee voice support for this concept, and I hope that consensus on this point continues to build.

The appropriations process—the spending process—has rarely worked as intended. In all but 4 years between 1977 and 2018, continuing resolutions, or CRs, were enacted because of the failure of Congress to complete all of the regular appropriations bills before the beginning of the new fiscal year. We have actually had more than 180 continuing resolutions signed into law over the last four decades. In this fiscal year alone, we required five.

These short-term continuing resolutions keep the government funded while we continue our work, but their recurring nature demonstrates the problems with our current process. The individual agencies have to operate on last year's budget until something new is approved. All too often, by the time Congress can agree on how to appropriate money for a given year, the result is a massive omnibus that funds the entire government. Members are

then presented with a choice—either pass the bill or shut down the government.

I have long believed that one of the most important things we can do is fix this process. The way to do that would be to move to a biennial appropriations system. By providing funding for 2 years instead of 1, Congress would immediately make the consideration of regular appropriations measures more likely. Instead of subjecting itself to a nearly perpetual annual cycle of developing and attempting to pass 12 appropriations bills for the next fiscal year, which starts October 1, Congress could spread those bills over 2 years, allowing more time to develop and scrutinize them and give 2 years' worth of planning to everybody.

Not only would a biennial appropriations process help Congress execute its power of the purse, it would also benefit the Federal agencies too. Agencies would have more time to devote to developing and to executing long-term strategies and would finally have some certainty in their budgets.

Nowhere is the need for this more obvious than at the Department of Defense. The Budget Committee has heard repeatedly from Defense Department leaders that the one thing they want more than anything is budgetary certainty. Annual spending fights and the inability to plan under continuing resolutions have wreaked havoc on the Department's workforce and contracting efforts.

Secretary of the Navy Richard Spenser recently delivered public remarks in which he identified \$4 billion in waste due to a lack of financial stability. He said:

Since 2001, we have put \$4 billion in a trash can, poured lighter fluid on top of it, and burned it. It's enough money that it can buy us the additional capacity and capability that we need. Instead, that \$4 billion of taxpayer money has been lost because of inefficiencies [caused by] continuing resolutions.

Transitioning to a biennial appropriations process could help solve that problem.

Last Congress, I introduced legislation that would continue the budget resolution process on an annual cycle in order to allow for top-line adjustments and reconciliation instructions as events warrant but would move toward a bifurcated biennial appropriations process. Under such a proposal, appropriations would continue to be divided among 12 different bills, 6 of which would be adopted in the first session of Congress, and 6 would be adopted in the second session. Maybe we could even make it so the six toughest ones would be done right after an election and the six easier ones, just before an election, to take more of the politics out of it.

By cutting in half the number of bills required to be adopted annually, Congress could create space for itself to devote more time and attention to oversight and other national priorities. If adopted, I believe this proposal would

yield a more sustainable and successful budget and appropriations process—a goal I believe both parties share.

I thank Speaker of the House RYAN for his comments this morning in which he suggested that we should do it on a biennial basis and that they should be divided into two segments of six, each for a 2-year period, so they would stagger how they are approached.

My third suggestion is a minor one but could have some of the most significant impact on the budget. The first one is, change the name of the Budget Committee. People think that we actually make all of those spending decisions. We don't. We set the top line for the Appropriations Committee, which is also improperly named, so they can do their work. My suggestion would be that we stop calling the Budget Committee the Budget Committee and call it the Debt Control Committee. We ought to be and are responsible for seeing how much revenue is coming in and what some of the different allocations are and doing a lot of reviews of that and checking to see what the debt-to-GDP ratio is going to be and how much the debt limit is going to go up, which becomes another subject of debate. If that were the Debt Control Committee, all of that could be done in committee, with one approval here on the floor.

The other half of that suggestion is that the Appropriations Committee ought to be called the Budget Committee because they really are the ones in control of the spending, in control of the budget. In every State in the Nation, the committee that actually does the appropriations is the budget committee. That would stop the flood of people who come in right after the President's budget comes out and before the Senate Budget Committee does their work, where they think they have to come in and ask for the details on their expenditures at that time. If it was the Debt Control Committee, they would have a whole different perspective on what it was that committee is trying to do, and they would take their suggestions to the appropriate committee, which would be the Appropriations Committee, renamed the "Budget Committee" so they would understand what they are doing.

As the Joint Select Committee continues to work, I encourage my colleagues here and in the other body to consider biennial appropriations as a necessary reform. I wish them success in their endeavor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Madam President, I rise today to talk about the farm bill. I want to start by thanking Senators ROBERTS and STABENOW for making this farm bill a model of bipartisanship.

I have lived in a community in Newark for the last two-plus decades that most folks would not associate with a

farm bill. The truth is, the issue we are grappling with in this bill affect all of our American communities—suburban, urban, and rural alike.

Folks in my community have borne the burden of horrific environmental injustices for decades—from toxins that poisoned our river, to lead in our soil, to pollutants in the air. Families in my city cannot plant crops in their soil because huge swaths of my city in many areas are toxic. We also have food deserts that exist in communities like mine, where people don't have access to healthy foods.

I have also visited rural areas of our country that endure the same kinds of injustices. I have met families who cannot open their windows because industrial farming operations are spraying waste into the surrounding air. Families can't hang their clothes outside, they can't run their air-conditioning, and they can't plant in their soil because of the way we do factory farming.

The truth is, pollution and environmental degradation at the local scale, in communities like mine and many of the communities I visited, are real for folks all across this country. It is real for rural folks; it is real for urban folks; and it is real for suburban folks. It has caused the same misaligned incentives that are also contributing to the much larger scale problem of climate change. Just like local-scale pollution—toxins—in communities like mine and others, global climate change is very real and cannot be ignored because of its impacts on folks all over our country, particularly on those in vulnerable communities.

So I will take a few moments to talk about these kinds of pollutants and to talk about climate change, which is closely intertwined with issues within the farm bill, even if it doesn't appear to be so at first glance.

The numbers on what is happening to our climate are clear. We know that atmospheric carbon dioxide levels are higher now than they have been at any point in recorded history and that our global carbon emissions are still rising.

Sixteen of the seventeen warmest years on record in history have all occurred in the 21st century, and if nothing changes, we are headed for 3 degrees Celsius of warming by 2100, which would cause catastrophic changes in many parts of the world and in many parts of the United States of America. Hurricanes in the North Atlantic will actually continue to become stronger and more intense and potentially more devastating. Drought and heat waves out West will become ever more frequent, and parts of the southwestern United States could see temperatures above 100 degrees for one-third of the year.

All of the extreme weather will have a dramatic impact on our farmers. Climate change is real for American family farmers even now. Some U.S. crop yields are expected to drop significantly with climate change, and estimates suggest that under a "business

as usual'' emissions scenario, yields of wheat and soybeans and corn could fall by 20 to 50 percent by the end of this century.

Just as climate change impacts our agricultural system, our agricultural system also impacts the climate. Although it is often not discussed in the same breath as transportation or power generation, the global agricultural industry is, actually, one of the largest contributors to climate change. Some estimates suggest that up to one-third of our global greenhouse gas emissions come from agriculture, and these numbers are projected to grow and grow and grow as people's diets from around the world continue to change. In fact, as China and India and parts of Africa move to a Western diet, our globe simply cannot sustain that impact. As people shift to our diet, global agricultural emissions are projected to rise another 80 percent by 2050 alone. This is huge. This is unsustainable.

Industrial animal agriculture, in particular, is especially harmful to the climate. This factory farming is having a tremendous impact on our climate. Globally, livestock production alone accounts for nearly 15 percent of all human-caused greenhouse gas emissions, which is greater than the total greenhouse gas emissions for the entire global transportation sector. It is a fact.

We have all of the tools we need to tackle the dual challenge of climate change and environmental degradation, but in order to solve these problems, we must address the impacts of this consolidating global industrial farming system. This system is having an impact on our climate and environment. The farm bill should find ways to reduce the pollution, to reduce the impact, to reduce the environmentally devastating impact it is having on our country. The 2018 Senate farm bill takes some small steps in the right direction.

The farm bill grows the overall funding for agricultural conservation practices. It encourages farmers to plant cover crops, which improve soil and water quality. The farm bill also helps to drive climate-smart agriculture with several initiatives to keep carbon stored in our soils and in our forests. Yet what we really need is a fundamental shift in some of the major elements of our food system, shifts that, actually, can improve health and well-being and improve our Nation as a whole.

We need to emphasize local farm economies, where food is produced in a way that minimally impacts the environment and, actually, empowers our small- and medium-sized farmers. We also need to grow more of our produce by using organic and regenerative methods.

We need to put limits on the ability of major agricultural corporations, which are growing in size, to consolidate—to merge—and dictate the market. These corporate agricultural insti-

tutions that are growing so large and so powerful are dictating practices that are contrary to our very idea of farming in our country, whereby small- and medium-sized farmers who engage in practices that are more sustainable are being overrun by these large factory farms. We need to protect small family farmers from being squeezed out of business.

I am a New Jersey Senator, but I have been meeting farmers from all over our country who have told me the painful stories of what we are allowing to happen as our country is being gutted out of our traditional farmers by these big agribusinesses.

Consolidation in the agricultural industry is threatening the American farmer. The top four grain companies today control 90 percent of the global grain trade, and just four companies now control 60 percent of the poultry market. While giant agribusinesses are posting record earnings, our farmers—our American farmers—are facing desperate times. A farmer's share of every retail dollar has plummeted from 41 percent in 1950 to, approximately, 15 percent today. Many of these large corporate agricultural companies—some of them are not even American-owned—are continuing to punish America's small farmers by shrinking their margins, driving them out of business, and undermining what is an American way of life.

This consolidation must stop. I am working on a new bill that would help address this challenge, but for the farm bill that is before us, I will speak now about three amendments that I have filed.

First, I will talk about the amendment that Senator LEE and Senator HASSAN and I have filed—a bipartisan amendment that would make much needed reforms to our checkoff programs.

Checkoff programs collect fees which amount to their being a tax on all farmers. They collect these fees from producers of particular agricultural commodities. They are supposed to use these fees that are collected from farmers to promote and do research on that particular commodity. Unfortunately, we have seen some of these checkoff programs plagued by conflicts of interest—people who are engaging in anti-competitive behavior and funneling dollars to trade associations that only represent a sliver of the farmers who are required to pay into the checkoff programs. As one would imagine, those farmers who get the benefit are the big agribusinesses, often to the detriment of our small- and medium-sized farmers. Let me give you some examples.

We know, for example, in 2015, that documents obtained from requests under the Freedom of Information Act showed that the American Egg Board illegally used checkoff dollars to attempt to halt the sales of an egg-free mayonnaise product. Talk about anti-competitive activities.

In 2016, it was discovered that the Oklahoma Beef Council lost 2.6 million

checkoff dollars to embezzlement by a staff member who wrote over 790 fraudulent checks to herself during a 10-year period.

In 2017, it came to light that the USDA had failed for more than 4 years to publish legally required annual financial reports on the \$400 million per year dairy checkoff program.

This year, 2018, a Federal court ruled that the USDA had unlawfully approved the spending of \$60 million of hog farmers' checkoff money on a defunct promotional campaign.

So this amendment I am leading with Senator LEE and Senator HASSAN would make some commonsense reforms to the checkoff program in order to stop these abuses. Frankly, I don't see how anyone could argue against what are very commonsense, moderate reforms to the checkoff program so as to create fairness and transparency and actually stop and prohibit these conflicts of interest. That is what the amendment would do—prohibit conflicts of interest.

The amendment would require more transparency and mandate that the USDA publish budgets and expenditures that the USDA approves.

The amendment would prohibit anti-competitive behavior, such as we saw from the American Egg Board in its attacking of a startup company that it viewed as a threat. The language from the emails was actually stunning—about working to kill a business.

The amendment would prohibit checkoff boards from contracting with entities that engage in ag lobbying. I am one of those people. We have enough lobbyists here in DC, so I hope that this bipartisan amendment to implement commonsense reforms will get a vote and that it will receive the bipartisan support it needs to pass.

There are two other amendments I have filed that I would like to discuss that would help to protect contract farmers. They are the salt of the Earth. These farmers are Americans, many of whom have been on their land for generations, and what is happening now is unacceptable.

The first amendment I am filing to protect contract farmers would prohibit retaliation against these farmers by the large integrators, like Smithfield and Tyson.

As our agricultural markets have become more and more corporate-concentrated, the rights and bargaining power of our family farmers have diminished dramatically. The traditional model of independent farmers selling to independent processors has shifted toward one of contract production, particularly in the livestock and poultry sectors. Farmers now go into debt in excess of \$1 million to help build the facilities on their farms in order to get into this new contract production and often put their farms and their homes up as collateral.

For the majority of contract farmers, the large corporate integrator with which one must contract is either the

only company or one of two companies in a farmer's area. These farmers simply don't have the option of shifting to other buyers. Under these new circumstances of consolidated corporate, major agribusinesses, contract farmers—small farmers, small business people—are left incredibly vulnerable to retaliation by these big corporate agribusinesses. At least one—Smithfield, for example—is not even an American company. It is a Chinese company.

Recently, I had some contract farmers come to my office to meet with me. These farmers were terrified of coming to DC and actually talking to Members of Congress and Senators. They were terrified that the integrators they contract with might find out that they were talking to us and raising legitimate concerns about the abuses they were suffering.

This is the United States of America. We are making our farmers, our small business people, afraid of even talking about the abuses they are suffering from these massive, multinational agricultural corporations. Our contract farmers should not have to live like this. They should not have to be afraid that they will be retaliated against for engaging in lawful activities like speaking with Members of Congress or the USDA or for joining together in producer associations. James Madison's Federalist No. 50 talks about this idea of free association. Yet these contract farmers are afraid of doing that.

The second amendment I am filing to help contract farmers would require transparency in how these large corporate integrators calculate the payments they make to contract farmers. The payment mechanisms that are used by poultry companies and meat packers to pay livestock and poultry farmers are deliberately opaque. It is deliberately difficult to understand how those payments are made. Not only does this lack of transparency make it difficult for farmers to make wise business decisions, but it allows integrators to manipulate the farmers' compensation. It is a practice that is despicable. It is not the free, open, and transparent market we all claim to have in the United States. These are large, concentrated, massive corporations manipulating local contract farmers in our communities for nefarious purposes.

My amendment would simply require poultry companies, swine contractors, and meat packers to provide farmers with the relevant statistical information and data used to calculate their compensation. This is clear. You shouldn't do these things to squeeze or retaliate or pit farmers against each other. These are businesses. Have some transparency about the data so businesses can make sound decisions.

When President Obama left office, the USDA would have proposed rules that would have prohibited this kind of retaliation from these large corporate entities. They would prohibit retaliation by integrating and requiring more

transparency in payments to contract farmers. We were moving in the right direction. Unfortunately, under this administration, when they came in, they killed these GIPSA rules, once again siding with big agribusinesses, some of which are these foreign-owned companies that are coming in and rendering our contract farmers and our small family businesses into what has been compared to sharecropping.

The dignity of these small businesses, the humanity, the American tradition of farming is being eroded and undermined by these massive corporations, many of them foreign-owned. They are attacking our way of life. They are attacking one of the most dignified professions in America, which is small farming. It is outrageous and unacceptable what is going on to contract farmers across our country.

These two amendments would reverse the Trump administration's rollback of these important protections for our small contract farmers. I urge, with all of my heart, my colleagues to support these two amendments to be with the small farmers of America, to be with these people who are now struggling with mortgages and facing bankruptcy, who are now suffering because of these large corporations that are making their lives so difficult, that are undermining what has been the American way for centuries.

I conclude by speaking about the importance of SNAP and SNAP assistance for the food insecure. I was relieved. I actually rejoiced to see that the Senate farm bill does not cut SNAP funding.

In 2014, I voted against the farm bill because it contained more than \$8 billion in cuts to SNAP, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. It disproportionately helps people in my State of New Jersey, so the cuts disproportionately impacted my State. The truth is, at a time when we continue to heavily subsidize these large agribusinesses, I say very purposely that there is still corporate welfare in our farm bill. We should not force struggling families, seniors, and disabled citizens, working Americans to make sacrifices they can't afford. At the end of the day, this program aims to feed our country's most vulnerable population, with more than half of SNAP recipients being children and seniors. I repeat that. More than half of SNAP's benefits are for our kids and our elderly.

In my home State of New Jersey, approximately 142,000 senior citizens and 113,000 disabled residents receive SNAP. SNAP helps a cross-section of Americans in all ethnic groups. SNAP helps folks in our cities, towns, suburbs, and rural communities alike, and SNAP feeds our family farmers who too often rely on food assistance to feed themselves and their families while producing the food we eat. The irony of that is unacceptable. SNAP feeds our childcare workers, our healthcare providers, and our veterans. SNAP feeds

those who are in between jobs or who have three jobs and are still struggling to make ends meet.

I am glad to see the Senate bill has rejected the damaging and destructive SNAP cuts in the partisan House farm bill because, the truth is, at a time when over 13 million children in our country—please understand, the children in America, a global, knowledge-based society, the greatest natural resource a country has is not coal, oil or gas, but the genius of our children, and young minds need proper nutrition. At a time when 13 million children in our country face food insecurity, what we need to be doing is funding programs like SNAP—not funding them less but actually funding them more.

SNAP plays a critical role in making sure children are able to focus in a classroom and not be distracted about where their next meal is coming from or the hunger pains they are feeling.

I live in a low-income community. I am a Senator who lives in a community where, according to the last census, the median income is \$14,000 per household. I see my neighbors, working folk, working full-time jobs and still not making ends meet. When I go to my local bodega, I see people use programs like SNAP. God bless America, if we are not going to raise the minimum wage so people who work a full-time job in this country don't have to still live in poverty, we should not be cutting programs that are essential to helping families meet their nutritional needs. I see this at the end of the month when SNAP benefits are running out. One study shows that calories fall by up to 25 percent—the intake of calories for folks on food stamps—from the beginning of the month to the end. Families struggle. Kids struggle when there is less food in the house, when they go to school hungry. What does that do to cultivate that genius?

That is why we should be passing the SNAP for Kids Act of 2018 introduced by my friend and colleague Senator KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND. If we are serious about helping our communities and making sure every child, every adult, every senior citizen has access to their next meal, this legislation is important.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I would like to talk today for a few minutes about food stamps and the farm bill. Let me preface it by saying, it has been my experience that the American people are the most generous people in the world.

We spend about \$1 trillion of taxpayer money at the Federal, State, and local levels helping our neighbors who are less fortunate than we are. In America—and I am very proud of this—if you are homeless, we will house you. If you are too poor to be sick, we will pay for your doctors. If you are hungry, we will feed you. That separates our country from a lot of other countries

that exist and have existed in the world, and I am very proud of those principles as an American. So I do get upset when people suggest that the American taxpayer is not generous with his or her money. We are the most generous people in the world.

In that regard, I know that for many Americans, the Food Stamp Program—we call it the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, some people call it SNAP—means the difference between an empty stomach and a warm meal, and that is just a fact. I am talking about the men and women, many of whom are hard-working, who do all they can to provide for their families, but they need just a little extra help to put food on the table. The American people are happy to provide it.

Each and every year, the Federal Government spends more than \$68 billion to make sure no American has to wonder where his or her next meal is going to come from. It is the generosity of the American people that pays for those meals.

If the Food Stamp Program is going to continue to provide food to the 42.2 million Americans who use their benefits every month—and I want you to think about that number—42.2 million Americans out of a country of over 120 million, including one in five Louisianians, we have to do our part to ensure our program's integrity.

This is a natural fact. The Food Stamp Program is rife with fraud and criminal activity. Every year more than \$1.2 million of SNAP benefits are stolen or misused by criminals. So it is no wonder Congress has been discussing requiring photo identification at the point of sale for the Food Stamp Program since the 1970s.

As early as 1981, our GAO testified—and GAO, they are not politicians, not Republicans, and not Democrats. I don't mean this in a pejorative sense, but they are bean counters. GAO testified that such efforts would be effective in reducing overissuance, but we have not acted.

Reform is long overdue, and the time to act, it seems to me, is right now when we are considering the farm bill. If SNAP is going to be available to the people who depend on it most of the years to come, we have to do more to ensure that taxpayer dollars are going where taxpayers intended them to go.

That is why I have offered an amendment to the farm bill which will help protect our precious SNAP dollars by requiring a photo ID to use your benefits. It doesn't take anybody off the rolls, it just says you have to have a photo ID to use your benefits.

This amendment is very simple. It will require States to list on EBT cards the names of all of those who are eligible to use the EBT card. Household members listed on the card must then produce photo ID at point of sale when they use the EBT cards—about as simple as you can get.

Two States right now are already doing it and doing it successfully. One

State is Maine and one is Massachusetts. They both have successful SNAP benefit photo ID bills in law that are already saving thousands—indeed, probably millions—of taxpayer dollars. This should send a very clear message to every Governor and every legislature and every Congresswoman and every Congressman that food stamp reforms can work.

In the past few months, we had numerous SNAP benefit fraud cases that have been identified throughout our country. In Tennessee, for example, two men were found to have been selling their EBT cards to undercover cops in exchange for cash and heroin. In New Jersey, a couple managing a grocery store exchanged more than \$4 million in SNAP or food stamp benefits for cash between the years 2014 and 2017.

In Rochester, NY, a storeowner was found to have used cash to purchase food stamp benefits from beneficiaries for less than half their full value over a 5-year period. Now that is not what the American taxpayer intends the Food Stamp Program to do. That one individual's criminal actions cost taxpayers and people who really need food stamps \$1.2 million. That was only one act, and I could go on and on.

In the farm bill, we are asking the taxpayers to spend \$68 billion a year. We throw this figure "1 billion" around like it is a nickel. A billion dollars is a lot. If I started counting right now to a billion—1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10—it would take me 32 years to count to 1 billion. It would be 2050 when I finished. I wouldn't make it.

We are asking taxpayers not to spend \$1 billion a year, but \$68 billion of their money on the farm bill. We have an obligation, therefore, to keep an eye on that money and to make sure it is going to those who need it the most. The Federal Government and not a single one of us in this Congress should stand by and tolerate criminal stealing from the mouths of children. That is not a Democratic principle; that is not a Republican principle. That is a human principle.

We owe it to the American taxpayer and to every family who relies on food stamps to put food on the table to protect the program from those who would take advantage of our generous American spirit. It is in that spirit that I will be offering my amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Madam President, first, I want to acknowledge and thank Chairman PAT ROBERTS and Ranking Member DEBBIE STABENOW for their incredible hard work and commitment to draft such a strong bipartisan farm bill. We would not be here today if it weren't for their tenacity. I think, more importantly, we would not be here today if it weren't for their love of agriculture and their love of rural America. Knowing these are challenging times in rural America, the one

thing we can do here is to take this important policy and enact it into law so that we can give a 5-year window of certainty to American farmers and farmers in my State.

Over 90 percent of the land in North Dakota is engaged in the production of agriculture, whether it is farming or ranching. It is the bedrock of what we do in North Dakota. In fact, it is who we are.

In every given year, 30,000 farmers and ranchers lead the Nation in the production of over 10 different commodities. These agriculture products are sold in every State and exported to every corner of the globe. At a time when farm income is down and commodity prices have declined, it is so important that we, as members of the Senate, work together in a bipartisan way to provide our Nation's farmers and ranchers with a strong farm bill. With disruptions in trade weighing heavily on our agricultural producers, the single most important job right now is to provide certainty to farmers and ranchers by passing this farm bill and reauthorizing it beyond September 30, 2018.

In fact, it is important to note that net farm income since 2013 has been literally cut in half. When people say: Why do we need a farm bill? Why should we care? I would suggest that if we want food security in this country and if we want to make sure that we have farmers in this country, we need to care.

How many American families could really support or weather a 50-percent reduction in their income? When I first came to the Senate, I was fortunate enough to receive a committee assignment on the Senate Agricultural Committee, which for North Dakota is, quite honestly, the highest and most important committee assignment.

Passing a strong, bipartisan farm bill has been my highest priority since coming to the Senate. I helped to write, negotiate, and pass the 2014 farm bill, and as a member of the Ag Committee, I have been working with farmers and ranchers to make sure that the 2018 farm bill is as strong as possible for North Dakota.

Since 2014, when the farm bill was signed into law, I have heard from countless farmers and ranchers about what programs worked and what didn't work and how we can build a stronger rural America. While the 2014 farm bill addressed a number of key priorities needed to ensure an effective safety net for farmers and ranchers, there were challenges with aspects of the law. Understanding these concerns, I am pleased that members of the committee, the current administration, the chair, and ranking member have been willing partners in addressing these important challenges.

In particular, I am excited that this bipartisan farm bill includes language from our ARC-CO Improvement Act, a bill I introduced with Senator ERNST last October. It works to strengthen

and improve the Agricultural Risk Coverage-County Program. This language would direct the Farm Service Agency to use more widely available data from the Risk Management Agency as the first choice in calculating yields so that county level data is more accurate and updated. This would calculate safety net payments to reflect what is owed to producers in the physical county where their farms are located and not where their farmstead is.

This bill succeeds in protecting and improving the safety net that allows farmers and ranchers to weather the most difficult times and thrive during favorable conditions. This bill extends and makes improvements to the commodity programs passed in the 2014 farm bill and maintains the farm safety net that is crop insurance.

I do want to give a shout out to my colleague Senator ROBERTS. Every time there was testimony on the farm bill, he started with crop insurance, crop insurance, crop insurance; and that is a sentiment that is shared by almost every producer in my State.

From those provisions passed in 2014, this bill extends the livestock disaster programs, which played a valuable role in North Dakota last year as we experienced one of the worst droughts in our recent history.

Additionally, this farm bill includes a number of provisions that work to improve access for beginning farmers and ranchers. Included in the bipartisan bill is part of the Next Generation in Agriculture Act, which I introduced with my colleague Senator COLLINS. It provides baseline funding for the Beginning Farmer and Rancher Development Program, and it would codify positions at the USDA to coordinate beginning farmer and rancher programs and to provide youth organization outreach.

The average age of farmers in our State and across the country is way too old. If we are going to help to build that next generation of farmers, we are going to have to pay attention to those risks and respond to those risks in a way that will make a difference for our future production.

I am also excited that this legislation includes a number of provisions that work to raise the profile of Indian Tribes within the farm bill, and it includes a provision from the Tribal Food and Housing Security Act, which I introduced earlier this year. Specifically, the provision included from my bill would waive the majority, if not all, of the administrative costs required to run the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations, which Tribes use to provide healthy, affordable food options to low-income individuals and families. It also would establish a permanent Rural Development Tribal Technical Assistance Office at USDA to provide rural development support for Native American communities and to offer greater certainty for the current Tribal Promise Zone designees.

As we consider the farm bill, I wanted to make sure that Indian Country

had a seat at the table, which is why I introduced this legislation. Indian Country faces a unique set of challenges, many of which can be addressed in the farm bill. I think sometimes we forget that the fundamental occupation of many of the Tribal members in my State is farming and ranching. I think we also sometimes forget that they suffer not only historic challenges to economic development but, as we are experiencing in all of rural America, challenges in economic development that are not only from the reservation but also from being rural.

Checkoff programs are vitally important for our ag commodities, as they provide beneficial research, promotion, and education services to the producers they represent. It is critical that these programs function as intended in order to be preserved and protected from unnecessary scrutiny. The beef checkoff program has not, for some time, represented the majority view of beef producers and hasn't been functioning as intended. As such, I strongly encourage my colleagues to examine with a critical eye the Beef Promotion and Research Act of 1985 to ensure that the checkoff functions as a truly independent organization, representing the needs and viewpoints of the majority of our Nation's beef producers.

The farm bill also makes important investments in ag research and enhances trade. I strongly believe that we need to increase our investment in research. I am pleased to see a robust level of support for our land-grant universities, and the inclusion of the Pollinator Health Task Force and funding is maintained in this bill. But I agree that more should be done in order to enhance agriculture so we may continue to be competitive on the global stage.

With that said, we also have to improve market access and develop new export opportunities for our agricultural products. In North Dakota, we export soybeans to China, beans to Cuba, and barley to Mexico. And the list goes on. Building upon these successes will play a critical role in the improvement of the economic health of rural America.

During consideration of the farm bill, we must also work to protect programs that are vitally important to farmers in my State who provide and produce American-grown sugar. Last week, I had the opportunity to deliver to each Senator a simple Hershey's candy bar with a sticker labeling the cost of the sugar included. First, I am going to thank Curt Knutson, a sugar beet farmer in the Red River Valley, who took time to put these candy bars together for me. In fact, he said he saw a rainy day, and he quickly put the stickers on.

I think you will hear a lot about the sugar program. People have probably been down here telling you how it burdens the confectionary industry and how this will, in fact, increase their costs. I think it is absolutely critical

that you know that in this candy bar—not this big one, but a normal size one—there is only 2 cents' worth of sugar.

Did you know that in 1980, a candy bar like this cost 35 cents and had 2 pennies' worth of sugar in it? Today, this same candy bar costs \$1.49, but still contains just 2 cents of sugar.

Don't let anyone tell you that we have a crisis as it relates to the sugar program. The beet farmers and the sugar cane farmers guarantee a steady supply of sugar in this country, and we know that we need to maintain that industry in our State.

I would encourage everyone to keep that in mind as they are being asked to roll back the sugar policy in the farm bill. Each year, our sugar industry employs nearly 142,000 Americans in 22 States and generates over \$20 billion in economic activity. The policy that makes it all possible—listen to this—is at a zero cost to taxpayers. Given the economic importance of this industry to our Nation, it is critical that we maintain the sugar program to protect the many jobs in this industry and so that we can continue to enjoy American-grown sugar.

The chairman and ranking member really deserve incredible praise for the work they have done collaboratively, not just with members of our committee but, as you see in the back here, working with Members who aren't on the Ag Committee to listen to their response. This farm bill works to improve programs that were authorized by the 2014 farm bill and to provide much needed certainty to farmers and ranchers.

I want to make a general observation. When all of us go home, we are asked: Why can't you get anything done? Why can't you work together to solve America's problems? I think it would be a wonderful way to exit for the Fourth of July if we were allowed an opportunity to say in a bipartisan way, after a robust discussion about amendments: We passed a farm bill.

I know the Presiding Officer knows how important the farm bill is to her State of Mississippi. She comes with that as her top priority. Let's get this done. Let's work together. Let's try and overcome any hurdles that we have right now. Let's tell the American people that, when it comes to producing their food and having them access their food, this food bill is possible in a time of great division in this country.

I am proud to have been a member of the Ag Committee. I am proud to say I played a role in improving this farm bill. I look forward to not only passing it but seeing what comes out of the conference committee.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

MR. GARDNER. Thank you, Madam President.

I know the Presiding Officer is a cattle farmer, as I think they are referred to in Mississippi. It is an honor to be

here on the floor with you to talk about important work for Mississippi.

Colorado is an incredibly diverse State. When it comes to our economy, we are the—if you look at jobs per capita, we have more aerospace jobs per capita than any other State in the country. We have the second highest number of jobs outright, second only to California. Our tourism industry is world renowned—our first-class ski resorts, our gold medal trout fishing streams. It is incredible, all that we have. We are also one of the country's biggest agricultural producers. In fact, the ag economy in Colorado remains the fundamental foundational building block of our economy.

I grew up in a part of Colorado that looks more like Kansas. Most people think it is in Kansas instead of Colorado. This is my backyard. This is where I live. I live in town. This is a farm, a pivot irrigation system that I grew up with. In fact, our family sells farm equipment. I have told stories about that to everybody here—everybody who will listen—so many times that they have probably stopped listening. I grew up selling farm equipment.

I can remember, when I first ran for office, going around eastern Colorado and introducing myself to farmers. I would introduce myself. I would say: Hi, I am CORY GARDNER, and I am running for the State legislature. I have met most of you at the implement dealership. I have sold half of you the wrong parts. I quit using that line when everybody would shake their head—yes, you have. So I grew up knowing a lot of great people in agriculture through that business.

Water is the lifeblood of our area. Agriculture is the lifeblood of our area. There is an old saying that sometimes if there is a downturn in agriculture, then our community will feel it next week. Well, that is not true anymore. If we have a downturn in agriculture, our community feels it that day. That is how connected we are to global commodity prices and what it means for us.

I am fifth-generation Coloradoan. Our entire family has been all agriculture. It is the heart and soul of who we are as a country, and that is why this farm bill debate is so important.

In Colorado, we have tremendous crop opportunities, livestock opportunities. We have some of the best hay operations in America. In fact, several of our counties—Yuma County, which is the county I am from, over the years has been ranked and rated one of the top corn-producing counties in the Nation. We are a leading wheat exporter. Eighty-seven percent of the wheat that is produced in the 4th Congressional District—my old 4th Congressional District in Colorado—gets exported overseas.

The research we are doing out in eastern Colorado on dryland cropping systems is pretty remarkable—the Akron research station there.

The San Luis Valley is known nationally and around the world for our

high-quality San Luis Valley potatoes, purple potatoes that you can get from the San Luis Valley. We have sorghum and barley. A lot of people are familiar with our Banquet beer in Colorado. We have great beef. We have pintos and potatoes. We have it all. And, of course, who could forget our world-renowned Palisade peaches? It is that time of year now when we are starting to see peaches in the farmers markets and in the stands all around. I challenge anybody from South Carolina or Georgia to compare their peaches to our peaches because we know we have the best. We are coming up on the Peach Festival, as well, in the Western Slope of Colorado. We certainly have sugar beets.

We have an incredibly diverse economy. We have a diverse economy that represents a lot of export opportunities. Some of our best exports and some of our largest exports are beef. Frozen beef, fresh beef—you name it; we have a lot of beef. That is why trade is so critically important to our economy. We are going to get our ag economy growing.

By the way, ag is kind of facing a tough time right now. Farm receipts are down about 35 percent from what they were in 2013. If you look at some of the golden years of agriculture not too long ago, we are probably down even further than that. When commodity prices drop, when exports drop, these communities that I grew up in—these agricultural communities in the Western Slope of Colorado and in the Eastern Plains—they feel that impact not next week, not the week after, they feel it immediately. That is why trade is so important.

Let me give an example of this field right here. If you had an irrigated cornfield in Colorado—let's say that you had a good year. Let's say that you raised 225 bushels an acre of corn. Let's say that in May the price of corn was \$4.05. I looked it up yesterday, and it was about \$3.55. That 50-cent drop in commodity price on 160 acres—if you take 160 acres a quarter, if you look at the farmable land, the irrigated land, that is probably around 120, 140 acres, somewhere in between that. If you just raise that corn crop on 120 acres of land, 225 bushels an acre, and that price drops 50 cents per bushel, that is about a \$12,000 or \$13,000 impact—loss of income—per quarter.

The average farm size in Colorado is—let's say a corn farmer—let's just say they have 1,000 acres of corn, irrigated corn. If that price drops 50 cents, that is a \$100,000-plus loss of income. If we start seeing the impacts of a trade war that lowers the price of these commodities, we will see that impact not tomorrow but today. These low commodity prices have already affected the health of our rural communities. We don't need any more downward pressure.

Beef alone accounts for \$675 million worth of these exports. We should be pursuing free-trade opportunities. Col-

orado-grown potatoes account for over 50 percent of all U.S. potato exports to Mexico. NAFTA is incredibly important for this country, what we are doing with all of our agriculture products and how we are getting them to market.

We know rural development is key, and agriculture is key and trade is key to that rural development. So the farm bill represents a great opportunity for us to focus on rural development—what we can do to help start young farmers, help them get a start and help them afford the operation, because it is incredibly expensive. A quarter of irrigated ground in Colorado at one point was approaching \$1 million a quarter. A tractor could cost around \$250,000 if you had to buy a new one, a big one.

All of this means that we have an obligation to provide certainty in policy. That is what this debate is doing with the farm bill—providing our farmers, folks involved in agriculture, with the certainty they need to plan, to be able to go to the bank to talk about next year's operation loan, this year's operation loan, how they are going to get the receipts to allow them to continue that generational business of agriculture in Colorado and beyond.

We know economic times have also resulted in significant economic stress and significant mental stress. I am very pleased to have worked with a number of my colleagues to introduce the FARMERS FIRST Act earlier this year. This is a bill that helps address some of the mental health concerns we have seen in agriculture.

In agriculture, per 100,000 population—we have about 5 times the number of suicides in agriculture than the broader group of Americans—5 times higher suicide rate. This bill starts to address that.

In Colorado, Don Brown, our agriculture commissioner—I grew up with him. He is from the same town I am from. They have restarted the suicide hotline in Colorado to address the mental health needs because of the challenges we face in agriculture today. I thank Commissioner Brown for that work.

I thank my colleagues for the work we have been able to do together on the FARMERS FIRST Act to make sure we can help provide some of that relief.

In this farm bill, we have also made great strides on conservation. I was able to get the EQIP amendment included in the farm bill. That addresses agricultural drought concerns to make sure that the farm bill more adequately addresses the critically important conservation title work as it relates to drought.

I thank Senators FEINSTEIN, WYDEN, UDALL, MORAN, BENNET, and HARRIS for their support in allowing me to work with them on this amendment and to have it included in the substitute. If you look at the drought that is gripping the Western United States in particular, you have Arizona, 100 percent drought; California, 69 percent of the

land in a drought; Colorado, 79 percent of the State in a drought; Kansas, 79 percent in a drought; Oklahoma, 80 percent; Utah, 100 percent; North Dakota, 81 percent. These are areas that this EQIP language that was included will help address as we work toward solving this ongoing drought condition.

Water is the lifeblood of the West. Colorado is the only State in the country where all water flows out of it and none flows into it, so we have to make sure we get this right. As you can see, this is a picture of the Colorado River. That is an example of a bloodline of water that goes from Colorado down to California and all the States in between that rely on this river. As we see, as that water in the river decreases, it puts more pressure on the upstream States. If we ever have a problem in the river, that is going to be a significant challenge between the upper basin States and the lower basin States. That is why the tools that we have helped provide in the farm bill will help us manage this river, will help us manage the land, will help us address conservation needs to use less water so that we can keep more water in the systems, keep more water on the land, and prevent the dry-up of agriculture.

We were able to streamline EQIP contracting, increase cost share for nutrient reduction practices, and increase the authority of USDA to enter into drought-related Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program agreements. This will help areas like the Republican River in Colorado and beyond.

These are important inclusions in the farm bill. We have other things that should be highlighted, though, that will also address some of our water concerns.

We know that forest fires are a significant challenge to Colorado. If there is a massive forest fire, all those watersheds that those forests are in result in debris flows and contamination of those water systems, those waterways, and that hurts our ability to have access to that water.

In the omnibus that we passed earlier this year, we were able to include certain language addressing categorical exclusions, building upon insect and disease—efforts to combat them in certain areas of the forest. The challenge we have in Colorado is that the categorical exclusions only apply to fire regime groups 1, 2, and 3, but in Colorado, we have about 24 percent of our zones of concern in Colorado that are in a different category, not in 1, 2, or 3, which means we can't use the categorical exclusion to address insect and disease concerns under that provision. Yet we know a significant area of these forests have insects. This is where a lot of the insect infestation has occurred.

Insects have devastated our forests. It results in dead trees, and then the drought doubles the pressure on that, creating historic fire conditions, and then you end up imperiling the watersheds.

We have offered an amendment to try to address that, to extend the categorical exclusion so that we can have better management opportunities to prevent the next disaster from occurring and to make sure that we can help manage our forests in a more responsible way.

I am also excited that we were able to include work addressing the Akron research station in Akron, CO, in eastern Colorado, a dry land facility. We have an amendment that is incorporated in the substitute that authorizes research and extension grants to study the utilization of big data for more precise management of dryland farming agriculture systems. This goes into how much water we need and how we could better manage dryland cropping alternatives. If we have a drought that continues, we are going to have to have more tools and data to help manage farming practices so that we can do a better job of creating high yields in a low-moisture environment.

These are all important issues that we worked on.

Crop insurance is incredibly vital to our Main Streets in rural Colorado and across this country. That is why we have to continue to strengthen the Crop Insurance Program. That is why I am glad the farm bill makes sure that it does just that. The conservation title is important to Colorado as well.

There are a lot of issues this farm bills addresses. I thank Chairman ROBERTS for his work on this legislation. He is our neighbor in Kansas. I don't think he included a provision in the farm bill to thank Colorado for the water that we send to Kansas, but they have better lawyers than us, so I will not push that too far when it comes to some of the water conflicts that we have had. I say that jokingly, of course.

What I don't say jokingly, of course, though, is what agriculture means to all of us. It is that bond that we share in our communities. It is the foundation of Colorado's economy and this country's economy. There are so few people today in agriculture, that those of us who are involved in agriculture, who are in agricultural communities, have to be strong advocates. I hope the work this Senate is doing when it comes to agriculture will be that ambassadorial effort that we need to be good stewards of our land, to continue to promote small farms, new farmers, and young farmers to make sure that we keep generations of farmers and ranchers on the land and that we don't have a buy-out and dry-out history because we mismanaged our water resources.

This farm bill helps address some of our biggest challenges. Let's get our other policies like trade right, continue to work together in a bipartisan fashion, and we can make our farmers and ranchers proud of the work we do every day.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, I rise today on behalf of this Nation's farmers and ranchers. I would urge this body to continue in the bipartisan way that they have been on the farm bill to get this farm bill passed, keep in good shape the strong farm bill at this moment in time, and work to improve it and get it out of the body so that farmers can have the certainty they need with a predictable farm bill.

I believe I am the only actively engaged working farmer in this body. I have lived on the farm I live on for over 61 years. My wife and I have been farming the land that my grandfather and grandmother homesteaded, and my folks farmed after them, for the last 41 years. During that time, I have been able to see good farm bills that have worked, and I have seen bad farm bills—the kinds of farm bills that have resulted in devastating consequences for our family farms, driving families off the land, paving the way for more consolidation; bad farm bills that have dried up our rural areas and our small towns and along the way dried up our rural way of life.

This is an important time for folks in production and agriculture. The commodity prices are low pretty much across the board. We are seeing this administration engaging in tariffs and a potential trade war that is threatening Montana's No. 1 industry—agriculture—and threatening the viability of the economy of Montana and rural America. That is why it is critically important that this week we pass a good farm bill that will work and give certainty to Montana's producers and rural communities across this country.

In my travels around the State of Montana, I have had a number of listening sessions on the farm bill. I have heard from farmers and ranchers. I have visited with them, looked at them eyeball to eyeball, and heard their concerns and their priorities. During these farm bill listening sessions in Montana, I heard from grain growers, cattlemen, sugar beet producers, hops growers, wool growers, pulse growers, specialty crop producers, and organic farmers. We grow a lot of stuff in Montana. I even sat down with the folks who fight the good fight to make sure our kids don't go hungry. I sat down with fifth-generation Montana farmers and ranchers whose families have worked the land for over 100 years and young producers who are getting ready to go out for their very first harvest.

For the most part, they all said the same thing; that is, they want certainty. They want access to quality crop insurance that is a big part of the safety net for our farmers and ranchers. In times when they can't get their paycheck from the marketplace, this safety net is critically important. They also want to be in a position financially where they can hand their farm—or their ranch or their operation—down to their kids and their

grandkids, but don't just take my word for it.

Since my last farm bill listening session, literally hundreds of Montana's farmers and ranchers have written in to my office to make sure their voice is heard on the farm bill.

Tom, from Glasgow, MT, wrote to me about the challenges facing farmers and ranchers. He said:

I urge you to support the Farm Bill before it expires on September 30. The legislation that came out of the Senate Agriculture Committee has a robust farm safety net, including a strong Crop Insurance Program. Our farmers face a challenging agriculture economy. They need the certainty of knowing what programs are available as they make their plans for the coming years.

That is critically important. Everybody who is in agriculture knows that you have to plan multiple years out before you can get to a point where you can harvest that crop and bring it to the bin and bring it to market. So having that kind of certainty of a long-term farm bill and getting one done long before September 30 is critically important.

Another fellow by the name of Frank, from Lewistown, MT, wrote me about the important role the farm bill plays in feeding this country—the United States. Here is what Frank said:

The farm bill can help put the United States on track to ending food insecurity and hunger in our country. I urge you to work on a bipartisan farm bill that protects and strengthens domestic nutrition programs, especially SNAP.

We have a democracy in this country, and we are very proud of it, but as we offer that safety net for our folks in production agriculture, we need to make sure we don't have hunger in this country, to the best of our ability, because democracies don't work well when you have a hungry society.

So I am on the Senate floor to tell Tom and Frank and the hundreds of other Montana farmers and ranchers who have contacted me that their voices have been heard and that their priorities are reflected in this Senate farm bill.

This bill reauthorizes critical crop insurance initiatives that keep farmers in business. It rejects the House attempt to combine and cut funding for successful conservation practices. It amends EQIP to allow dollars to flow to producers that focus on research conservation and drought resiliency. It strengthens our fight against foot-and-mouth-disease. It keeps in place important sugar provisions which have a multidecade track record of success, especially in the sugar beet country of Southeast and Eastern Montana. It reauthorizes funding for agricultural research and, as we know, for every dollar invested in agriculture research, we see major returns to our economy. It gives the green light to industrial hemp growers. Industrial hemp is a crop that can fit in most rotations around this country, and Montana is no exception, and it reauthorizes funding

for critical USDA rural development grants, which help fund water and wastewater infrastructure, and it helps build rural communities.

Although the House chose to make political hay out of the farm bill, I commend the folks in the Senate because we got to work and, through the Senate Ag Committee, we put together a bill that farmers and ranchers can literally take to the bank. We did so while protecting the provisions that feed hungry families and protect seniors.

Now is the time to get this bill across the finish line. Through the amendment process this week, we have the opportunity to make this farm bill an even better bill.

We have already attached a bipartisan amendment to this bill that strengthens the safety net by ensuring that ARC-county payments probably reflect yields. We are giving more authority to the State and local FSA committees to identify ARC boundaries that reflect the conditions and the crops being raised in that region.

I want to thank the Montana Grain Growers for their support of this amendment, as well as the Montana Farmers Union for their input.

It is my hope that folks continue to check their politics at the door and do what is right for Montana's family farms—the folks who are making a living off the land—by passing a good farm bill this week.

Farmers and ranchers are always talking about the future. They are always thinking about the future, whether it is the future of commodity prices or market access or costs, yields, or, yes, the weather. They are constantly thinking about the future of their operation—how they can implement new practices that will make their operation more financially viable to pass on to their children. So let's get the job done this week and pass a good farm bill that gives our producers in this Nation and my producers in Montana the kind of long-term certainty they deserve and gives them the keys to building an even stronger family farm unit.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

CALLING FOR THE RELEASE OF PASTOR ANDREW BRUNSON

Mr. TILLIS. Madam President, I am doing something this week I wish I didn't have to do. As a matter of fact, for the past several weeks I wish I didn't have to do this, but I have to draw attention to something that is very important to me and should be important to everybody in the United States and every person on Capitol Hill. It is about a man who has been held in prison in Turkey for 628 days, most of that time without charges, in a cell that was designed for 8 people that had 21 people in it. This man's name is Pastor Brunson. He is a Presbyterian minister who has spent most of the last

20 years doing missionary work in Turkey, sometimes going into Syria, visiting Syrian refugee camps in Turkey, living in and around the Izmir area.

In October of 2016, after the coup attempt, President Erdogan started sweeping up thousands of people, including people who were doing nothing but trying to bring the Word to those who wanted to hear it—in this case, in the country of Turkey. He was actually accused of being a part of plotting the coup attempt. He subsequently has been accused of plotting terrorist activities against the people and the Government of Turkey.

We have been working on this case for well over a year. We treated it like constituent work. We were doing everything we were supposed to do, working with the State Department, working with the various agencies, reaching out to the country team to ask: Why can't we get this pastor free? Why is he being held without charges? How could a Presbyterian missionary—how could he possibly be considered a terrorist or a coup plotter?

About 4 months ago, I was in a meeting, and I overheard—this is about the time he was indicted, about 17 months of being held without charges. I heard he was afraid that after the indictment was released, the American people would believe the indictment and just turn their backs on him and forget him.

So it was important for me to go to Turkey. I requested a visa to get to Turkey. I went to the Turkish prison, and I told Pastor Brunson that is the last thing that is going to happen. I told him he had my personal commitment and that I knew I had the backing of the majority of the Members of the Senate and almost 200 Members of the House now who believe Pastor Brunson needs to be set free. It was important to tell him that face-to-face.

About a month later, I went to his first court hearing. It was absurd. I spent about 12 hours in a Turkish courtroom hearing some of the most extraordinary—almost comedic—allegations against Pastor Brunson. Every week I vary the presentation of the allegations because there are so many you can't cover them in any one reasonable length of floor speech. So this week's absurd allegation is this notion that the Turkish prosecutors believe all the Christian religions in the United States are actually somehow woven together as some sort of intelligence-gathering, coup-plotting, terrorist-plotting network throughout the world to collect information and use it to the detriment of a sovereign nation like Turkey. That is the sort of—so he is an operative. He is a man who actually comes from Black Mountain, who is affiliated with the same church as Rev. Billy Graham, and has been, for 20 years, plotting the overthrow of the Turkish Government.

Now, keep in mind, it is only a concept. He hasn't been charged with any specific activity. There is no witness

attesting to some specific thing that he did, but because he is a Christian, because he is a missionary, and because he has been in Turkey for 20 years, he has to be a part of this organization. Therefore, we are going to put him in prison for 628 days. That is what we are dealing with.

Now, when we started down this path, I spoke with a lot of Turkish officials. What I heard from them is, well, justice has to take its course. We have an independent judiciary; justice has to take its course. Then, not too long ago, President Erdogan, who was just recently reelected President for, I believe, another 5-year term, had the audacity to say: "We will give you your pastor if you give us our pastor."

Well, it turns out there is someone here in the United States who was previously an ally of President Erdogan. They had a falling out, and he is a part of a movement that wants to see change in Turkey. He is a man of faith—a man of Muslim faith.

The President transformed what I believe started out being a situation of let's just let the independent judiciary take its course—they transformed what was an illegal detainment, lengthy detainment of a Presbyterian pastor into what I believe is a hostage swap.

The President said this. If the President could actually make this offer, then, clearly, he is not constrained by a judiciary outcome like we are in the United States.

So the day President Erdogan said this, that was the day we could clearly say Pastor Brunson is being held as a political hostage, and the President—President Erdogan—has the power to end it.

I do this speech every week, and I will do it every week for as long as Pastor Brunson is in prison. Every once in a while my mother or my wife will see a videotape of this speech, and they always say: Why do you act like you get so angry toward the end of it? Because I am. I am angry for a lot of reasons. One of them is that they are a NATO ally.

Since 1952, Turkey has been a member of the NATO Alliance. At the most profound level, that means that if Turkey is attacked by another Nation and their safety, security, and freedom is at risk, then the United States has an obligation to submit our men and women in uniform to the country of Turkey to potentially lay down and die in defense of their freedom. That is what we call a partnership. Now, for the first time in the history of NATO alliance, they are holding an American hostage.

So, on the one hand, in the Armed Services Committee where we spend a lot of time focusing on our alliances, a lot of time training with various countries—and Turkey is one I would like to have a great relationship with—but they are holding a North Carolinian hostage. They are subjecting him to a kangaroo court, and they think it is

OK. For the first time in the history of an alliance, for a NATO alliance partner to behave this way is unacceptable.

So we have taken all the steps we could diplomatically, and it hasn't worked to this point. Now we have to take additional steps, and one of those steps is to put a provision in the national defense authorization bill that asks certain questions about the long-term nature of our relationship with Turkey. Turkey is a very important ally in the Middle East. I hope that someday I come down to the floor gushing over all the great relationships we have. We have many. Their work in Afghanistan is important. Their work and fighting in Syria is important. But what is more important than anything is the freedom of a man who is held in prison and respect for a fellow NATO ally.

So we have put a provision in the National Defense Authorization Act that asks certain questions, like, does Turkey have somebody illegally detained, yes or no? And our President can certify one way or the other. Does the fact that Turkey is considering the acquisition of the S-400 missile system from Russia, which comes with it a lot of intelligence gathering and other tools that could put the safety and security of the Air Force base that we have in Turkey and the manufacturing operations for the Joint Strike Fighter in Turkey at risk—certify one way or the other.

Incidentally, because we rely on Turkey for the supply chain for the Joint Strike Fighter and if that supply chain were to shut down, if Turkey continued to drift further away as a NATO ally—does it make sense to have the entire manufacturing supply chain of the Joint Strike Fighter dependent on a country that is drifting away from the nations that are members of NATO?

Those are simple provisions. We are asking the President of the United States to certify one way or the other. If he can't certify it, then we have to really start questioning just how much further we can go with a country that is holding an American citizen, with a country that is considering a would-be adversary's missile defense system, and with a country that is a critical link in the supply chain for the Joint Strike Fighter.

We will be going into conference fairly soon on the national defense authorization. I am asking all of my colleagues—the 70 who signed on to a letter expressing their concern with the detainment of Pastor Brunson—to stick with us to make sure that provision makes it out of conference and that we hold Turkey accountable.

It is within President Erdogan's power to end this now. I would love to come back to the floor next week and not be talking about the illegal detainment but talking about a freed man and an improving relationship with Turkey.

My last message is to the Turkish people. This is not about the Turkish

people. They are wonderful people. I have traveled to Turkey several times in various official capacities. They are wonderful people who love freedom and want freedom just like we have in the United States. This is about an administration that needs to understand what it means to be a NATO ally. It is about an administration that needs to understand what a real, independent judiciary looks like. It is about an administration that needs to be put on notice until they take the positive step in that direction.

Madam President, thank you very much. I hope I don't have to come to the floor next week when you are presiding and present this same speech, but I promise you, as long as I am a Senator and Pastor Brunson is in prison, I will be back.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, this week we are considering the bipartisan farm bill. The Senator from Mississippi who was just presiding, the Presiding Officer, and I were all raised on farms, so we have an immediate sense that this must be pretty important because of where we grew up and how we grew up. But I think people have less and less connection with what it really takes to grow the food and fiber we need in this country. The farm bill doesn't have quite the same resonance it used to have in terms of millions and millions and millions of families watching carefully to see what the Congress is going to do. In fact, the families who watch this most closely today may very well be the families who benefit from the nutrition parts of the farm bill. The vast majority of spending is in the nutrition parts of the farm bill. The truth is that if you don't have what people need to sustain themselves, nutrition policy really doesn't matter unless what we do in agriculture works. So a lot of the debate here is about that.

In my State of Missouri, we have nearly 100,000 farms. The vast majority of those are family-owned and cover two-thirds of the total land of our State. The industry supports 400,000 jobs in a State of 6 million people, so it has a substantial impact on what we do. The Mississippi Valley, where the Presiding Officer and I are located, is the biggest piece of contiguous agricultural ground in the world, and we are in the middle of that.

In terms of production in the United States, Missouri ranks second in the number of beef cows; fourth in rice; fifth in turkeys; sixth in soybeans; seventh in hogs; ninth in corn; and tenth in cotton. So there are a number of places in the farm bill that impact us, and those crops and others that we might not rank quite so high in are still an important part of our economy.

World food demand is expected to double in the next 30 years or so. That is an easy thing to say and an easy thing to hear, but it is sort of a hard thing to think about. With all the time

in which people have been trying to develop better and better agriculture—we think it took about 10,000 years to raise all the food we raise today—we have about 30 years to figure out how to raise twice as much food as we raise today, and we are likely to need to do that on no more land than we are doing it on now and with fewer inputs. We will need to do that in a way that probably uses not just less water per amount of food grown, but less water totally—not just less fertilizer per crop, but less fertilizer totally. So we will need a lot of science-based work to figure out how we meet this incredible opportunity and challenge of doubling all the food we grow.

I saw some FFA students under a big shade tree looking back at the Capitol on two different days last week. Both times I said: I really can't think of any group I can talk to where I could say with such certainty that no matter what you do, understand that agriculture in the next 30 years as a part of our economy is going to be twice as big the day you retire from whatever you decide to do as it was the day you started. It would take a cataclysmic event for that not to be true.

I said just a minute ago that world food demand will double in about 30 years. We think world food needs will double in 40 years. What is the difference? In 40 years, we will have to have that much food to feed all the people there are to feed. We think that in 30 years it will have to double to meet people's demands for the kinds of food they want to buy. No matter what, in 40 years, twice as much food as we have today will be needed.

This farm bill gives us the chance to advance the kinds of policies that allow us to meet that challenge. It is a bipartisan bill. Chairman ROBERTS and Senator STABENOW, the top Democrat on the committee, have worked hard to produce this bill. Like all pieces of bipartisan legislation, it is not the bill either of them would have written on their own, but it is a bill that can and should pass.

It makes difficult decisions on how to balance priorities and maintain budget discipline at the same time. It is logically connected with helping those who grow our food—the people who determine whether we have an affordable and dependable supply of food, fuel, and fiber. All of that is at stake in this legislation.

The farm bill we are considering provides certainty for farmers. Like the farm bill we did 5 years ago, it takes a different course. It stays where we were. This is more evolutionary than a big revolutionary change. Five years ago, we went much more toward risk management, where the Federal Government basically helped put an insurance kind of component together to insure against the many things that happen in the life of a farm family and in the life of growing food. You don't control the weather. You don't control the prices. You don't control much of any-

thing. You just hope that everything works out and allows you to continue to do something that in the case of almost all farm families in America, they love to do and that is why they do it.

The bill makes forward-looking investments to help new and beginning farmers. The average age of farmers in America today is almost 60. That means half the farmers are over 60, and half the farmers are under 60. Obviously, we have to be concerned. We are concerned about pilots and say: Gee, we are running out of pilots because military-trained pilots are not going to be available to us. We are also about to run out of farmers.

If half the farmers in the country today are over 60, we need to be looking for ways to allow beginning farmers to farm and to meet the needs as well as the opportunities of a growing world where, with fewer resources and the same amount of land, as I said before, we are going to have this great opportunity.

Nobody in the world is better at this than we are, and nobody in the world is better positioned than we are to get ag products all over the world. This is a huge opportunity for our country. In my State—the one I know more about than any other State—we are home to world-class animal and plant scientists. There are more plant scientists within 100 miles of St. Louis, MO, than there are anywhere else in the world in the same amount of space. The farm bill will continue to allow those things to move forward and, again, try to do more with less and produce a better quality product with less input. As farmers deal with the unpredictability of the weather and the market, this is designed to help provide stability as that market grows.

To go back to where I was a minute ago, I believe the biggest economic transactional group in America on any given day—people buying food, fuel, and fiber—relates to agriculture. That is going to double in less than one working lifetime. That is almost never going to work out exactly right. The weather will not be right; the world crops will not be what we thought they were going to be. We want to be sure people don't give up on this opportunity because it is also such a big challenge.

How do you communicate in a world environment with this kind of challenge? The bill also makes investments in rural America to expand high-speed broadband and improve rural infrastructure, something the President, in every discussion I have heard on infrastructure, talks about 25 percent of this needing to go to rural infrastructure. But part of that infrastructure is wireless technology and wireless infrastructure.

If you are going to have precision farming, if you are going to not put more cost into parts of your field than you should, you and your equipment need to know exactly where you are—

I mean precisely where you are. You can't do that if you are not connected to broadband in some way. The GPS systems, the data centers, the automation systems just don't work without that. If you don't have high-speed internet, you don't have high-speed commodity trading capacity. So while somebody maybe 10 miles down the road from you has instantaneous ability to take advantage of a market to buy or sell, yours may be just slow enough that you miss the moment.

So the ability to live in rural America, to thrive in rural America, and to farm as you are going to need to farm for the world we are about to get into is really important. This farm bill isn't just about economic security, although that is a big part of it. It is also about what it takes daily to sustain yourself and those you care about.

As I said, the nutrition programs are now a significant majority of farm bill spending. We are going to debate how some of that money should be spent. But we are entering a time of great opportunity—a time where Americans, particularly in the middle of the country, are really good when you have an economy that is production-oriented, based on growing things and making things, and that growing-things economy is a lot bigger than just production agriculture. It is production agriculture; it is food processing; it is insuring what happens on the farm; it is transportation. We are one incident away from identifying where all that food has been all the time.

I am glad we are getting to the farm bill as quickly as we are. I hope we can pass our bill, come to conference with the House, and put a bill on the President's desk as soon as possible, so with all of the other things that farmers and their families have to deal with, the one thing they will know with some certainty is what the Federal farm bill and what Federal nutrition programs are going to look like over the next handful of years.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RETIREMENT OF JUSTICE ANTHONY KENNEDY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, just a few moments ago, Justice Anthony Kennedy announced that he is retiring as an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court and taking senior status, effective July 31.

First and foremost, I want to pause and express our gratitude for the extraordinary service that Justice Kennedy has offered our Nation. He has served on the Federal bench for 43 years.

In particular, we owe him a debt of thanks for his ardent defense of the

First Amendment right to political speech. As Justice Kennedy concludes his tenure on the Court, we wish him, his wife, Mary, and their family every happiness in the years ahead.

The Senate stands ready to fulfill its constitutional role by offering advice and consent on President Trump's nominee to fill this vacancy. We will vote to confirm Justice Kennedy's successor this fall. As in the case of Justice Gorsuch, Senators will have the opportunity to meet with President Trump's nominee, examine his or her qualifications, and debate the nomination.

I have every confidence in Chairman GRASSLEY's conduct of the upcoming confirmation process in the Judiciary Committee. It is imperative that the President's nominee be considered fairly and not be subjected to personal attacks.

Thus far, President Trump's judicial nominations have reflected a keen understanding of the vital role that judges play in our constitutional order. Judges must interpret the law fairly and apply it evenhandedly. Judicial decisions must not flow from judges' personal philosophies or preferences but from the honest assessment of the words and actual meaning of the law. This bedrock principle has clearly defined the President's excellent choices to date, and we will look forward to yet another outstanding selection.

But, today, the Senate and the Nation thank Justice Kennedy for his years of service on the bench and for his many contributions to jurisprudence and to our Nation.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, we recently received news that Justice Anthony Kennedy will be retiring, leaving a vacancy on the Nation's highest Court. This is the most important Supreme Court vacancy for this country in at least a generation. Nothing less than the fate of our healthcare system, reproductive rights for women, and countless other protections for middle-class Americans are at stake.

Will Republicans and President Trump nominate and vote for someone who will preserve protections for people with preexisting conditions, or will they support a Justice who will put health insurance companies over patients or put the Federal Government between a woman and her doctor?

The Senate should reject, on a bipartisan basis, any Justice who would overturn *Roe v. Wade* or undermine key healthcare protections. The Senate should reject anyone who will instinctively side with powerful special inter-

ests over the interests of average Americans.

Our Republican colleagues in the Senate should follow the rule they set in 2016 not to consider a Supreme Court Justice in an election year. Senator MCCONNELL would tell anyone who listened that the Senate had the right to advise and consent, and that was every bit as important as the President's right to nominate.

Millions of people are just months away from determining the Senators who should vote to confirm or reject the President's nominee, and their voices deserve to be heard now as Leader MCCONNELL thought they deserved to be heard then. Anything but that would be the absolute height of hypocrisy.

People from all across America should realize that their rights and opportunities are threatened. Americans should make their voices heard loudly, clearly, and consistently. Americans should make it clear that they will not tolerate a nominee, chosen from President Trump's preordained list and selected by powerful special interests, who will reverse the progress we have made over the decades.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, I am here to talk about the bipartisan, commonsense farm bill that we are working on in the Senate this week.

Agriculture is an essential part of the fabric that defines my home State of Indiana. Hoosier farmers are growing the food that feeds our families. Biofuel producers are making the ethanol and biodiesel that drive our economy. Ag students and researchers are developing the technologies of tomorrow. Together, they represent the best of Hoosier values.

Right now, Hoosier farmers in our communities are navigating significant challenges. They need us to work together to help provide solutions. Our farmers are dealing with turmoil on the international marketplace, uncertainty in Federal policies, like the RFS, and low commodity prices that, in many cases, are below the cost of production. This farm bill can provide our ag community with some stability, and we need to ensure that we do our part to get it across the finish line.

Here is how Indiana Farm Bureau president Randy Kron described the situation:

Farmers are relying on the Senate to pass a farm bill that will allow them to plan for their operations with some level of certainty for the next five years and provide a safety net in case extreme weather or a natural disaster damages their crops. Indiana's farmers are facing a lot of uncertainties right now.

The dairy industry is facing low prices and lost contracts, there are fears over potential retaliatory tariffs and their impacts, there is a grain surplus that has brought commodity prices down drastically as well as the uncertainty of the Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS).

Net farm income is down more than 50% compared to just five years ago, and the ag-

riculture community is depending on the passage of this farm bill.

If our nation's farmers have the programs and assurances they need, all U.S. citizens will reap the benefit of quality, affordable food in our grocery stores.

Phil Ramsey, a corn and soybean farmer from Shelbyville, IN, and the chairman of membership and policy for the Indiana Soybean Alliance, described the challenges farmers are facing by saying:

After a spring that has challenged our farms from nearly every angle, Hoosiers and rural Americans need a Farm Bill now more than ever. With farm income down . . . input costs skyrocketing, the ethanol industry constantly under attack, and disrupted trade relations sharply driving down prices, the stability and safety net provided by the Farm Bill are critical to our farmers and ranchers across the nation.

Randy and Phil are right. Now, more than ever, farmers need us to do our job, to put together a farm bill that makes sense and gives them the opportunity to succeed.

A farm bill that gives us the best opportunities to be successful will help farmers manage the risks outside of their control, but it is about much more than that. It is also about helping rural communities thrive and also about fighting food insecurity. It is about investing in tomorrow's farms and the most advanced technologies. It is about ensuring that Hoosiers have the resources and the tools to develop new markets for their products anywhere in the world. It is about promoting conversation so that farms and natural habitats remain healthy, generation after generation, and doing the conservation work to make that possible.

Because there is more wisdom in Indiana than in Washington, DC, I firmly believe a good farm bill is one that is written with input directly from Hoosiers and that addresses issues important to our State. From Wayne County to Evansville to Washington, IN, to DeKalb County, to Jasper County, to Rensselaer, across our State there are great ideas, great leadership, and great entrepreneurial skills that can help us build the best farm bill possible. That is why I took every opportunity to listen to the priorities and concerns of Hoosiers who are involved in nearly every segment of our State's agriculture community during my farm bill listening tour and in meetings over the past year-plus. From student groups and researchers to anti-hunger advocates, to soybean and corn growers, to pork and dairy farmers, and to just about everyone in between, I wanted to hear from all of them about what this farm bill should do.

I am not hired help for the people of Indiana. I work for all of our citizens. I took what I heard from Hoosiers, and I worked with my colleagues to develop this bill, to work this bill, and to successfully secure provisions that would include risk management tools for our farmers, while still ensuring full planting flexibility; to expand market opportunities for Hoosiers products; to

promote impactful, voluntary conservation activities; to help fight the opioid epidemic, which is a scourge on our State and our country; to support rural communities with investments in high-speed internet and waste and drinking-water infrastructure; to fight against food insecurity; and to invest in the research necessary for tomorrow's technologies.

I would like to highlight a few of the Hoosiers priorities in this bill. One of my top priorities was helping to fight the opioid epidemic in rural communities. We know it will take all of us, working together, to confront this opioid epidemic—this horrible nightmare that we have. We have more work to do to stem the tide of this public health crisis in our rural communities.

I am pleased this bill includes three of my bipartisan provisions that combat the opioid epidemic by targeting telemedicine and community facility investments for substance abuse treatment as well as by investing in prevention and education programs. We want all of our families to be safe. We want all of our citizens across this country to avoid this scourge. We lost over 60,000 of our fellow brothers and sisters across this country to drug abuse last year. We do not want to lose one more, and we want this farm bill to help end this.

These provisions I have discussed were developed from my bipartisan rural opioids package I introduced with my friend, Chairman PAT ROBERTS, then-Senator Strange, and with Senator JOHN HOEVEN from North Dakota in 2017. I thank all of them for partnering with me on these efforts.

I have also advocated for efforts to ensure that farmers are provided the tools they need to be good stewards for our environment, to hand off to our children and grandchildren, and an even safer, better, stronger planet.

This bill will eliminate potential disincentives for voluntary conservation practices like cover crops and supports soil health improvement programs.

It also allows States to increase cost sharing for the most impactful conservation practices. Soil health and clean water are a passion for many Hoosiers, and for many Hoosier farmers, and this bill helps in those efforts. The need to expand market opportunities has also come up in my conversations with our farmers. I am fully committed to expanding market opportunities for our ag products.

This farm bill will increase opportunities for Hoosier farmers through export promotion programs. I worked with my colleagues on proposals to open up more markets for American exports, including my bipartisan bill that increases investments in two important export promotion programs: the Foreign Market Development Program and the Market Assistance Program. This is legislation I introduced in September of 2017 with my friends and Senators JONI ERNST of Iowa, ANGUS KING of Maine, and SUSAN COLLINS of Maine.

I have also worked to ensure full planting flexibility for our farmers who want to plant fruits and vegetables. This ensures that farmers can diversify their farms without worrying about losing access to commodity support programs in the future. It may sound a little bit technical, but it is critically important, and we have to make sure it gets done.

Ensuring planting flexibility is a strong passion of mine. It builds on the bipartisan bill I introduced with Senator TODD YOUNG, my colleague from our home State, in December of 2017, and it also builds on my work in the 2014 and the 2008 farm bill.

Another important issue I care deeply about is helping those struggling with food insecurity. I am really proud that this bipartisan bill strengthens the oversight of the SNAP program and helps to fight food insecurity by reforming food assistance programs while protecting access to benefits and maintaining the integrity of the programs. It makes it easier for seniors to access food assistance by reducing burdensome paperwork. This is based on legislation I worked on with my friend BOB CASEY from Pennsylvania.

Providing for the future of agriculture by making the investments in vital research and extension activities is another priority. This bill contains a provision of mine that reauthorizes and revamps the New Era Rural Technology Program to help our community colleges fund efforts to develop a workforce trained in the precision agriculture technologies that are expected to continue to improve the efficiency of modern farming.

I have a few more amendments I am hoping we can get adopted this week, including one that increases funding for the Emergency Food Assistance Program. This helps food banks and pantries respond to the needs of their local communities.

I have also introduced a bipartisan amendment with Senators SMITH and FISCHER. It allows community colleges serving rural areas to receive funding through USDA's Essential Community Facilities Program. This helps ensure rural communities have the local educational opportunities that can help our children thrive, that can help our friends and neighbors thrive, and that can help create success in every county in my State and across our country.

Finally, I thank all of my colleagues on the Senate Agriculture Committee for their efforts to ensure that we had strong bipartisan support for getting the farm bill to this point. Everybody worked incredibly hard; everybody focused on doing what was right for America and not worrying about politics; and everybody focused on how we can help our ag community be stronger, have more success, and do even better in the future.

Our farmers need us to continue working together as advocates for agriculture and for a farm bill that supports their hard work.

The ag community gets up in the dark, works all day, and goes home in the dark. They are an incredible example for everybody in our country about dedication to family and faith and community and country.

I know the farmers of Indiana and in Hoosier rural communities are tired of being pawns to partisan politics. They have been dealing with depressed commodity prices, chaotic trade markets, and the uncertainty of Federal policies, whether it was the previous administration's expansion of the WOTUS rule or this administration's efforts to undermine the RFS.

It is time for us to do our part to make sure this is a strong bipartisan bill and that it is an example of us working together—not as Democrats or as Republicans but as Americans—to do good things for our economy and for our people.

I urge the Senate to promptly pass this bill so we can conference with the House and get this to the President's desk as quickly as possible. Farmers and rural communities in Indiana and across our country are counting on us. It is an incredible privilege to represent our ag community on the Agriculture Committee and to work with the farm bill to make the lives of everybody in our farming communities better, stronger, and even more successful.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to call up the following amendments to the substitute amendment No. 3224: the amendment by Senator LEE, No. 3074, and the amendment by Senator DURBIN, No. 3103.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, in this farm bill, when it was considered in committee, there was an amendment added that allows for American agricultural interests to promote American agriculture on the enslaved island of Cuba.

In an effort to be accommodating, I have said: Well, that is fine. It is not a very large market, and, frankly, as long as we are not lending them money—because they are never going to pay us back—I am not going to object to the ability of American farmers to market our products to a market. In the end, it is food.

What I do think we should not allow, however, is the ability to spend American taxpayer money in properties and in other places on the island that are owned and controlled by the Cuban

military. Last year, President Trump issued an Executive order that prohibited American citizens who traveled to Cuba from staying at hotels or frequenting businesses or anything of this nature that is controlled by GAESA, which is a holding company controlled by the Cuban military.

So what I have proposed as a way forward on this is to basically say: That is fine. You can promote American agriculture in Cuba. But while you are there and doing your activities, you can promote it, but you just can't spend any of these taxpayer dollars at any of the facilities or businesses controlled or owned by the Cuban military. The list is detailed and provided by the State Department via Executive order.

That is the amendment I offered. To date, we have not been able to get it considered as part of any of these vehicles that are moving. Therefore, procedurally, I am wanting to protect my right to ensure this gets included in something that is incredibly important from my perspective, so I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I want to indicate I certainly understand the concerns of the Senator from Florida, and we have been looking for the last 2 days to find a resolution. There are multiple interests on various sides of this issue on Cuba that we are trying to work through so that we can move forward on this as well as other amendments.

As the chairman has indicated, there are two amendments we are trying to get pending so that we can move forward and take the next steps to be able to come to a resolution and get to a final vote on the farm bill, which our farmers, ranchers, and families in rural communities are very anxious to have us do.

We will continue to work, as we have all day and as we did yesterday, looking for ways to resolve this and to be able to move forward. Hopefully, we can do that because there are a lot of folks really counting on us to come together and get this done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I would only add at this point—and I think Members who have paid attention to this debate at all or to this particular issue are probably a little tired of hearing this, but maybe there are some who haven't really grasped the issue. We have to get a farm bill.

We are the Agriculture Committee. Agriculture is in dire need of this farm bill—the farmers, the ranchers, the growers, their lenders, and everybody up the food chain. Our situation being what it is, I certainly hope that improves.

Many people, of course, are interested in opening up any bill to amendments, having regular order, and voting on their amendments. I understand

that. I think there are about 146 amendments we have agreed to. We are reaching out to people and urging them to come forward and, on a bipartisan basis, agree on these amendments or modify them and then agree to them. So it isn't as if we have not done that.

At some point, we have to pass this bill. The issue is so paramount and the situation is so dire—on behalf of the folks who produce the food and fiber for this country in a troubled and hungry world to at least go on for another year—that it is paramount over any other issue, despite the fact that some people want to come in under a reform they believe would be very salutary, and I understand that. Again, we have to pass this bill.

With that observation, I hope people can understand and we can get some agreement with regard to some of these issues. None of my remarks are intended to impugn in any way the interest of the distinguished Senator from Florida.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

WOMEN'S HEALTHCARE

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, 2 years ago, the Supreme Court handed down its decision in *Whole Women's Health v. Hellerstedt*, which reaffirmed the longstanding view that the government should not be in the business of deciding what kind of healthcare a woman in America can or cannot receive. A number of my colleagues are going to be coming to the floor to discuss this issue. It was a crucial victory. My colleagues who have been so involved in this issue over the years—Senator MURRAY and Senator BLUMENTHAL—and I as the ranking Democrat on the Finance Committee have tried to do everything we possibly could because our committee has extensive jurisdiction over women's healthcare in a variety of programs that are crucial for women. It is in that context that I want to reflect on what has happened since the Supreme Court handed down that crucial victory, that important win for women's healthcare as embodied in *Whole Women's Health v. Hellerstedt*.

At every turn since the President went to the White House, the President's administration has put themselves in between American women and their doctors. The President has sought to prevent healthcare providers from sharing critical care information. The President has sought to place restrictions on health clinics that women rely on every single day for lifesaving services, such as cancer screenings, physicals, prenatal care, and more. He has again and again sought to place restrictions on and attempted to defund health clinics, such as Planned Parenthood, that women in America rely on every single day for lifesaving services, such as cancer screenings, physicals, prenatal care, and more.

I hope colleagues will look at the words that I used to describe those life-

saving services—lifesaving services that have absolutely nothing to do with abortion—nothing—cancer screenings, physicals, prenatal care, and more. That is what the President sought to place restrictions on and attempted to defund in terms of health clinics that offer those services.

The latest blow to the cause of making sure women can go to the healthcare providers of their choosing came yesterday from the Supreme Court. Yesterday, the Court in effect opened the door for deceptive crisis pregnancy centers that are allowed to lie to women about what kind of care they are able to receive.

All of these developments demonstrate that the effort for affordable, accessible healthcare is far from done, and it is going to take a constant push to ensure that healthcare in America moves forward and not backward.

In my view, one of the biggest threats to Americans' healthcare is the Trump administration's full-throated endorsement of repealing preexisting condition protections. That is particularly important for women who count on these essential consumer protections to get affordable care for all services.

American women don't want to turn back the clock to the days where health insurance was more expensive by default for women because maternity care and other services weren't covered in standard plans. Women don't want to be denied health insurance because of a cancer scare they had a few years back or a small preventive surgery. That was the reality before the Affordable Care Act.

I can only say that at one time, Democrats and Republicans here in the Senate felt very strongly about loophole-free, airtight protection for women and men and all Americans against discrimination for preexisting conditions. I know that because in the context of debating the Affordable Care Act, I was the sponsor of legislation, the Healthy Americans Act, which had seven Democrats and seven Republicans as cosponsors. Our proposal did have loophole-free, airtight protection for women and all Americans against discrimination for preexisting conditions. Essentially, what we seven Democrats and seven Republicans proposed is what became part of the Affordable Care Act provisions against discriminating against those with preexisting conditions, and it is those protections, which are now law, which the Trump administration seeks to roll back.

It is not widely known that it is not just men and women in the individual healthcare market whom the President's reckless approach on preexisting conditions is actually threatening. If the Trump administration is successful, protections for the 167 million Americans with employer-sponsored health insurance will also lose the Affordable Care Act's airtight, loophole-free preexisting condition protections.

That means America would be turning back the clock on healthcare, and an employer could once again put their bottom line over the health of the American people. Back then, it meant individuals were prevented from getting healthcare for months or leaving care for their preexisting condition uncovered. I think it is pretty clear that the American people do not want to return to a system like that.

Over the Fourth of July break, I will be heading back to Oregon. I am going to have my 900th townhall meeting—900 meetings where, for an hour and a half, I don't give any speeches; folks can just come in and say what is on their minds and say what is important to them. I would say that at a significant number of those 900 open-to-all, 90-minute townhall meetings in Oregon, folks at home talk about the importance of the issue I have just described—the protection for women and men and all Americans against discrimination for preexisting conditions.

Certainly, women in America can't afford to return to a system where they are systemically discriminated against. Women have been on the frontlines, standing up and speaking out to ensure that doesn't happen, ever since Donald Trump was elected.

I thank my colleagues, particularly Senator MURRAY and Senator BLUMENTHAL, who have been our leaders on this effort. As the ranking Democrat on the Finance Committee, I try to do everything I can to help them in their good work, and I appreciate their taking the time to point out that it has been 2 years since the Supreme Court handed down a historic decision that actually protected women and why we all feel so strongly about not walking back that decision.

I thank Senator MURRAY, and I yield my time to her.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon.

RETIREMENT OF JUSTICE ANTHONY KENNEDY

I would just say I have been planning to come to the floor about a specific issue related to women's healthcare and rights and freedoms, but before I get to that, I want to comment on the news that is clearly very closely connected.

It is clear that Justice Kennedy's retirement comes at a pivotal point in our Nation's history, when so many of our values are under attack by a President who has spent every day in office testing the limits of our Constitution.

I share the deep concern of so many families across this country who are already suffering under the Trump administration and fear further erosion of the progress in this country.

So, first, I want to be clear. I am hopeful that Republican leaders go back and look at what they said very recently and give families across the country the opportunity to weigh in with an election before moving forward

to fill this seat. We don't know whom President Trump will nominate just yet or when he will make that nomination, but I want to go back to something my dear friend and colleague Senator Kennedy said because it highlights the stakes right now. He was talking about an extreme nominee, Robert Bork. He said:

Robert Bork's America is a land in which women would be forced into back-alley abortions, blacks would sit at segregated lunch counters, rogue police could break down citizens' doors in midnight raids, schoolchildren could not be taught about evolution, writers and artists would be censored at the whim of government, and the doors of the federal courts would be shut on the fingers of millions of citizens for whom the judiciary is often the only protector of the individual rights that are at the heart of our democracy.

Robert Bork was rejected, and Justice Kennedy took his place.

Today, we face similar stakes right now, in this moment. Voting rights are at stakes. LGBTQ rights are at stake. The right to organize collectively is at stake. Those are just a few. There are a lot more.

Families across the country are paying attention, and they are going to be watching what President Trump and individual Members of this Senate do right now. This is what they are going to want to know: Will their rights be protected? Will their freedoms be secure? Will the Supreme Court put people like them first, or will they stand with special interests, big business, and the most extreme ideologues in our country? Those are the questions people across this country will be asking. That is the conversation I expect we will have here in the Senate, and that is what President Trump should be considering as he thinks about this issue and hopefully as he slows this down and gives people across the country a chance to weigh in.

WOMEN'S HEALTHCARE

Mr. President, one issue I know women across the country will be focused on and asking about is their constitutionally protected right to control their own healthcare decisions affirmed in *Roe v. Wade*, because, let me be clear, women and men in this country understand how directly tied this right is to a woman's freedom and economic security, and they overwhelmingly do not want to see that right rolled back.

Today is the anniversary of a ruling that further upheld women's constitutionally protected reproductive rights, and I want to take a few minutes today to discuss what this decision meant for women's lives and why we will not stop fighting to protect the progress we have made.

Almost half a century ago, in its historic *Roe v. Wade* decision, the Supreme Court ruled that every woman, no matter where she lives, has the constitutional right to make her own decisions about her body, her family, and her future, including the right to safe, legal abortion. But a right means nothing without the ability to exercise it.

While *Roe v. Wade* has been the law of the land for years, extreme conservatives have continually tried to undermine the Court's decision by peddling ideological policies that would make it hard for women to exercise their reproductive rights.

Women across the country have not been silent about these efforts and neither has the Supreme Court. Two years ago, the Court reaffirmed the rights enshrined in *Roe v. Wade* when it ruled in favor of *Whole Woman's Health* and struck down an anti-abortion law in Texas that was designed to make it harder for women to access the care they need.

The law in Texas attempted to undermine women's reproductive freedom by putting access to that care far out of reach for women. If it had been allowed to stand, the law would have closed three-quarters of the clinics in the State that provided abortion services. If it had been allowed to stand, hundreds of thousands of women would have no option but to travel hundreds of miles for their reproductive health services.

The Texas law didn't stand; women's constitutional rights did. That Supreme Court ruling sent a strong message, one women have been making for years, and one we continue to make clear today: Politicians have no business interfering with a woman's most personal decisions.

Unfortunately, many people on the right continue to ignore that message. Unfortunately, they have continued to push for damaging, extreme policies that ignore the Supreme Court, the Constitution, and women across the country.

From day one, President Trump and Vice President PENCE have made it clear that turning back the clock on women's health and reproductive rights is a top priority for them. They recently proposed a harmful domestic gag rule on Federal family planning funds designed to restrict access to healthcare for women, interfere with care providers' ability to talk about the full range of reproductive health services with their patients, and ultimately make it harder for women to exercise their healthcare choices and constitutional rights.

That is just the latest of so many extreme and ideological steps, statements, policies, and appointees that have repeatedly shown the Trump administration's hostility to women's rights. We are still seeing radical Republicans in many States pushing to put up new barriers, like those that were struck down in the *Whole Woman's Health* case, to prevent women from making their own healthcare decisions—barriers that would allow perhaps a woman's ZIP Code or her income to determine whether she is able to get the care she needs.

We are also still seeing that every time far-right politicians try and bring us a step back, women and men across the country are stepping forward and

speaking out against them, and that is not going to stop. We are going to continue to defend women's reproductive rights, on all fronts and against all attacks.

One effort to do that in Congress is the Women's Health Protection Act—legislation I am very proud to cosponsor—that would help protect women's constitutional rights to safe, legal abortion care and bring down harmful, ideological barriers to that care, like the one struck down in Texas, once and for all.

I remember being in the room when the Supreme Court heard the Whole Woman's Health case and hearing the skepticism from many Justices as they asked thoughtful questions about Texas's flimsy excuses for trying to undermine women's rights. I remember being outside of the Court shortly afterward and seeing all the women and men making their voices heard and fighting for those rights. I remember being moved by the personal stories shared by so many women about what the right to make their own personal decisions meant for their health, for their family, and their opportunities in life.

I am not going to let anyone forget those stories, including President Trump, Vice President PENCE, and far-right politicians across the country. I am not going to stop defending women's health and reproductive freedoms. I am not going to stop fighting to make sure our daughters and granddaughters have stronger rights and more opportunity, not less. I am not going to stop, and I know women and men across the country aren't going to either.

There is no question in my mind that people nationwide understand just how important a woman's ability to control her own healthcare decision is. This is not about politics. It is about women's health. It is about their economic security, about a woman's ability to contribute fully and equally in our country.

I am confident people across the country who do not want to go backward will stand up and make their voices heard and reject President Trump and Vice President PENCE's extreme ideology wherever it rears its head. I am hopeful that President Trump takes this to heart as he thinks about his Supreme Court vacancy. I am hoping my Republican colleagues are paying attention. I am truly hoping President Trump decides to listen to people across the country, listen to what Republicans just said recently, and not jam a nominee through before people have a chance to weigh in.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, first, I wish to thank Senator BLUMENTHAL for organizing this block of time and for his continued leadership in the fight to protect women's healthcare. Today marks the 2-year anniversary of the Supreme Court's decision in *Whole Woman's Health v. Hellerstedt*.

That landmark decision struck down two provisions of a Texas law that imposed medically unnecessary, burdensome requirements on abortion providers and reaffirmed a woman's constitutional right to access safe, legal abortion. If the Supreme Court had allowed these provisions to stand, more than 75 percent of all reproductive health clinics in Texas would have been forced to close, leaving many women unable to access the care they need.

Whole Woman's Health was a significant victory for reproductive freedom, but the assault on a woman's constitutionally protected right to an abortion has continued unabated over the past 2 years. During that time, Iowa passed an outrageous bill that would prohibit women from seeking an abortion after 6 weeks of pregnancy, often even before these women knew they were pregnant.

West Virginia enacted legislation that would prohibit the State's Medicaid Program from covering abortion services for low-income residents. Indiana passed an onerous new law requiring physicians to report confidential patient information to the State if a woman experienced complications from an abortion.

Louisiana recently passed a law establishing a 15-week abortion ban that includes criminal penalties for any physician who performs the procedure after that time—with only a very narrow exception to save the life of the mother.

These are the kinds of lengths those who want to limit a woman's right to choose will go to. Advocates have recognized the harm these laws would have on women and have filed suits to block their implementation. Several lower courts have ruled that these restrictions are unconstitutional and could come before the Supreme Court for review in the months and years ahead. These laws are only a few of the hundreds of new restrictions enacted in States across the country that are harming women's health and violating their constitutional right to an abortion.

To understand the negative impact of these laws on women, I point to a recent report from the Guttmacher Institute that found 58 percent of women of reproductive age in our country live in a State considered hostile or extremely hostile to abortion rights. Only 30 percent live in a State supportive of abortion rights. We are talking about millions and millions of women who are living in States that are extremely hostile to abortion rights.

Respect for a woman's constitutional rights should not depend on where she lives. Women in Texas, Louisiana, or Iowa deserve the same respect as women living in States like Hawaii, where we have some of the country's most humane, expansive protections for reproductive rights. In fact, Hawaii was the first State in the country to legalize abortion. These disparities and protections for women in different States can have life-or-death con-

sequences for women in need of reproductive healthcare.

Earlier this year, I shared the story of Dr. Ghazaleh Moayedi—an abortion services provider who used to practice in Texas but now lives and works in Hawaii. Dr. Moayedi's story is worth sharing again because it poignantly captures what is at stake for women living in States with sweeping abortion restrictions.

In her letter to me, Dr. Moayedi shared the story of a young woman in her Texas town who sought medical treatment with another provider after her water broke at 22 weeks. This woman desperately wanted a baby, but her fetus was not viable outside the womb. Because of Texas's restriction on abortion services, the patient's doctors were unable to counsel her on all medically appropriate options, including immediate delivery.

This patient became increasingly ill and requested an abortion to prevent her condition from getting worse. The doctors on her case refused this request. Why? Because Texas law would not allow them to respond to her request.

After spending 2 weeks in a hospital intensive care unit, this woman was transferred to Dr. Moayedi's care, where she ultimately had to have both hands and feet amputated due to severe infection. She also lost her baby.

Dr. Moayedi recently moved from Texas to Hawaii, where she provides lifesaving abortion care to women at all stages of pregnancy, including a woman with a desired pregnancy who was flown in from a neighbor island for management of her previsible labor.

Despite the expert specialist care she received, the patient's water broke at 22 weeks. At that point, there was nothing Dr. Moayedi could do to prevent labor. She performed an abortion and saved her patient's life.

The stark contrast in outcomes for Dr. Moayedi's two patients is completely unnecessary. Women across the country have a constitutional right to an abortion, and Congress needs to do more to fight back against what States like Texas, Louisiana, and Iowa are doing.

It is time for Congress to pass comprehensive legislation that prevents States from imposing unconstitutional restrictions on abortions and that ensures every woman has access to the healthcare they need when and where they need it. We need to pass the Women's Health Protection Act, a bill introduced by Senator BLUMENTHAL and one I have supported since its introduction in 2013.

This critical piece of legislation would explicitly prohibit States from imposing restrictions that limit women's access to safe and legal abortion services. It would prevent States like Iowa, Louisiana, and Mississippi from imposing abortion bans before viability; it would preclude States like Arkansas from restricting access to medication abortion; and it would stop

States like Texas from passing laws that impose arbitrary and capricious requirements on facilities and abortion providers that do not improve the health of their patients.

Passing this legislation is particularly important following Justice Kennedy announcing his retirement. The fundamental rights of women should not be subject to the whims of Donald Trump and whomever he selects to fill Justice Kennedy's seat. Congress needs to take decisive action to protect a woman's right to choose. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the passage of the Women's Health Protection Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

RETIREMENT OF JUSTICE ANTHONY KENNEDY

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, before I begin my remarks concerning the Women's Health Protection Act, I want to state for the record that given Justice Kennedy's announcement today that he will retire, and there will therefore be a vacancy on the Supreme Court, any nominee for the Supreme Court must be committed to protecting the rights of all Americans, including the reproductive rights of women. Nominees can't just be focused on protecting corporate special interests and the powerful few. I also continue to believe that Supreme Court nominees should have broad support from both political parties and be able to clear a 60-vote threshold. A strong and independent judiciary that is above politics and is willing to stop abuses of power is more important than ever given that our current President regularly disregards established democratic norms and voices contempt for constitutional safeguards.

WOMEN'S HEALTHCARE

Mr. President, with this attention on the Supreme Court, it is appropriate that I rise on the 2-year anniversary of a critical victory for women and families across our Nation.

Two years ago, the Supreme Court's ruling in *Whole Woman's Health v. Hellerstedt* reaffirmed that every woman has the right to make her own healthcare decisions and chart her own destiny. This decision preserved women's access to critical health services and reinforced that placing an undue burden on abortion access violates the 14th Amendment of the Constitution.

Unfortunately, despite the fact that the Court has made this clear, politicians in Washington and in States across our country have made it their mission to undermine women's access to safe and legal abortions. Here in Congress, we have seen bill after bill that marginalizes women and restricts their fundamental rights, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have confirmed Trump administration officials and judges who are vehemently opposed to women having the freedom to make their own healthcare decisions.

Additionally, State legislatures have pushed a number of burdensome re-

strictions. Politicians have pushed these restrictions under the guise of protecting women's health, but in the *Whole Woman's Health* case, the Supreme Court called their bluff and stated that the real point of these State laws was to deny women access to care.

Unfortunately, many States have remained persistent in their efforts. Since that 2016 decision, State legislatures have introduced 1,039 restrictive bills and have passed 180 of them. These bills have focused on everything from closing abortion clinics to criminalizing providers who offer reproductive health services. No matter their ZIP codes, women deserve equal access to care, but it is clear that there will continue to be attempts from politicians to violate women's rights.

With all of these relentless attacks, it is evident that what we need is Federal legislation that protects women's access to care in every State throughout our Nation. That is why, last year, I was proud to join with dozens of my Democratic colleagues to introduce the Women's Health Protection Act.

This legislation is vital because it protects women from the burdensome requirements that States are enacting. It would invalidate laws that require women to endure unnecessary tests and procedures and would invalidate laws that prevent doctors from prescribing and dispensing medication that is medically appropriate. Above all, the Women's Health Protection Act would ensure that women across the country receive safe, medically sound care if they choose to have an abortion.

At a time when politicians in Washington and in State legislatures continue to marginalize women, I will continue to fight for the Women's Health Protection Act because women deserve respect when making their most deeply personal healthcare decisions, and they have to have the full independence to do so.

TRIBUTE TO MASTER SERGEANT LEE HIRTLE

Mr. President, I rise to recognize retired Air Force MSgt Lee Hirtle, who is also a retired New Hampshire State Trooper of Northfield, NH, as the June Granite Stater of the month for his incredible dedication to honoring our servicemembers and veterans who have passed.

Over a decade ago, at a military funeral, Master Sergeant Hirtle noticed that "Taps," the traditional bugle call performed at military funerals, was playing from a CD player that was hidden behind a gravestone. When he returned home from the funeral, Master Sergeant Hirtle went to his basement and dusted off his old trumpet—an instrument he had not touched since he had been a college student. He taught himself to play "Taps" and practiced until he was skilled enough to play at the funerals of fellow veterans and servicemembers.

Since playing at his first funeral in 2007, he has sounded "Taps" over 3,650 times across the Northeast.

When asked why he continues to sound "Taps," Master Sergeant Hirtle

talked about his first military funeral. At that funeral, he stood alongside a New Hampshire National Guard member named CPL Scott Dimond. A year later, after Corporal Dimond was killed while serving in Afghanistan, Master Sergeant Hirtle sounded "Taps" at his funeral. As the master sergeant said, servicemembers like Corporal Dimond—and all of our veterans—deserve the live version of "Taps."

We can never fully repay those who have served or have made the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our freedom, but we must commit ourselves to honoring those sacrifices. Master Sergeant Hirtle does that and is a true embodiment of that commitment. For his dedication to honoring those who served, I am so proud to recognize him as the Granite Stater of the month.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

AMENDMENT NO. 3134

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I rise in support of my amendment, No. 3134.

By providing haying and grazing flexibility, this amendment would offer commonsense and effective land management options for land enrolled in the Conservation Reserve Program, or what we refer to as CRP.

There are CRP contracts today that are typically 10 to 15 years in duration. As it stands, some CRP contracts only allow for vegetative cover to be removed once or twice during the life of the contract—a practice that is referred to as "mid contract management." Even in areas that have experienced a drought or feed shortage, CRP mid contract management rules have required vegetative cover on CRP land to be destroyed—a practice I have never understood and one about which I get a lot of feedback from farmers across South Dakota who don't understand it either.

The amendment before us today would allow haying and grazing under terms agreed to between the USDA and State technical committees, with safeguards in place that would protect the CRP cover when long-term droughts occur. Specifically, the amendment would allow haying and grazing on one-third of a producer's CRP contract acres on a rotating basis, which would be coupled with a reduction in the CRP rental payment.

CRP is important for so many reasons. After more than 30 years, it remains the cornerstone of the conservation programs the USDA administers.

In my opinion, we need more than the 24 million acres the current CRP acreage cap allows. In order to raise this cap in the current budget environment, in both the House and the Senate farm bills, the CRP cap is raised, and annual CRP rental rates are lowered to 80 and 88.5 percent of normal rental rates, respectively.

In other words, to get an additional cap, you have to reduce the rental rate in order to offset the cost of raising the cap. The House found a way to do that.

It raised it to 29 million acres in its version of the bill, but it lowered rental rates to 80 percent of normal. In the Senate version of the bill, it only goes up 1 million acres, from 24 million acres to 25 million acres, but the rental rate is at 88.5 percent.

My assumption is that in the conference with the House, when we get there, this will be an issue that will be negotiated. Yet, as I said before, it makes sense, in my view, to raise that cap because the cap today is not sufficient for what the demand is out there and for the importance of the program in terms of its impact on production and agriculture in our farming and ranching communities.

The haying and grazing flexibility provisions in this amendment will help to offset these lower rental rates and make CRP a viable choice for a producer's less productive land in today's very tough agriculture economy.

This amendment is a win for farmers and ranchers, and it is a win for conservation.

I thank Senator KLOBUCHAR, my neighbor from Minnesota, for cosponsoring this amendment. I think she will be here, at some point, to talk about this as well.

I thank Chairman ROBERTS and Ranking Member STABENOW for following through on the commitment that they made at the Ag Committee markup, when we were debating this, to work with me on this amendment to improve the CRP program.

I also thank the stakeholder organizations and majority and minority committee staff, who worked with my staff over the past 2 weeks to reach agreement on the amendment before us today.

In my view, this strengthens the farm bill, and it strengthens the CRP program in a way that many producers, farmers, and ranchers across my State have sought for a long time. It allows that added flexibility so that they can, on a 3-year basis, rotate and allow a certain amount of those CRP acres to be harvested and to do away with this crazy mid contract management practice requirement that, as I mentioned earlier, has very little support out there in the farm community.

It also does away with another issue that comes up frequently in States like mine when we have a drought. We had one in 2012, and we had one last year, in 2017. We had to plead with the USDA to allow emergency haying and grazing. This also would eliminate the need for that and, on a periodic basis, when we would face those conditions in States like South Dakota and in other States across the country.

I see that the distinguished committee chairman of the Ag Committee is here. As I said, I appreciate his leadership on this and on so many issues in this farm bill. I hope we get a good, strong, big vote in the end.

Mr. ROBERTS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. THUNE. Absolutely. I am happy to yield to the chairman of the Ag Committee, Senator ROBERTS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I rise in support of my colleague's amendment.

As Senator THUNE indicated, this amendment proposes to make changes to the Conservation Reserve Program. Goodness knows that we have been working on that for several years. As a matter of fact, I can even remember back in the House when I was the original sponsor of the Conservation Reserve Program and when Senator THUNE was Congressman THUNE and continued that effort.

We provide additional flexibilities for the management of routine haying and grazing, which the Senator has pointed out.

The amendment provides greater clarity for when and how often producers can conduct the active management of their CRP land. I strongly support that, as do all of the members of the committee.

These flexibilities not only provide a benefit to the producer but a more active management of CRP also has a mutual benefit to the wildlife that relies upon the habitat created by CRP.

What the distinguished Senator has pointed out is exactly right in that during the Ag Committee markup, both Senator STABENOW and I committed to working with him on this priority. I am pleased the amendment reflects that bipartisan agreement that has the support of the grower and wildlife organizations. I thank my colleague for working with Senator STABENOW and me on this amendment. I support it and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Thanks, dude.

Mr. THUNE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate that endorsement. Again, I thank you for your hard work and that of your staff in helping to structure this in a way that we could get the broad support you mentioned from the commodity groups and the wildlife groups. I think this is a win-win for conservation and certainly a win-win for the CRP program and for the farmers and ranchers in South Dakota who—and not just in South Dakota but all across the country who make use of this important and vital resource.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

TAX REFORM

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I want to talk about the tax reform legislation that this body passed at the end of last year. It turns out that this week is the 6-month anniversary of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, the tax reform legislation. It is time for us to look at it and determine how it is working. It is particularly important because there are a number of provisions in the tax legislation that are not permanent. In other words, there is a sunset on some of the tax cuts. Some of these provi-

sions expire as soon as the end of 2019, which is just the end of next year, so it is time to start thinking about how it works.

Second, we have Members on the other side of the aisle saying that we ought to get rid of this altogether. That would mean, of course, big tax increases for a lot of folks. But let's look at what the results are before we take those kinds of votes and make those kinds of decisions.

I would submit that in the 6 months since it has been put into place, it has worked incredibly well for the people I represent, for the workers and small businesses I represent, and for those who are concerned about getting wages back up, fighting poverty, and helping to grow the economy.

I know that in the debate we are having on the farm bill right now, there has been discussion about the food stamp program. One of the points that are being made is that food stamp spending is actually down right now. It has decreased in the last 6 months. Why? Because the economy is improving. That is a good thing.

Before tax reform, let's face it, our economy was incredibly weak. Wages were flat and had been flat for almost a decade. With the Congressional Budget Office estimating that this year's growth was going to be only 2 percent, we were looking at more weak economic performance. We were looking at another year where we were going to be performing way below our potential as an economy. So what happened? A couple months ago, when the Congressional Budget Office looked at what is happening with the economy, which they attributed to pro-growth policies, including tax reform, they said: You know what, the economy is not going to grow at 2 percent this year. Their projection for this year is now 3.3 percent growth. That is a huge difference. Going from 2 percent to 3.3 percent is going to make a world of difference to people in their lives, in our economy, in their ability to see higher wages and better jobs.

The economy is doing better. Six months into this new law, the economy is up and running and moving toward its full potential. In the most recent Congressional Budget Office estimate for this quarter, it looks as though we are going to see some significant growth. There is no estimate yet from the CBO, but it was stated that the Federal Reserve gave an estimate of 4.5 percent growth. I don't know if that will happen, but the consensus estimate from economists is that in the second quarter of this year, we are likely to see growth at over 4 percent. We will hear the final number from the Congressional Budget Office at the end of July, but, again, we are seeing more jobs, higher wages, better economic growth, and therefore more opportunity for all Americans. That is a good thing.

Why is tax reform helping to create this new opportunity for higher wages

and more growth? I am going to discuss three reasons why I believe this tax reform proposal has been helping to get the economy moving and why it is so important to keep these policies in place and to not risk higher taxes on individuals or lower economic growth if we were to move away from this legislation and not make it permanent.

No. 1, updating our international tax code has definitely encouraged companies to invest in America. We had a totally outdated international tax code. We had the highest tax rates among all the industrialized countries at the business level for international companies. We had a system that actually encouraged companies to keep their money overseas and therefore spend it overseas. So a company facing our old Tax Code would have had their board and stakeholders saying: Don't bring that money back because it is going to be taxed too high. Keep it overseas. That was crazy. It made no sense whatsoever.

Frankly, it took us too long to address that issue, but we finally did. Let me give an example. I am told that in the first quarter of this year, more than \$300 billion was brought into this country, repatriated back to America from overseas. This is the profit U.S. companies made overseas, and \$300 billion was brought back. Compare that to the first quarter of last year, when \$38 billion was brought back. This is because of tax reform. This is good. This money is being brought back to invest in America, and it is the most money on record, by the way. So something is changing, and it is positive. The change to the international system is helping in a number of ways, including companies bringing the money back and investing it here.

Second, lowering the tax rate for small and large businesses has resulted in new investments in people, plant equipment, and technology. We have seen it in terms of higher bonuses, higher wages, and increased retirement contributions.

There are a lot of examples. We have seen it in terms of investing in new technology and new equipment, which, in the end, is probably as important as anything because—think about it—one thing the economists have said about our economy over the last decade is that we are not improving our productivity as we should. What they mean by that is that the productivity of each worker has been disappointing, and that leads to lower wages and not having higher economic performance. If you make a worker more productive by investing in the latest technology and new equipment, that helps everybody. It helps that worker have a higher salary, and it helps the economy.

That is actually happening out there. I have seen the results of it all over Ohio. I represent the State of Ohio, which has a lot of manufacturing and a lot of small businesses. I have gone around and talked with them. I visited 21 individual businesses and held about

a dozen roundtable discussions with small and midsized businesses and one large business. We talked about this, and of the 21 businesses I visited, every single one of them is taking the tax savings and investing it in their people, their plant, and their equipment. Some are raising wages. Some are giving bonuses to their employees. Some are buying new equipment. Some are expanding their operations. Some of them are improving employee benefits.

There is a company that has three branches of an auto parts store that stopped offering healthcare about 5 years ago because of the cost of the Affordable Care Act. They couldn't afford healthcare. Their people had to go out on the individual market and get it through the Affordable Care Act. They are now offering healthcare again, and the employees are extremely happy. Their costs are down, and their deductibles are down. They did that all with tax savings.

Many companies have done a combination of these things. They are investing in their people. There is a small manufacturing company in Cincinnati, and shortly after the tax bill was signed into law, they said: We are going to give \$1,000 bonuses to our people. And they did. They also invested in equipment.

A company I visited in Columbus, OH, invested in equipment. It is a steel processor. The equipment they used was from 1986. The equipment itself was 31 years old, which is exactly the age of our old Tax Code. Nineteen eighty six was when we last reformed the Tax Code. After we modernized the Tax Code—finally modernized an antiquated tax code that was 31 years old—they got rid of a 31-year-old piece of equipment and replaced it with a brandnew piece of equipment. I thought that was appropriate.

That is how these tax savings are being used. There are some groups in town that put up a website saying: These businesses have benefited from this and these employees. I can tell you that it is way understated. I can't find a business in Ohio that hasn't benefited from it.

Some are doing more than others, no question about it. Some of the big financial service companies are giving big wage increases. Other small businesses might be investing in a new piece of equipment, but there are so many businesses out there. They are not all putting out press releases or talking about it, but they are doing something. This is good.

This is why you see this economic growth coming up, finally, after so many years of flat wages and high expenses. You are seeing people begin to see a little improvement in their wages. That is really important.

First are the international parts. Second is what this is doing in terms of the business side and how that affects people. The third one is direct tax relief to individuals because that is part of this bill too. If you hear people talk

about this bill—sometimes on the other side of the aisle—you would think that is not in there. It is very much in there.

People are able to keep more of their hard-earned money, and it goes directly to the middle-class constituents whom I represent. They are the ones who get the biggest bang for their buck because we doubled the standard deduction, taking it from \$12,000 to \$24,000 for a family because we doubled the child tax credit, including increasing the part that is refundable. Even if you don't have an income tax liability, you get it.

We also lowered tax rates for people. That combination means that people have seen their paychecks go up. About 90 percent of workers in America got a paycheck that had more money going into their bank account rather than to Uncle Sam because their withholding changed. You know this if you are listening today because you probably had this happen to you if you are one of the 90 percent, which you probably are. Uncle Sam is taking a little less withholding, and you are able to keep a little more.

As I said consistently during the debate on tax reform, and we went back and forth on this, I just said: Look, the proof is in the paycheck. We can argue this all day long. When people get their paycheck, it is either going to be better or not. For 90 percent of the people I represent, it is better. Of course, they are happy about that.

In addition to that, we also made the Tax Code more progressive. What does that mean? That means those at the top of the income ladder are actually paying a larger portion of the overall tax burden, not a smaller portion. Let me say that again. The Tax Code is more progressive. If you are at the top of the income ladder, you are now paying a larger portion of the overall tax burden. At the lower end, you are paying less in terms of the overall tax burden. The biggest percentage tax increase is for those making over \$1 million a year, and the biggest tax decrease is for those making \$30,000 a year or less. This is why the Joint Committee on Taxation, in response to questions I asked them directly, said that over 3 million Americans now have no tax liability at all in terms of income tax liability thanks to this tax reform effort because they are at the lower end of the economic scale. Before, they had a tax liability, but now they don't because of a lower rate doubling the standard deduction—doubling the tax credit.

Three million Americans don't have to worry about Uncle Sam because they don't have tax liability anymore under this bill. This has changed the way our tax bill works. The Joint Committee on Taxation can show you those numbers. All of this resulted in higher wages for the first time in about a decade. This was the strongest wage growth for nonsupervisory employees in 9 years. That is the latest data. You

can check it out at the Department of Labor.

It also resulted in a lot more optimism out there. If you look at the surveys on optimism—I saw there was one done by an NBC station recently saying this is the highest level of optimism they have seen.

There is optimism also in small businesses. The National Federation of Independent Business does surveys regularly. Their surveys are unprecedented because they are coming back saying that small businesses are ready to invest now and planning to invest.

In my home State of Ohio, we had the Ohio Chamber of Commerce do a survey recently. They found that 70 percent of the businesses already added new employees. We are now in the second quarter, and 75 percent are planning to add new employees. It is amazing. This is actually happening as we talk because we changed a tax system that was discouraging growth, discouraging investment, and making it harder for people to get ahead, harder to see wages go up to meet expenses.

There are good things going on. Since December, the number of long-term unemployed people has decreased by about 400,000 people. The unemployment rate has fallen from 4.9 percent to 4.3 percent in my home State of Ohio. Nationally, unemployment is now down to 3.8 percent, the lowest since 2000.

That is all good news. What do you hear now? I hear from businesses, not so much about the tax burden—and, frankly, not so much about the regulatory burden because Congress has also done some things to relieve the regulatory burden, particularly for small businesses—but I hear that finding qualified workers is their biggest challenge. I heard it last weekend, and I will hear it this coming weekend.

As a small business person myself, I sense it. It is a major hurdle right now. There is a shortage of workers. A big reason is what economists call the labor force participation rate. What does that mean? It just means the number of Americans who are unemployed and not looking for work at all is higher than it has been in the past. These are folks who are on the sidelines. They are not even reported in the unemployment numbers. It is so bad, our labor force participation rate was at its prerecession level of 66 percent of people working rather than the current 62.7 percent. If we just had a level of 66 percent working 10 years ago, our unemployment rate today would not be 3.8 percent. If you take into account those people, our unemployment rate would be about 8.6 percent. It is pretty disappointing.

That is one challenge we still have with this incredible tax relief and tax cut legislation, and increasing economic opportunities, growing jobs, and raising wages. We still have a lot of people who are on the sidelines and not in the workforce.

Among able-bodied men, by the way, between 25 and 55, 8.5 million of them

are in this category. They are not even showing up in the unemployment numbers. That is wrong. You want them to have the dignity and self-respect that comes from work, and our economy needs these people to be able to work.

According to the Congressional Budget Office's 30-year projection they gave us yesterday, they think the labor force participation rate will get even worse. That is what they told us yesterday. It will be declining over the next 30 years to even below what it is now—below 60 percent. That can't happen. That is unacceptable.

The low labor force participation rate cannot be the new normal, and it can't get worse. We want people to get that dignity and self-respect that comes from work. We want them to enter into our economy.

As the economy is growing and businesses are expanding, there is no better time to reverse this trend, to bring people into the economy and bring them back to work.

I have dug into this issue, trying to figure out why this is. There are a number of reasons: dependency on government programs and being sure we don't have people go to work who then lose all their benefits right away—trying to deal with that cliff. Then there is the tax issue. When you go to work, you have higher taxes. We should do more to get people into work making more pay. We should have work requirements in some of these programs. That has been talked about a lot on the floor. We should deal with other issues, including the skills gap. We are doing it with career technical schools and other things.

OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Mr. President, I want to mention the single most important problem we face, and that is the opioid crisis. I say this because the opioid epidemic has hit our country and is, by the way, the No. 1 killer in my State of Ohio right now and in many States around the country. It is already having a devastating impact on everything—on crime, families, the ability for jails to work, our healthcare system to work—but it is also affecting employment in huge ways.

A recent report by the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland found that counties with higher levels of opioid prescriptions have lower workforce participation rates. It is no wonder. They surveyed the business community, and about half the organizations they contacted said the opioid epidemic has negatively impacted their businesses. People can't get through the drug tests. Also, people aren't applying for work.

Why do I say that? Well, the Department of Labor did a study earlier this year that showed 44 percent of these people outside the workforce altogether, who are off in the shadows or on the sidelines—44 percent of them had taken a drug, a pain medication the previous day. The Brookings Institute says the number is 47 percent.

When further pushed, two-thirds said they were taking prescription pain medication. That is amazing. That 44 percent is likely underreported. There is a stigma attached to the opioid crisis. Second, there is a legal issue for a lot of people.

It is not like this is an overreported number. That is an amazing number that nearly half of the people who are outside the workforce are saying they are taking pain medication on a daily basis. The sad reality is, again, it is likely to be much higher than that.

We know what we have to do. We need to get people into treatment, support them, help them overcome their addiction, and get them back to work and leading productive lives. There are things Congress can and should do to take care of that.

I ask unanimous consent to continue to discuss solutions to the opioid epidemic after the majority leader has a chance to make his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for Senate amendment No. 3224.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 3224 to Calendar No. 483, H.R. 2, an act to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Shelley Moore Capito, Pat Roberts, John Barrasso, John Cornyn, Susan M. Collins, Lamar Alexander, John Hoeven, Orrin G. Hatch, Richard Burr, Roy Blunt, Steve Daines, Mike Crapo, Mike Rounds, John Boozman, Joni Ernst, Deb Fischer.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for H.R. 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 483, H.R. 2, an act to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Shelley Moore Capito, Pat Roberts, John Barrasso, John Cornyn, Susan M. Collins, Lamar Alexander, John Hoeven, Orrin G. Hatch,

Richard Burr, Roy Blunt, Steve Daines, Mike Crapo, Mike Rounds, John Boozman, Joni Ernst, Deb Fischer.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Ohio.

OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, we talked a little about the growing economy, and we talked about the fact that one of the weaknesses we have is, in spite of a growing economy and lower unemployment—all this good news coming with the tax cuts and tax reforms and investments—we have a problem, which is that many people are outside the workforce altogether.

Historically high levels of labor force participation are not being part of the workforce, but instead people are being sidelined. How do you get those people back to work? There are 8.5 million men between 25 and 55, as an example, who are not working. They are not showing up on the unemployment numbers because they are not looking for work.

There are a number of reasons for that. The one I think that is most significant today, that puts us at this high level of people outside the workforce, is the opioid epidemic. I am talking about the fact that we have data on this from the Federal Reserve. We have data on this from the Brookings Institute and data from the Department of Labor and the Trump administration showing this is a huge problem.

About half the people, for instance, outside the workforce altogether are taking pain medication on a regular basis. This opioid crisis is affecting us in every way. What is Congress doing about it?

We have made progress. In the last couple of years, we have made unprecedented progress to combat addiction with legislation like the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, a bipartisan bill I coauthored with my colleague Senator WHITEHOUSE. We have the 20th Century Cures Act, which has been very important in getting funding out to the States to deal with this crisis. We just passed legislation that provides more funding for the kind of treatment and prevention in longer term recovery programs that are proven to work, that have evidence-based results behind them.

That is all very important. We need to continue to push back against this addiction by helping people get the

care they need and the treatment they need to overcome their dependency.

By the way, I have been with three community roundtables in the last few weeks talking specifically about how this funding is being used. It is exciting because it is being used on innovative new ideas that will make a big difference going forward, in terms of getting people who are addicted and overdosing. We are getting them the Narcan they need to save their lives and then not allowing that gap to occur where they go back to that same environment but getting them into treatment. There are quick response teams—a combination of law enforcement, social workers, and treatment providers getting in immediately saying: OK. You overdosed. Your life was saved by this Narcan—this miracle drug that reverses the effect of the overdose. Now, instead of going back to your old community where, unfortunately, many of those people are overdosing again and again, let's get you into treatment.

One of these organizations that is funded by the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act is telling me they are getting an 80-percent success rate getting people into treatment. That is huge. It is still too low, but that is so much higher, unfortunately, than what is typical out there.

So we are beginning to make progress—closing some of the gaps, getting people into the treatment they need, and sending a stronger prevention message out there, keeping people out of the funnel of addiction in the first place. But, in the meantime, we have a huge problem, and it is not getting better in my home State. It is actually getting worse.

In most areas of the State, you will now see higher rates of addiction and more overdoses, and the increase is almost all due to one thing, and that is fentanyl. This is this synthetic form of opioid that is now coming in and kind of taking over, pushing out heroin, prescription drugs, and other drugs.

Fentanyl is incredibly powerful—50 times more powerful than heroin. It is incredibly inexpensive. We are told by the experts that most of it is coming from China—not over land from Mexico but from China—through our U.S. mail system. It is unbelievable. It is a shock, but it is true. It is so potent that a few flakes of it can be deadly. It is totally unacceptable that in some laboratory in China, some evil scientist is making this poison and being allowed to ship it into our country.

It is now the No. 1 cause of death in my home State. Two-thirds of our overdose deaths last year, we believe, are going to be as a result of fentanyl, not heroin or prescription drugs. It is tragic and eye-opening that, when you look at what has happened, the Ohio Alliance for Innovation in Population Health has estimated that opioid overdoses were responsible for more than 500,000 years of life expectancy lost in Ohio between 2010 and 2016. It is

an interesting way to look at it. It is tragic. More than 500,000 years of life expectancy were lost in Ohio between 2010 and the end of 2016.

Overdoses are now the top cause of deaths for all Americans over the age of 50. It is the top cause of death in my home State for everybody.

Increasingly, these drug overdoses are from fentanyl. In Ohio, two-thirds of overdose deaths last year were from fentanyl. That is up from about 58 percent in 2016. It is the deadliest, most difficult drug for us to deal with right now.

Two weeks ago, the police in Dayton, OH, seized about 20 pounds of fentanyl during a drug arrest. Last Friday, Federal agents in Columbus arrested 4 people and seized 22 pounds of fentanyl. Taken together, these two busts—20 pounds and 22 pounds of fentanyl—is enough fentanyl to kill 9.5 million people. Think about that. By the way, that is about 80 percent of the population in my State of Ohio, from just these two busts alone.

On Monday we had a tele-townhall here. We do these on a monthly basis. We asked a number of questions. One question I have started to ask in the last several years is this: Do you know anybody who has been directly affected by the opioid epidemic?

We had the highest percentage of response ever at our townhall meeting here on Monday. The tele-townhall response was that 67 percent of the people on the call said yes. Over two-thirds of the people on this call said that yes, they knew someone who has been directly affected by the opioid epidemic. That is the highest level we have had.

One woman I spoke to on the call, Pauline from Zanesville, OH, told me a tragic story that is, unfortunately, similar to other ones I hear as I travel across the State. It was about her brother. Her brother had died of an overdose. Her brother, according to her, did not use opioids, and yet he died of an opioid overdose. She said he did smoke marijuana, but she said somehow there was something put into the marijuana that he was smoking that caused him to overdose and die.

I hear this story a lot back home. I talked about the three roundtable discussions we had recently in Ohio. In two of those three roundtables, a police chief and a sheriff, respectively, told me about a young man who overdosed, who was saved by Narcan, and then woke up and said: I was just smoking dope. Well, they checked, and guess what it was? It was fentanyl that had been sprinkled into the marijuana.

I am sure it is the same situation with Pauline's brother. The fentanyl that she talked about was what killed him.

What is the lesson here? It is that every street drug—whether it is cocaine, whether it is heroin, whether it is crystal meth—all of them are now subject to having fentanyl included within them, including description

pills, because sometimes they are reformulated to make it look like prescription pills.

That fentanyl is the killer. It is not that those other drugs can't cause you to overdose and die also, but with regard to fentanyl, that is the deadliest and riskiest of all. Any of these street drugs can be deadly. We need to combat this drug influx of fentanyl, and Congress has had a breakthrough recently in a way to do that.

I mentioned that it primarily comes from China, and it primarily comes through our U.S. postal system. The STOP Act, which is bipartisan legislation that I authored with my colleague AMY KLOBUCHAR from Minnesota—I see her colleague is on the floor now—will combat fentanyl at the source by closing a loophole that is currently in place in the Federal law.

After 9/11, we insisted that all of the private carriers—FedEx, UPS, DHL—had to give law enforcement information about every package that comes into America. This was after 9/11, remember. We asked the post office to study it, and we asked the Postmaster General to get together with the Homeland Security people and to come up with an answer. That was 16 years ago, and it hasn't happened.

Even though you send something by one of these private carriers, like FedEx, you have to provide this information up front: What is in the package? Where is it from? Where is it going?

Electronically, law enforcement takes that big data and decides what packages should be taken offline. They have been able to stop a lot of bad stuff, including fentanyl, from coming through. The post office doesn't require that because we haven't required it here in the Congress. It is time for us to do that.

I am pleased to tell you that after a few years of work, last week the House of Representatives passed the STOP Act by a vote of 353 to 52. The appropriate committee here in the Senate that has jurisdiction, the Finance Committee, also agreed to discharge the STOP Act recently. So now we can vote on it in the full Senate and get it to the President's desk to be signed into law.

As we developed the STOP Act, we conducted an 18-month investigation into this in the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which I chair. We revealed just how easy it was to purchase fentanyl online and have it shipped to the United States.

Based on our undercover investigation, these drugs could be found through a simple Google search. Overseas sellers accessed through an undercover investigator, essentially guaranteed delivery if fentanyl was sent through the U.S. Postal Service, not if it was sent through one of the private carriers.

Traffickers prefer the Postal Service because it doesn't have the screening that you have through the private car-

riers. So we need to be sure that the requirement is met with the advanced electronic data that is on all of the packages coming in. It tells law enforcement that they need to be able to use big data to identify suspicious packages and to keep this poison from coming into our communities.

That law is something we can do right now. The post office would say: Well, we are beginning to provide that information. Unfortunately, based on their testimony before my subcommittee, even with the pressure from us over the last couple of years, only 36 percent of packages are getting screened, and 20 percent of those aren't presented to law enforcement, based on their testimony. Also, some of the information is not helpful because it is not legible.

We need better data. We need to get 100 percent of the packages subject to this data. We need to be sure we can do a better job of, one, stopping the poison from coming into our country, into our communities, into our homes, but also, at the very least, increasing the cost of this. By reducing the supply, we can increase the cost.

One of the reasons fentanyl is growing so much is because it is so incredibly powerful, but, also, it is so incredibly inexpensive.

Let's have a vote on the STOP Act in the Senate as soon as possible. I think we can do it next month. Let's get it to the President. Let's get it signed into law. There is an urgency here.

As I mentioned, in just 7 years, in my home State, Ohioans have lost an estimated half million years of life expectancy as a result of opioid overdoses.

The impact is far greater than that, though. There are families who are broken apart. Prisons are flooded. Businesses are deplete of workers because of this addiction. We talked about this earlier. There is a lack of workforce because of this addiction.

The STOP Act will allow our country to push back against this international influx of fentanyl and will help our economy continue this positive momentum we have been experiencing since tax reform became law. We can do so by combating this newest and deadliest scourge of the opioid epidemic.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

WOMEN'S HEALTHCARE

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I am proud to join my colleagues today in recognizing the anniversary of a landmark Supreme Court decision, *Whole Woman's Health v. Hellerstedt*.

Before I talk about that decision, I want to talk today about Justice Anthony Kennedy's retirement. This is a pivotal moment in our country. With Justice Kennedy's retirement announcement today, the stakes have never been higher for making sure we

choose a Supreme Court Justice committed to the Constitution and to protecting the most fundamental rights of Americans—the right to vote, the ability to organize, and a woman's right to choose.

Whomever replaces Justice Kennedy will, no doubt, have a say on issues that affect the lives of every American—issues such as the healthcare system, our elections, and the health of our environment.

In February of 2016, some 9 months before the 2016 election, Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL issued a statement saying: "The American people should have a voice in the selection of our next Supreme Court Justice." He kept his word. He didn't hold a hearing or a vote on President Obama's nominee, Merrick Garland, during that election year.

I believe Republicans should be held to the same standard they set themselves. The Senate has a constitutional duty to provide advice and consent. We are a little more than 4 months away from an election that will decide the balance of the Senate. So let us let the American people decide who provides that advice and consent, especially given the close balance of the Senate as it stands today.

Back to the *Whole Woman's Health* decision, 2 years ago today, the Court reaffirmed that women have a constitutional right to make their own decisions about their reproductive health and family planning. The Court found that this fundamental right could not be unduly burdened with regulatory restrictions and requirements by the State or Federal Government. This was just one in a long line of Supreme Court decisions that affirm a woman's right to make personal, private decisions about her healthcare and family planning.

Whole Woman's Health recognized that in order to protect women's constitutional rights, it is not enough that abortion services are theoretically available. They must also be practically accessible.

It is especially important to recognize the anniversary of this important decision today because just yesterday the Supreme Court issued another decision, one that, unfortunately, threatens to make it harder for women to receive reliable and accurate information about the full range of their reproductive healthcare options.

As a U.S. Senator but also as a woman who served as a volunteer for Planned Parenthood and then as an executive for Planned Parenthood in North Dakota and South Dakota, I know that the right to access safe and reliable reproductive healthcare has a profound impact on women's lives.

Women cannot have economic security if they do not have the freedom to decide when and how to raise a family. This deeply personal decision influences women's choices about whether to go to school, buy a home, or start a new business. I trust women to make

these decisions for themselves and their families without the government looking over their shoulders.

Whole Woman's Health struck down some of the most egregious burdens on women's rights to access reproductive healthcare. But the fight to protect women's rights to accessible, safe, and reliable reproductive health is far from over. Despite this ruling, some States have continued their attempts to undermine women's constitutional rights.

In fact, in the 2 years since Whole Woman's Health was decided, States have proposed over 1,000 new restrictions on abortion, and 180 of those have become law. Many of these restrictions are aimed at shutting down clinics or criminalizing providers. Make no mistake. This is not about protecting women's health. This is about influencing women's choices, and it is wrong.

I believe strongly that the government has no business interfering in a woman's medical decisions. These decisions should be made by a woman, her family, and her healthcare provider. I trust women to make these decisions that are best for themselves and their own situations. This is why I am proud to cosponsor the Women's Health Protection Act, which would protect women's access to safe and legal healthcare services, regardless of where they live.

The bill would prohibit States from imposing restrictions on abortion services that do not promote women's health or safety. For example, laws that target providers with unnecessary and burdensome building codes or those that force women to undergo medically unnecessary testing and procedures would be prohibited.

This bill would codify the standards set in Whole Woman's Health and authorize the Department of Justice to protect women's constitutional rights by going after these unconstitutional laws.

I stand with women, and I invite my colleagues to do the same by cosponsoring the Women's Health Protection Act.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

FARM BILL

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I would like to spend a few minutes on a major piece of business this week, our 2018 farm bill.

Unlike so much of what comes to this floor—or never comes to this floor, never makes it to the floor—this is not a 5-month bill or a 5-week bill or a 5-hour extension; this is an honest to goodness 5-year farm bill. That is 5 years of certainty and predictability for our farmers and ranchers. It is a testament to the great work of the Senate Agriculture Committee, and I want to thank Chairman ROBERTS and Ranking Member STABENOW for leading yet another bipartisan, consensus-driven process.

When Democrats were in charge way back in 2014, we passed a bipartisan farm bill then. Now we are doing it again, only this time the Republicans are in charge. That is how this place should work. We have set aside the political antics and focused on our farmers and ranchers and rural communities, especially when they have all faced more uncertainty than they have in years.

In Colorado we have dealt with years of persistent drought. In the southern part of my State, waterflows in the Gunnison and Animas Rivers are at less than half of their average levels. Feed shortages are even forcing ranchers in Southwest Colorado to sell off their cattle. Besides drought, our farmers and ranchers are contending with erratic commodity prices, a broken immigration system that is actually putting some of them out of business because they can't find workers, and uncertainty over trade because of the administration's unusual approach to foreign policy. All of this has made it harder for them to plan for the next 5 months, let alone the next 5 years. This farm bill cannot come soon enough.

The Agriculture Committee has put together an excellent piece of legislation. For the first time in 80 years, this bill legalizes hemp. We forget, but hemp was widely grown in the United States throughout the mid-1800s. Americans used hemp in fabrics, wine, and paper. Our government treated industrial hemp like any other farm commodity until the early 20th century, when a 1937 law defined it as a narcotic drug, dramatically limiting its growth. This became even worse in 1970 when hemp became a schedule I controlled substance.

In Colorado, as is true across the country—I have talked to a lot of colleagues about this—we see hemp as a great opportunity to diversify our farms and manufacture high-margin products for the American people. That could help drive incomes in rural parts of my State, like Montrose County, CO.

Let me tell my colleagues about Montrose. It is a rural mountain area on Colorado's West Slope. It flattens out to the west. I managed to win 29 percent of the vote there in 2016, and I managed to win 29 percent the first time I ran as well. I can't seem to improve my position.

I want to show my colleagues a picture from there. This is from Montrose. Here is their Republican State senator, my friend Don Coram, who is standing right here, standing in front of a hemp plant. This is his greenhouse. He was kind enough to let me visit this past March. He told me that hemp growers operate under a shadow of uncertainty, worried that at any moment somebody in the Justice Department is going to wake up one morning and decide to cripple their operations by targeting their access to water or labor.

When we passed the last farm bill in 2014, Colorado farmers harvested

around 200 acres of hemp. Last year, we harvested 9,000 acres, and that is despite the uncertainty around hemp's legal status. Our farm bill eliminates that uncertainty by legalizing hemp.

If this farm bill passes, our growers are going to have a much easier time opening a bank account, buying and selling seeds, transporting their goods, and accessing water.

This bill also gives hemp growers access to important risk management tools, like crop insurance.

That is hemp that Don Coram, my Republican politician friend, is standing in front of at his greenhouse. This means dollars for rural Colorado and rural America, where the ingenuity and the creativity of people is already being unleashed on a crop that, until this farm bill was written, we could not grow in our country in a meaningful way and whose byproducts—the things that will create margins for our farmers—were imported from Canada.

Go into stores in the United States today and you will see hemp byproducts, hemp products, but they are grown in Canada. That doesn't make any sense. I am glad this farm bill fixes it, and I am glad the majority leader was the one who led the way on that.

Looking ahead in the West, we know that the risks of drought and wildfire are only going to grow worse. That calls on us to make sure that risk management tools are using the best available data. Over the past year, we have worked with Colorado's ranchers to make sure the USDA has good drought and market data for livestock disaster assistance.

In uncertain times, these programs are critical to sustaining our farms and working lands, which are fundamental to our heritage in the West and the legacy we hope to leave the next generation.

The same is true of our vast grasslands, healthy forests, and abundant wildlife. They are also fundamental to what it means to be in the West, which is why we made sure this farm bill emphasizes conservation and responsible management of our natural resources.

In this bill, we increase funding for conservation easements. We also make the EQIP Program easier to access for small farmers and ranchers. That idea came directly from Mike Nolan, a vegetable grower in Mancos, CO, who was having trouble accessing conservation tools designed more for big farms than for his 7-acre operation.

We reward farmers in this bill for improving soil health. We strengthen the Regional Conservation Partnership Program and reduce redtape for projects that improve drought resilience.

We increase funding for voluntary wildlife habitat improvements on working lands—an approach in Colorado that has helped us protect habitat for iconic species like the Greater sage-grouse but to do it on our own and in collaboration on the ground.

In Colorado, forests are one of our most important natural resources. The

health of our forests affects the strength of our outdoor economy, the quality of our water, and the safety of our communities from wildfire. This bill doubles funding for collaborative forest projects that promote forest health and reduce wildfire risk. It creates a new water source protection program to bring utilities and upstream communities together around forest health. It also requires the Forest Service to evaluate the health of our watersheds and monitor the effectiveness of treatments, and it provides new authority for the Forest Service to work with local communities on housing and infrastructure—a major issue in our mountain communities.

Finally, this bill makes new investments in our rural communities by expanding access to high-speed internet and encouraging projects to improve energy efficiency, energy storage, and cyber security.

Working with Senator DAINES, we also maintain funding for the Voluntary Public Access Program to increase opportunities for hunting and fishing, which are so important to our outdoor recreation economy.

All in all, this is a good bill. It would materially improve the lives in communities in Colorado and across America—something I don't get to say a lot about our work around here.

It is even more impressive because the farm bill is not some tiny piece of inconsequential legislation. It is among the most complex things we do as a Congress. It touches every region of our country—urban and rural—and involves thousands of different, often competing, interests. It affects the lives of every single American—whether they know it or not—through its investment in our food, forests, water, and wildlife.

We passed this bill 20 to 1 in the Agriculture Committee. I told the majority leader the other day, when he came for our markup in the committee, that I wish he would send everything through the Agriculture Committee. Then we might actually get something done for the American people around here.

We might fix our broken immigration system to make sure our farmers have access to the labor they need. We might address the threat of climate change and the strain it will put on our food systems. We might address the backlog of infrastructure projects in rural Colorado and all across the West, where some of our pipes and dams date back to the 1950s. We might push for coherent trade policies that increase market access for our farmers and ranchers, instead of subjecting them to retaliation and uncertainty.

There is a lot we could do if we took a page from the Senate Agriculture Committee and approached our work not oriented toward a political fight for the benefit of cable news but oriented toward a solution for the benefit of the American people. We need to get back to that kind of work around here.

We can start by passing this bill and giving our farmers and ranchers the

certainty they deserve from our government. Given all they do for us—providing the food, fuel, and fiber we rely on every single day—that is the least we can do for them.

I thank my colleague from Arkansas, who has joined me on the floor and has been such a great member of the Ag Committee as we brought this bill forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I also thank my colleague, the Senator from Colorado, for his efforts in getting this done. It has been a real bipartisan effort. We hear so much about all the infighting that goes on here, and this is certainly one of the underpinnings of our country. Again, we are working very hard to get it across the finish line. So I thank him very much.

The majority leader recently announced his intention to keep the Senate in session through the majority of August. It is the right thing to do. We have a lot of work to complete ahead of us, and our to-do list just got a little bit longer with today's excellent news. The 12 appropriations bills are at the top of that list. We have been busy clearing these bills at the committee level and now on the Senate floor. I am particularly pleased that Military Construction-VA appropriations bill was part of the first group of appropriations bills that received bipartisan approval here on the Senate floor.

While we work to ensure passage of bills that fund vital Federal programs, we must also continue to pass the important bills that authorize them. We have a chance this week to add to our list of bipartisan achievements by passing the farm bill, which was recently approved by the Ag Committee with overwhelming support from both sides of the aisle.

If you have ever been to Arkansas, I don't need to tell you how important the farm bill is to our State. You have seen it. You have seen the cotton fields, the rice silos, the chicken farms, the cattle ranches. We have it all in the Natural State. In fact, 95 percent of the land resources of Arkansas are devoted to agriculture and forestry. While there is variety in what our farmers grow or raise on their land, the family farm is a way of life shared by thousands of Arkansans.

Agriculture is a driving force of the Natural State's economy, adding \$16 billion to our economy every year and accounting for approximately one in every six jobs. But the farm economy is in a much different place than the last time this Chamber debated a farm bill. That is the case not just in my home State of Arkansas; it is an issue nationwide. If you look at the numbers across the Nation, farm income is approximately half of what it was then. Farm bankruptcies are up by 39 percent since 2014; financing is becoming more expensive; input costs are rising; and the trade outlook is volatile and uncertain.

Farmers across the country, regardless of where they call home or which crops they grow, are hurting. They are experiencing the most fragile farm economy since the 1980s farm crisis. With the current farm bill set to expire at the end of September, we must pass a new one in a timely manner to provide certainty and predictability to the folks who feed and clothe our Nation and the world.

Programs authorized by the farm bill are vital to making sure that as a nation we do not become dependent on other countries for our food supply. Along with providing key risk management tools for our farmers, the farm bill also helps our rural communities by authorizing key economic development and job creation programs. It helps rural Arkansans with everything from home financing to internet access to small business loans.

The Agriculture Committee, under the leadership of Chairman ROBERTS and Ranking Member STABENOW, approved a fair and equitable farm bill with overwhelming bipartisan support. I was particularly pleased to see that the committee-passed mark maintained strong farm policy for producers of all stripes. These programs allow our Nation's family farms to compete in a high-risk, heavily subsidized global marketplace. As we debate amendments on the floor, we must defeat amendments that would harm the farm safety net for our producers.

Ensuring that producers across the Nation have options that meet their specific needs when those needs are so varied is a delicate balance to strive for, but the chairman and ranking member have achieved it. I appreciate what a heavy lift it is and what it took to get to this point, and I hope the Senate as a whole does as well.

I do have very deep concerns about provisions included in the substitute amendment that undermine this delicate balance. One provision in particular, aimed at bolstering small family farms, will, in fact, hurt family farms across the country. Unfortunately, we do not know exactly how deep this cut will be. The provision was not filed as an amendment, and Senators were not given time to properly read it. But I do know one thing: This will hurt farmers and the rural communities where they live. USDA estimates that my home State of Arkansas will be the third most impacted State, behind Texas and Illinois. Iowa will be the fourth most impacted State.

This provision does not discriminate against regions. It discriminates against farmers and those who feed and clothe this Nation. I am very much opposed to this language, but I am thankful that the House did not take this tack in crafting its farm policy.

I am committed to working to remove this provision before we enact a final farm bill this Congress. We must provide a farm bill that gives producers certainty and predictability without further exacerbating the difficult farm economy they are facing.

If we can commit to continuing to follow the fair and equitable approach that was exhibited when we fashioned the bill in committee, we can pass a farm bill that has a chance to become law. Let's not squander this opportunity.

Our farmers in rural America need this bill. Let's get it passed so that we can provide our farmers and ranchers with the certainty and predictability they need to succeed.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FAMILY SEPARATION

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the immigration crisis that this President has generated.

The Nation has seen images of children trapped behind wire fencing and children sleeping on concrete floors. We have seen the tents hurriedly set up to house children separated from their parents. We have seen the video of Jessica, who doesn't know where her mother is and wants to talk to her. We have heard the audio of young children crying out for their mothers and fathers. We have heard the audio of a detention facility staff person telling the kids not to talk to the press, claiming it will hurt their immigration case.

As of June 12, on American soil, over 100 babies under the age of 1 year are being held in detention by the American Government. We think this can't be happening in the United States of America, but it is.

Last Friday, Senators HEINRICH, BLUMENTHAL, and I visited President Trump's tent city in Tornillo, TX, and we toured a Border Patrol station in Clint and El Paso and a port of entry in El Paso. We were turned away from Tornillo on Friday, so I went back Saturday and got inside to see the children. We all went to these government facilities to get answers, but we came up short.

Most pressing, we still don't know when or how all the thousands of children taken from their parents will be reunited. We don't know how children whose parents have already been deported will be reunited. We have parents scared that they will never see their children again.

The confusion, chaos, and incompetence with which the President's zero tolerance policy was executed is only outmatched by the confusion, chaos, and incompetence with which reunification is being handled.

The immediate priority must be to get these children back to their parents as soon as possible. We know we are doing damage to these children

every day that they are not with their families. We know this. Pediatric and mental health professionals all agree. The American Academy of Pediatrics condemned the administration because those doctors know that separating families can result in "irreparable harm." That is a quote from the American Academy of Pediatrics—"irreparable harm" to separated children.

Last weekend, I saw children detained in the tents in Tornillo who were able to talk to their parents only twice a week for 10 minutes. I saw astounding young children—children 3 to 10 years old—who had crossed the border without their parents. I saw families from Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador, fleeing violence and persecution, locked in detention at Border Patrol. I met Jade Gabriela, who is not even 2, and her father, detained in El Paso, both of them trying to escape the brutality and gangs in Honduras.

President Trump claims there is a border crisis, but communities on the border dispute this. I am a Senator from a border State, and I dispute this. I represent border communities, and I have been to the border many, many times recently and over the years. President Trump has not. He should come see for himself and see the humanitarian crisis he has created.

Detention facilities for children are overwhelmed. We have heard from a whistleblower in New York that there is not enough staffing at her facility because of all the young children coming in. These internment camp-like facilities—as former First Lady Laura Bush has compared them to—are costing Americans and American taxpayers millions of dollars. The Tornillo tent city costs \$400,000 every day. The President's poorly conceived Executive order directs the Department of Homeland Security Secretary to set up even more family detention facilities on military bases.

Zero tolerance has overwhelmed the U.S. attorney's offices on the border. Now, instead of prosecuting violent criminals for serious crimes, Federal prosecutors are wasting resources, focusing instead on criminally prosecuting mothers and fathers for misdemeanor improper-entry violations. There is a call to take military JAG lawyers away from their more important duties to handle the flood of immigration cases and recall prosecutors from their posts in Indian Country, where they are so sorely needed. All systems are bursting at the seams thanks to the President's made-up crisis, cruelty, and bureaucratic incompetence.

As of today, there is no clear path forward to reunite families. There is no timeline. Tuesday, Secretary Azar of Health and Human Services admitted in his testimony before the Senate Finance Committee that there is no timeline. The Department of Health and Human Services is prohibited under the Flores case from reuniting children with parents who are in detention.

The President wants to keep zero tolerance in place and continue to prosecute and keep parents in detention with their children. Not only is this cruel and un-American, but I think the Federal judge in Flores is going to reject the President's request to allow children to be jailed with their parents longer than 20 days.

The President has doubled down on zero tolerance. Like many of his policies that are hastily implemented and borne of his divisive agenda, there is no plan B if the court refuses, as it should, to allow children to be jailed with their parents.

There is an obvious solution. Successful alternatives to detention have demonstrated compliance rates of 99 percent with court appearances and ICE appointments. These programs are both effective and cost a fraction of what it takes to detain families. Why doesn't the President use these programs and save taxpayers millions of dollars? Because he thinks it doesn't appear tough and takes away his bargaining chip of detained children that he thinks he can use to get his wall.

In the President's rush to gain political traction, he has created a humanitarian and moral crisis within our own borders, the likes of which we have not seen since we interned families of Japanese heritage during World War II.

I can tell you that I will not back down from this fight. More importantly, I can tell you that the American people and New Mexicans are with me. It is the voices of the American people that forced the President to retreat from his brutal family separation policy, and it is those voices that will prevail in the end.

The administration is trying its hardest to hide what is going on from the American people, but the American people are demanding answers. We all must continue to speak out until we have policies in place that make sure families stay together, lawfully and humanely. We need alternatives to detention, and we need to stand up for due process.

As Americans see images of separated children and family detention camps, they turn to Congress, and they turn to the judicial system as well. A Federal judge recently issued a ruling barring family detention and ordering reunification within 30 days, but the Trump administration may fight this ruling—just like they are fighting to overturn Flores, which came out of a Supreme Court case.

RETIREMENT OF JUSTICE ANTHONY KENNEDY

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, today, Justice Kennedy has announced he is retiring. I had some very strong disagreements with his rulings, especially on campaign finance reform, but I thank him for his service. He was a thoughtful Justice. I am very concerned with the process to replace him.

The majority leader is trying to eliminate advice and consent from the process. We should wait until after the upcoming election. That will be a shorter time than Leader MCCONNELL waited in 2016, the last election year.

I am very concerned with the President's process. He is picking from an ideological list, with a history of personally attacking judges he disagrees with, while demanding loyalty from his appointees. At the same time, this administration is undermining due process across the board—along the border, for minority races or religions, for a woman's right to choose.

The Constitution requires a real advice-and-consent process. The majority leader needs to ensure one. If the McConnell rule was in place in the 2016 election year, it should be in place for 2018.

Given the President's attacks on due process and rule of law, we should let the people speak before we consider his next Supreme Court nominee.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FARM BILL

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I am here on the Senate floor this afternoon to discuss, really, the farm bill but, more importantly, to discuss the current state of the farm economy in the place I call home, Kansas.

Every 5 years, we have an opportunity to develop farm policy, and this is my fourth time, I would guess, in being involved in farm bill discussions and negotiations and the passage of a farm bill. Each farm bill is developed at a time at which agriculture faces unique challenges, and rural America is in a different circumstance. Yet the farm bill is important to us. It is important to Kansans, and it is important to Kansans whether they are farmers or not. This is a way in which we provide certainty, security—a future—for the places that many of us call home.

The challenges farmers and ranchers face today are significant. They are tremendous. The ag economy is struggling, and commodity prices are low. Over the course of the 2014 farm bill—the one we are soon to replace—farm revenues have fallen by over 50 percent, and there continue to be those low commodity prices today.

In addition to low commodity prices, weather has not been our friend in Kansas and in many places across the country, especially in the Midwest with its continuing drought. So you end up with the worst of circumstances—low commodity prices and not much production.

It is important that we pass the farm bill. It is important that we provide certainty. It is important that we provide a safety net to those who struggle every day to feed, clothe, and provide energy to us and the rest of the world.

A primary motivation for which I asked Kansans to represent them here in the U.S. Senate and to represent them in Congress is the belief that rural America is a place worthy of keeping around for a while longer and I hope a long while longer. But when agricultural interests struggle and when farmers and ranchers are in difficult circumstances, every community across Kansas struggles, and, in fact, the United States of America faces tremendous challenges.

Again, you don't have to be a farmer or rancher in our State, but your community's future depends upon whether the farmers and ranchers are successful. The extended downturn in the economy has forced more and more ag producers to look for off-the-farm income. Many farmers and I would say most farmers in Kansas no longer earn a living solely by farming. Husband, wife, or both have to find off-the-farm income to keep the farm intact.

The Wall Street Journal indicates that 82 percent of income for U.S. farm households is expected to come from jobs off the farm this year. I highlight that because it is that struggle that farmers face every year, all the time, every day, to keep the farm intact.

I visit with farmers and ranchers on a regular basis, and it is apparent that the stress they are encountering is taking its toll. Many farm families are now stretched to the limit of their financial viability.

This week, the Senate has the opportunity to consider and to vote for legislation that will help address the challenges in rural America. The Senate farm bill provides a stable safety net for our farmers and ranchers; protects key risk management tools, crop insurance in particular; and ensures continued access to credit for producers, particularly for our young farmers, which is so important. You cannot borrow money from a bank or from a financial institution in the absence of the safety net that the farm bill provides. You cannot borrow money from a financial institution for a line of credit for your farm to pay for the seed or to buy the fuel in the absence of crop insurance that protects you in the loss or reduction in production on your farm.

I appreciate the strong focus in this farm bill on rural development and on conservation programs. The farm bill is mostly about SNAP, nutrition programs, but the title of the farm bill that is also important to our country is title I, which is the farm program, but you add to that conservation programs, add to that rural development programs, and this is one of the most significant opportunities we have to stand strong, side by side with those who live in rural America.

One of the primary ways that I judge whether farm policy or a farm bill is of

value is the circumstances in which we allow for young farmers, young men and women who grew up on a farm, young people who want to be a farmer—do they have the opportunity to return to their home community, to their family's farm and become farmers? Is that increasing or decreasing? Again, I look at a farm bill and whether it is successful by looking at whether we are increasing the number of young men and women across Kansas and the United States who return to take over family farming and ranching operations.

The McCurry Bros. Angus farm in Sedgwick, KS, is an example of this generational operation that we ought to make sure continues into the future. I just saw and learned yesterday that this year the McCurry Bros. farm is notably celebrating its 90th anniversary. We need more aspects of American life like the McCurry brothers and other farmers and ranching operations where sons and daughters work alongside moms and dads and grandmothers and grandfathers. In agriculture, land, equipment, and livestock are passed down from generation to generation.

I care about farmers and ranchers because they are the economic future of most communities in my State, but I also care about farmers and ranchers because it is a way of life that allows us to pass on values, morals, integrity, and tradition from one generation to the next.

That opportunity to work side by side with mom and dad and the opportunity to work side by side with grandparents is a vanishing thing in our country. Agriculture is a place where it still occurs, and it has been important in the way in which our country has developed—that relationship, that passing of integrity, character, love of life, and understanding what is truly valuable in life. Knowing about farming and ranching and working with your parents and grandparents changes the way you see the world, and in my view, this country needs more of that, not less.

This farm bill is especially important now because of the uncertainty that exists related to trade. With low commodity prices and uncertain export markets now, providing risk management tools and a strong safety net through a farm bill is even more important than ever.

There are low commodity prices, poor weather, and now the uncertainty of where the United States will end up with regard to trade around the globe. We should be clear that no farm program safety net can replace lost exports and lost markets in agriculture. That is why it is critical that we successfully conclude NAFTA renegotiations and avoid a multifront trade war that will have a direct economic consequence for agriculture in rural Kansas.

In meetings across Kansas, sometimes I hear: Jerry, let's just forget the rest of the world. Let's just take care of ourselves.

But if a farmer thinks that or says that or if we think that is possible, I would say to those people: Which 48 percent of wheat acres in Kansas do you not want to plant and do you not want to harvest? We produce more in the United States in agriculture than we can consume, and we earn a living by selling that surplus to places around the globe. It is income to farmers and ranchers. It is the economic future of my State.

The trade uncertainty has already impacted markets, as countries that typically buy American-grown commodities have started to look to other suppliers, including to our competitors, especially Argentina and Brazil. Given the trade and market uncertainty, it is critical that we do our job and pass a farm bill this week as we work toward a finished product for the President to sign by the end of September, when the current farm bill, the current legislation, expires.

In that economic development aspect of the farm bill and in that rural development aspect of the farm bill, I want to mention a key provision of the Senate farm bill. I want to indicate some areas in which we can make some improvements, and I would like to do this in a highlighted way in a brief manner.

I want to talk about the importance of broadband to rural States like mine. I was excited to see that the fiscal year 2018 omnibus bill included a loan and grant program in the United States to bolster broadband across our States and bridge the digital divide between urban and rural. To ensure effective use of those Federal resources, I applaud the Senate farm bill for including critical guardrails to prevent duplication and overbuilding of broadband infrastructure for new and current USDA programs. We want to make sure those dollars are spent where there are no broadband services or where there is very little.

Access to broadband in agriculture is so important. It matters in our communities, schools, libraries, hospitals, and businesses, but to farmers in today's world, technology is the key, and broadband access determines whether your farm equipment can provide you with the latest technology and information to more efficiently and effectively and hopefully more profitably farm. Access to quality high-speed broadband will remain a necessary tool for rural communities to participate in an increasingly globalized economy.

I also want to mention something called ECP. I note my appreciation to Chairman ROBERTS that this bill includes an amendment that I offered along with Democratic Members in the Senate, to increase the level of support that ranchers would receive under the Emergency Conservation Program, ECP.

In 2016 and 2017, I talked about how weather wasn't our friend, but that drought then caused fires to consume thousands of acres of grassland in our State, causing great damage to cattle

producers. Ten thousand miles of fence was destroyed in Clark County, KS, alone. The ECP provided assistance to producers but in many cases fell well short of providing the level of assistance needed to replace the miles of fence that ranchers lost in the fire. It wasn't just fencing that ranchers lost; it was their entire herd in many instances.

We also learned of areas of ECP that ought to be improved as a result of those fires. This legislation incorporates those provisions, and I am appreciative that is the case.

Farmers and ranchers have been frustrated by the long delays they have encountered in receiving reimbursement for building those fences under ECP. In many instances, the ranchers didn't have the money to pay for the fencing in the beginning. So this is a significant improvement, and I am grateful it is here. When a ranching family has lost everything in a fire, including cattle, fence, rangeland, and their homes, taking over a year to provide emergency assistance is unacceptable. Further, because they lost everything, many of the ranchers do not have any collateral necessary to get a loan to cover the significant costs of rebuilding fencing.

I also want to compliment the Senator from South Dakota for legislation in an amendment that he has offered regarding livestock hauling. We have a significant problem in our ranching world where, in many communities, truckers—those who haul cattle from market to market, from feed yard, to market, to processing plant—that is an important way to earn a living. The Senator from South Dakota, Mr. THUNE, has offered an additional 150-mile radius exemption for agriculture at the end of that drive.

Cattle are transported across this Nation to Kansas each year, and we need to make sure that the hours-of-service rules for those haulers allow that to occur safely and humanely, yet allow the transportation to continue to occur. I am a cosponsor of legislation to address this issue, and I hope that amendment is included in the farm bill.

Again, I appreciate the chance to have a conversation with my colleagues this evening to highlight the importance of this legislation. This is about the future of America. It is about the future of rural America.

I always look forward to working on a farm bill that allows us an opportunity to enact and improve on policies that help the farmers, ranchers, and the rural communities they live in and support. This farm bill will provide stable farm policies during a time of high uncertainty in agriculture.

I thank Senator ROBERTS, the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, my colleague from Kansas, and I thank the Senator from Michigan, Ms. STABENOW, the ranking Democrat on the committee, for working together. I hope at the end of the day or by the end of this

week we will see the benefits of their work.

I look forward to supporting this bill and continuing to work to improve the final version as it continues its march through conference with the House.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I commend my colleague for his focus on the farm bill and thank him for the work we are doing together on the Consumer Protection Subcommittee of the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee. I look forward to continuing that work together, which involves so closely and importantly the rule of law.

FAMILY SEPARATION

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I come to the floor on a separate issue involving the rule of law. We have been reminded literally within the last 24 hours about the importance of the rule of law as applied to the families who have sought to cross the border and experienced extraordinary cruelty and inhumanity when their children were taken from them. A court, literally in the last 24 hours, issued an order requiring that those children be reunited with their families. That decision is not only a humane and moral one, it is also in accord with constitutional and statutory requirements. Those children never should have been separated from their parents, but now, because of the court, an excessive and abusive use of power will be corrected.

We are living in a time of unparalleled threats to the rule of law and fundamental rights and liberties from a Chief Executive who seems to have no respect for them. The courts are exercising their traditional role—in fact, the role the Founders envisioned for them as a check on unhinged Executive power.

We also learned just today that a key figure in the judicial system, Justice Kennedy, will be retiring this summer. This retirement is earthshaking and gut-wrenching, and his departure means a historic challenge is ahead. The American people should have a voice. My Republican colleagues should follow their own precedent. A confirmation vote should take place after the new Congress is seated. A historic decision—one that will literally shake the decisions of the courts for years and likely decades—requires deliberate consideration that simply is impossible in the short months we have between now and the election; indeed, politically charged months.

The future of privacy protections, women's healthcare, and many basic civil rights, including healthcare—whether young people are on their parents' insurance until the age of 26, whether people are vulnerable to pre-existing condition abuses, whether people have basic healthcare rights that

are guaranteed to them under the Affordable Care Act—all of these rights are at stake and at risk.

The Supreme Court is not just marble pillars and velvet drapes. Its decisions have a direct impact on people's lives and the lives of our children. So we are in this Chamber at a critical moment when the judicial system literally will be determined for decades to come.

Nothing brings this issue home more readily and dramatically than viewing the children who have been separated from their families and the families themselves at the border.

I visited the border this past Friday, along with my colleagues Senator HEINRICH and Senator UDALL of Utah—two good friends and colleagues. At each stop we made, we saw the devastating human impact of this President's immoral and inhumane policies of family separation and family detention. In Tornillo, TX, we visited a tent city where teenagers, 14 to 17 years old, are confined—in effect, incarcerated in a modern-day internment camp. Make no mistake, they have been deprived of basic access to the outside world and of access by that outside world to them.

The deprivation of liberty is the core definition of incarceration, and the potential detainment of tens of thousands of families in exactly that kind of tent city located on our military bases throughout the country should frighten and alarm every American because we are seeing repeated in a different age, in color rather than black and white, the images of those internment camps where thousands of people of Japanese descent were sent during World War II.

We may not agree with every decision of the U.S. Supreme Court, but we know it is unique. It is certainly different as a judicial institution. It should be considered unique in choosing open-minded and fair jurists in the mold of Justice Kennedy for these positions—not right-wing fringe ideologues.

I believe colleagues on both sides of the aisle will stand up and be counted if that kind of right-wing fringe ideology is nominated. We certainly must use every tool available to stop that kind of nominee because what is at stake are real lives like the ones I saw in El Paso.

I met with a 2-year-old girl who trekked across Mexico with her father for a month. Her father held her as we spoke to him. He must now worry whether she will be separated from him and detained indefinitely and indiscriminately. The anguish and anxiety I saw in that girl's eyes still haunt me, and it will be with me for a long time.

We saw a legal, moral, and humanitarian crisis unfolding before our eyes in realtime. This administration claims it is solving this crisis, but the clear, virtually undisputed evidence suggests exactly the contrary. More than 100 facilities nationwide house migrant children, and the administration

is looking to open even more facilities, very likely, on military bases, and little progress has been made on reunifying these families.

The Department of Health and Human Services has reported that 2,047 unaccompanied minor children are still in its custody. Health and Human Services Secretary Azar claimed before the Finance Committee yesterday that there is “no reason why any parent would not know where their child is located.” He claimed that “every parent should know where their child is located.”

The reality is, there is no plan to reunite them. Thousands of parents have no idea where their children are. What is happening on the ground is that many parents are enduring the pain and suffering of simply not knowing where their child is, and many children have the pain and suffering of not knowing where their parent is. The father of the 2-year-old whom I saw clutching his child to his chest as she stared into the unknown future ahead of her has no reason to believe the Secretary of Health and Human Services because he knows what the reality is on the ground.

If the Department of Health and Human Services or the Department of Homeland Security can tell parents where their children are as easily as Secretary Azar claims, they should have done so yesterday. They should have done so before Friday when I visited.

We all know, from firsthand accounts, it simply isn't happening and that the emotional, mental, and physical damage to these families will last a lifetime for many of them. That trauma will be enduring. The President claims his Executive order has solved these problems, but it has not. All it has done is substitute family imprisonment and incarceration for family separation.

This Executive order is in clear violation of the Flores settlement agreement, which is legally binding on the U.S. Government. It prohibits detaining children for more than 20 days, in effect, imprisoning them with their parents, as the Executive order has the effect of doing. Putting aside the humanitarian and moral costs to this Nation and the damage to our image around the world, the cost per individual per day in Tornillo is \$2,000. Let me repeat that number. The cost per individual per day for every person in Tornillo is \$2,000. That cost alone, financially, is intolerable, but moral and humanitarian costs are even more profound.

This Executive order is destructive. It is draconian. It is no answer to the problem of family separation and detention. The evidence is clear from my visit to the border, so far as I am concerned but also in everything the administration said, that the time is now to end this immoral and inhumane zero tolerance policy that involves, integrally, criminal prosecution, and the

rest of these issues really flow from that criminal prosecution because it triggers the imprisonment. In effect, confinement without bail is the way it would be looked at in the civilian setting.

This administration must adopt less restrictive alternatives if it wants to guarantee the appearance of these families for their hearings. We know less restrictive alternatives work, they have been proven in the past, and they also cost less. They are more humane. They protect our moral principles, and they are less expensive.

Piecemeal announcements from this administration have been contradictory and unclear. It has been the opposite of transparent. Congressional committees now must exercise our responsibility for oversight and scrutiny. There must be hearings. It must involve all the Federal agencies with responsibility. As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I am particularly concerned that the Department of Defense is dramatically increasing its involvement in immigration and enforcement. The plan is to build these tent camps on two military bases in Texas. Fort Bliss in El Paso is one of them, and unaccompanied children will be held at Goodfellow Air Force Base in San Angelo. The families at Fort Bliss and the unaccompanied children at Goodfellow Air Force Base in San Angelo will be, in effect, incarcerated at the bases of military men and women who serve and sacrifice for the values that will be betrayed by that illegal and immoral confinement, in violation of the Flores agreement and fundamental principles of fairness.

Military services are preparing, as well, to offer additional military bases to detain migrants. DOD has sent 21 Active and Reserve uniformed judge advocates to the border on temporary order to prosecute Department of Justice immigration cases. All of these developments represent a clear diversion of Department of Defense resources from military mission to immigration enforcement.

The Presiding Officer and I serve together on the Armed Services Committee as well as the Judiciary Committee. We both know the deep and serious consideration that was required as to resource commitments in the latest National Defense Authorization Act—the difficult decisions that had to be made in a time of scarce resources and growing danger around the world through our military and national security. I am concerned that these policies will comprise military residents and immigrants on American military installations.

I consistently oppose the use of these military installations to house unaccompanied migrant children. I will continue to oversee the Department of Defense's involvement in this critical issue.

Again, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that the Senate Armed Services Committee must hold

an oversight hearing on this issue as soon as possible. We owe it to the American people. Family separation and detention should no longer be a political issue. We need to come together and make sure the President understands that migrant children can no longer be treated as pawns or hostages—as leverage to secure changes to parts of our immigration system that have nothing to do with the plight of these immigrant families. We should reject this President's crude and cynical political strategy. We cannot risk continuing to separate and indefinitely detain migrant families. These practices offend our basic sense of morality and justice, and they are unnecessary to protect our borders.

Yes, we all want border security. Yes, we want to stop drug traffickers and human traffickers from taking advantage of our borders. We want more resources in judges and Border Patrol agents and members of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection Service. They should have the resources and support they need. We met with many of the dedicated men and women who are serving in those agencies. Violating our basic sense of due process, abrogating due process rights so adjudication is denied and due process is abrogated certainly should be intolerable.

At this juncture, the emergent need that has to be addressed now is reuniting these families. If shaming the administration is what is needed, we should do it, but ultimately the rule of law will be enforced by our courts. They will be regarded in history along with our free press as the bulwark between a potentially tyrannical Presidency and preservation of our fundamental rights. Now is the time to celebrate and protect those basic rights and the rule of law.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING JUDGE GEORGE LEIGHTON

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, 27 years ago this week, one of the towering giants of American justice announced that he was retiring. Thurgood Marshall was a pillar of America's civil rights revolution, architect of the legal strategy that ended the shameful era of official segregation in this Nation, and the first African-American Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. His name will be forever linked with such civil rights icons as Martin Luther King, Rosa Parks, Fannie Lou Hamer, and JOHN LEWIS.

But the moral arc of the universe is never bent by just a few hands. We

know that. The foot soldiers for justice in America's civil rights revolution also includes millions of people whose names are not recorded in history books—people like the men and women of Montgomery, AL, who walked to work and church and every other place for more than a year in 1955 and '56 rather than ride on the back of segregated city buses. The moral arc of the universe was bent by thousands of ordinary men and women who risked their livelihoods and sometimes even their lives by daring to try to register to vote in some states in the Deep South before the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

The city of Chicago was honored to be the adopted home for more than 70 years of a man who bent the moral arc of the universe more than most. George Leighton's name may not be as well known as that of his old friend, Thurgood Marshall, but his contribution to the civil rights movement and to American justice was profound. Judge Leighton died earlier this month at the age of 105. If you think that is remarkable, consider this: He only retired 6 years ago, at the age of 99, still strong and sharp as a tack.

As a pioneering civil rights lawyer, George Leighton took on entrenched racism and injustice in Chicago and far beyond. He fought for fair housing and integrated public schools in Illinois and for voting rights and equal access to jury service in the Deep South, and he won. Several of his legal victories took him all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court.

George Leighton was also a distinguished law professor and a judge. In 1969, he made history as the first African American ever to sit on the Illinois Appellate Court. Six years later, President Gerald Ford nominated him to serve on the Federal bench as a U.S. District Court Judge for the Northern District of Illinois. As a fellow judge and admirer and recently, Judge Leighton defined for generations of Chicagoans what it meant to be a lawyer.

He was a man of enormous intelligent, integrity, and courage who dedicate his first to seeing that the law was applied equally to all. He had a heroic imagination. Board and raised in the era of Jim Crow, he had the vision to imaging a more just America and the courage to help bring that America into existence. His work and his sacrifices broke barriers and changed the meaning of equality in this country.

Judge Leighton was eloquent, with a rich baritone voice. He dressed impeccably, elegantly, and stood ramrod straight well into his 90s. He was a champion chess player. Despite all of that, he was a remarkably humble man.

He was born in 1912 in New Bedford, MA, one of seven children of immigrant parents from the Cape Verde Islands off the western coast of Africa. His family's name was Leitao—a Creole name—but a fourth-grade teacher

changed his name to Leighton, reasoning that he would go further in life with a name that sounded more American.

He and his siblings worked with his parents in cranberry bogs and picked strawberries and blueberries from March until late November every year. His early education was hit-or-miss, since education had to fit in around the demands of farm work. He had reached only the seventh grade by age 17, when he left home to work on an oil tanker sailing from Fall River, MA, to Aruba, off the northern coast of South America. That job ended when the ship's crew mutinied.

George Leighton returned to New Bedford, working in restaurant kitchens and playing percussion in a dance band.

Always a voracious reader, he borrowed books wherever he could and took classes through the Works Project Administration. In 1936, he tied for first place in a local essay contest. With his \$200 prize money, he talked Howard University into admitting him on a conditional basis, without a high school diploma. He made the dean's list that first semester and every semester and graduated from Howard 2 years later, Phi Beta Kappa.

It was during his Howard years that he met Virginia Quivers, the woman who would become his wife and the love of his life.

After Howard, George Leighton attended Harvard Law School on scholarship—one of the few African Americans of his generation to attend that prestigious school—working odd jobs to support himself.

His law studies were interrupted after 1 year by World War II. For 3 years, he served as an officer in the U.S. Army's fabled 93rd Infantry Division, an all-Black division, in places such as Guadalcanal.

He returned to Harvard after the war's end and graduated a year later.

He moved to Chicago to start his legal career. He had never been to Chicago before, but he knew two things about the city: It was a cauldron of racial tension, and Chicago voters had just elected the only African-American Member of Congress. There was important work to do in Chicago, and there was a glimmer of hope that change was possible.

The Chicago that greeted George Leighton was a hard place. Even with a Harvard law degree, George Leighton couldn't rent office space or dine in many of the restaurants or stay at a hotel in the Loop. He was not allowed to join the segregated Chicago Bar Association or the American Bar Association.

For 18 years, he practiced law with other African American attorneys, from an office in the shadow of Comiskey Park on Chicago's South Side. When his clients couldn't afford to pay him, which was not uncommon, he worked for free.

He built a national reputation for criminal and civil rights cases and several times won cases before the U.S.

Supreme Court. He helped integrate the Chicago Housing Authority and the public schools of Harrisburg, IL. In the South, he successfully challenged an amendment to the Alabama State constitution that used a "constitutional knowledge" test to deny African Americans the right to vote. He also helped to end the exclusion of African Americans from jury duty in Mississippi.

In 1951, 5 years after arriving in Chicago, George Leighton was indicted by a Cook County grand jury. His "crime"? Telling his clients, an African-American family, that they had a legal right to rent an apartment in the then all-White Chicago suburb of Cicero. Enraged neighbors rioted, nearly burning the apartment building nearly to the ground.

The county grand jury indicted George Leighton on charges of conspiracy to incite riot and lower property values. Judge Leighton was represented by his friend, Thurgood Marshall, and the indictment was quickly dismissed.

Not long after that, with the support of Chicago Mayor Richard J. Daley, George Leighton was elected as a Cook County judge. He was later elevated to the State appellate court, the first African American to sit on that bench.

He served as a Federal judge from 1976 until 1989. He would have preferred to stay on the bench, but his beloved wife, Virginia, had suffered several strokes some time before. Judge Leighton's insistence to provide her with round-the-clock medical care had depleted the family's savings, and he needed to make more money.

He returned to private law practice, joining the Chicago firm of Neal & Leroy. His new partner, Langdon Neal, was the son of Judge Leighton's old friend. Judge Leighton could have joined any law firm in Chicago, but he chose once again to go with a small, minority-owned firm. That was important to him.

Langdon Neal tells the story about walking into the office early one morning to find the lights already on. He looked into Judge Leighton's office, saw him sprawled out on the floor, and feared the worst. Before his law partner could say a word, Judge Leighton pushed himself up and did 10 more push-ups. He was taking a rest during his morning exercises.

At 77, he still had a lot of fight still in him. For the next 22 years, he would practice law, looking and sounding like a man decades younger. At 97, his hearing, vision, and cholesterol were all still perfect, and he was only 3 pounds heavier than when he was released from Active military duty.

As a Cook County judge in 1965, Judge Leighton acquitted two Latino men accused of beating and slashing a Chicago police officer. Judge Leighton believed that the officers who testified against the men were lying, and he told them so.

The decision touched off a public furor and angry calls to remove Judge

Leighton from the bench. A Chicago Tribune reporter asked the judge if he feared for his safety. No, Judge Leighton quipped, "I'm making careful plans to die of old age in office."

Six years ago this month, June 2012, the Cook County courthouse where Judge Leighton acquitted those men, the courthouse where he first made his name as a civil rights lawyer in the 1940s and '50s and where he began his career as a judge, was renamed in his honor. "26th and Cal" is now the Judge George N. Leighton Criminal Court Building. It is one of many tributes in his honor.

In 2005, the main post office in his boyhood home of New Bedford, MA, was renamed in his honor. In 2008, the Illinois Supreme Court Historic Preservation Commission established the Honorable George N. Leighton Justice Award. Judge Leighton accepted these and other honors with grace, humility, and a bit of puzzlement. He was always genuinely surprised that people found his life worth celebrating in such ways.

There was only one honor that Judge Leighton wanted for himself at the end of his life. His final wish was to be buried in Arlington National Cemetery.

Judge Leighton died in New Bedford on June 6, the 74th anniversary of D-Day. In a reflection of Judge Leighton's distinguished military service, his place in American history, and the esteem in which he was held by so many, Arlington National Cemetery has approved his burial in those hallowed grounds.

Sometime in the not-too-distant future, Judge George Leighton, the son of immigrants who bent the moral arc of history, will be laid to rest at Arlington National Cemetery. He will rest there in honor among such other American heroes as his old friend, Thurgood Marshall, General Benjamin O. Davis, the commander of the Tuskegee Airmen and the first African-American general in the U.S. Air Force, and other members of the Army's 93rd Infantry Division, with whom Judge Leighton fought with in World War II. It is a fitting final tribute to a great man who fought so long and in so many ways to preserve and defend freedom and liberty for all.

I am honored to have known him, and Loretta and I want to offer our condolences to his family, especially to his daughters, Virginia and Barbara, and their husbands, to Judge Leighton's five grandchildren and eight great-grandchildren, and to his friends and colleagues.

ENERGY AND WATER, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH, AND MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS APPROPRIATIONS BILL AND THE AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION BILL

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss votes on final passage of H.R. 5895 and the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2.

I was not in Washington on Monday because I was visiting Senator JOHN MCCAIN at his ranch in Arizona.

The Energy and Water, Legislative Branch, and Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act of 2019, H.R. 5895, is the result of a commendable bipartisan negotiation process led by Chairman SHELBY and Ranking Member LEAHY of the Appropriations Committee. The bill includes strong funding for ongoing work on Bureau of Reclamation rural water projects like the Lewis & Clark Regional Water System that will benefit approximately 300,000 people in the southwest Minnesota, southeast South Dakota, and northwest Iowa regions. The bill also includes legislation I led with Senator TILLIS to create a center of excellence within the Department of Veterans Affairs to address the health conditions relating to exposure to burn pits. Had I been in Washington, I would have voted in favor of its passage.

The Agriculture and Nutrition Act, H.R. 2, passed the Senate Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee by a vote of 20 to 1. The bill will provide critical investments in communities in Minnesota and will provide much-needed certainty for our farmers and ranchers. The bill includes provisions I championed to continue investments in renewable energy programs, create an animal disease and disaster program, and provide support for our dairy farmers. Had I been in Washington, I would have voted in favor of the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to the bill.

Thank you.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement from the National Sheriff's Association about border security and immigration reform be printed in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL SHERIFF'S ASSOCIATION POSITION STATEMENT ON BORDER SECURITY AND IMMIGRATION REFORM

The Government Affairs Committee of the National Sheriffs' Association recommends to the Board that Sheriffs stand together to affirm that securing of the borders of the United States and reform of the Immigration System are the top legislative issues for the Association.

Sheriffs pledge that they will commit their influence and some financial resources of the Association to affecting a resolution to these issues.

The National Sheriffs' Association recognizes and supports results-based solutions that address or solve the multitude of challenges that ineffective border security has caused our nation and our communities.

Further, the Committee recommends that the Association vigorously supports any legislation that includes:

Support for following the Rule of Law for the legal immigration process;

Makes the Nation's borders secure through use of physical barriers, technology and increased manpower of the Customs & Border Patrol and ICE;

Sheriffs be given the statutory authority to honor ICE issued detainers for detaining illegal criminal aliens, as well as being granted indemnification under civil law and tort law for those detentions;

Have reasonable criminal background checks for all granted citizenship; and

Support for equitable and fair cost sharing through the allocation of funds to all non-federal agencies.

45TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED STATES RERECOGNIZING THE COUSHATTA TRIBE OF LOUISIANA

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, along with Senator KENNEDY, I wish to talk about the Coushatta Tribe. The Coushatta Tribe of Louisiana is descended from a large, powerful sovereign nation of Coushatta—Koasati—people who lived prosperously and peaceably for thousands of years in what is now the southeastern United States. The principal Coushatta—Koasati—villages were located on islands in the Tennessee River, in what is now south central Tennessee, which is where the Tribe was living when they first encountered the European explorer Hernando DeSoto in 1540.

Koasati oral tradition also holds that they were always the most northerly of the Muskogean-speaking peoples. Tribal elders say that their villages were “abon, fallami-fa” which literally means “above, to the north.” They believe that their tribal name comes from “Kowi iisa-fa aati-ha,” which is literally translated as “the people from [the lands] where the big cats live.” Some elders believe that the name Coosa given by the Spanish to the affiliated group of villages, what is now called the Coosa chiefdom, was actually pronounced “Kohosa” and thus the people were called “Kohosa Aati,” literally translated as the people—of Kohosa. Numerous period maps support these oral traditions, identifying these islands as “Cosauda”—Koasati, Coushatta, or some other spelling of the Tribe’s name. These include the Franquelin map of 1684, the 1711 Crisp et. al. map, and the 1720 Moll map.

When the Coushatta—Koasati—were moving southward from their villages on the Tennessee River in October 1686, they encountered the Spanish explorer Marcus Delgado. They explained to him that the two major reasons for their move were drought and aggression from the neighboring tribe of “Chalagues”—Cherokees.

The Coushatta—Koasati—initially settled in villages in the Guntersville Basin area of what is now northern Alabama, then moved a little further south to be allied with the political organization that became known as the Creek Confederacy. The present-day town of Coosada, AL is named for the Coushatta who lived in nearby villages.

The Coushattas entered into several treaties with the United States, starting with the Treaty of New York in 1790, signed for the Koasati by Alexander McGillivray and Chiefs Hopoy,

Muthtee, and Stimafutchkee, and the Creek Treaty of August 9, 1814, which was signed by Nomatlee Emautla—Captain Isaacs—of Cousoudee—Coushatta, Koasati.

When the Creek chiefs negotiated their boundary lines with the United States in 1814, they stated that their northernmost boundary should stretch to “Cosauda Island in the Tennessee River.” This is a clear indication that the Koasati people considered these lands in what is now Tennessee as their homelands, never renounced them, and that this claim was widely known and accepted by all of the Tribes. The transcribed text from the papers of the War Dept. is as follows:

We, the undersigned head men of the Creek nation, convened [on behalf of] General John Coffee, and the Confederated nations to adjust the line designated by the Treaty of Fort Jackson, and all [-] connected treaties [-] etc.—that the lines between the Cherokee nation and that part of the Creek nation added to the United States by the aforesaid Treaty ought, by right, to begin at the junction of the Eastern [-] with the Hightower [Etowah] river and continue from thence to the old Cosauda [Coushatta, Koasati] village on Cosauda Island in the Tennessee river.

In 1797, the great Coushatta Chief Red Shoes is said to have had a devastating vision of the coming Creek Wars, causing him to encourage about half of the Coushatta people to begin migrating westward. Numerous additional groups followed over the next 30 years. By the time of the Creek removals, the Coushatta—Koasati—people had split into three major groups: the present-day Coushatta Tribe of Louisiana, Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas, and Alabama-Quassarte Tribal town in Oklahoma.

As a result of Red Shoes’ leadership, the Coushatta—Koasati—relocated to Spanish territories in Louisiana and Texas. By careful diplomacy, they were able to remain culturally, linguistically, and politically autonomous.

In an 1805 report to Congress, Agent John Sibley, appointed in 1804 as an Indian Agent for the Territory of Orleans, reported that he had told Red Shoes and “Pia Mingo”—Grass Chief—“the two Conchetta Chiefs,” that “their great Father the President considered all the Red people as his Children, and he would not suffer any wrong to be done them without giving them just & legal satisfaction.”

After living in villages along the Trinity River during the Civil War and Texas fight for statehood, the Coushattas returned to Louisiana to live in villages near the present-day town of Indian Village, near Kinder, LA. Existing laws allowed the tribe to get homestead lands along Bayou Blue, three miles north of Elton, LA.

On February 9, 1898, the United States issued an Indian trust patent for 160 acres to Sissy Robinson Alabama, a Coushatta woman. The land patent explicitly provides that the Robinson patent was granted under the Indian Homestead Act.

In 1933, the trust was divided under bureau supervision and the two parcels

were held in trust for the heirs of Sissy Robinson Alabama until June 11, 1953, when fee patents were issued to the heirs. Thus, the Federal Government exercised jurisdiction over Coushatta trust lands from 1898 through 1953.

In addition, according to a report to the Division of Investigations, dated March 14, 1941, 38 homesteads were granted by the General Land Office to members of the “Koasati Tribe living in the vicinity of Elton, Louisiana” between 1862–1941. The report concludes that, of the 38 homesteads, only two were granted in accordance “with applicable law,” i.e., under the Indian Homestead Act. The two correctly issued patents were, apparently, the Robinson patent, issued under the Indian Homestead Act, and another patent issued under the same act for the benefit of another member of the Coushatta Tribe.

On September 2, 1919, an attorney from Alexandria, LA, wrote to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs on behalf of the Coushatta Tribe, asking for “allotted Indian lands.” The letter reached U.S. Representative James B. Aswell of Louisiana’s Eighth District, who in 1920 asked Mr. Cato Sells, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to provide him with the information sought by the Tribe.

On December 20, 1919, Frank E. Brandon, Special Supervisor of the United States Indian Service, issued a report to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs describing the Indian groups in Louisiana. The report describes the Coushatta Tribe’s land predicament as follows:

There is approximately 1050 acres of land owned by the Indians divided among various families in tracts ranging from ten to two hundred acres which was acquired by them under the homestead laws. Originally they were induced to make such entries by timber companies who later purchased the timber from the Indians leaving the Indians a title to cut-over land of little value for agricultural purposes on account of it being low and flat with a clay soil which is best adapted to the production of rice.

The report goes on to recommend that the Federal Government purchase 40 acres of land for a farm station, erect a cottage on the land, and provide a farmer to direct the Tribe’s farming efforts. While Brandon’s recommendations do not appear to have been implemented, the fact that he made them demonstrates the Federal Government’s ongoing relationship with the Tribe.

Over the years, the U.S. Government further engaged with the Coushattas through agents, kept track of the Tribe’s status, and provided the Tribe with limited financial assistance including funds for food, supplies, education, a physician, and farming. The government also conducted a census of the Tribe and explicitly acknowledged that the Tribe was under the jurisdiction of Federal Indian agencies. In this way, the government recognized and exercised its government-to-government relationship with the Coushatta Tribe for almost 200 years.

In 1954, Congress considered legislation that would terminate the government's recognition of the Coushatta Tribe, but this legislation was not passed, and the Tribe's recognition continued. However, for reasons unknown, the Tribe was not included in the well-known Haas Report of 1947 and was subsequently not included on the Federal Government's list of federally recognized tribes.

From 1954 to 1971, the Coushatta Tribe was therefore unofficially "terminated" through a series of clerical errors and technicalities. Despite no longer being unrecognized by the government and losing assistance, the Coushatta people survived through their hard work and determination.

However, in 1971, Ernest Stevens, Acting Commissioner at the BIA, wrote a detailed letter confirming Coushatta's longstanding relationship with the Federal Government. The Stevens letter confirmed that the Coushatta Tribe was a historical tribe that had never had its rights to Federal services terminated. "In the absence of such legislation, and in consideration of the possibility of a treaty relationship, we think that the Louisiana Coushattas are eligible for some special federal services to Indian people," Stevens wrote.

On June 27, 1973, the U.S. Department of the Interior officially rerecognized their historical relationship with the Coushatta Tribe of Louisiana, and in 1975, the Secretary of the interior took land into trust for the Tribe's benefit.

In 1985, the Federal District Court for the Western District of Louisiana, Lake Charles Division, confirmed that the Coushatta's lands were "reservation lands" and that the State of Louisiana had no criminal jurisdiction over activities on such lands.

Through the continued efforts of Tribal leaders and community members, the Coushatta Tribe has steadily grown stronger in the 45 years since receiving rerecognition. From its initial reservation base of 15 acres, the Tribe now owns more than 6,000 acres in trust and fee-simple lands.

The Coushatta Tribe now operates more than 20 departments to provide services to members, including a health department and clinic, an education department, and social services department. The Tribe owns and operates Coushatta Casino Resort, the largest land-based casino in the State of Louisiana, and employs more than 3,000 people, making it one of the largest employers in the State.

Throughout its proud history, the Coushatta Tribe of Louisiana has played an important role in communities across the South. The Tribe looks forward to its continued growth and positive impact for many generations to come.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL THADDEUS J. MARTIN

• Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize MG Thaddeus J. Martin on the occasion of his retirement from his position as adjutant general of the Connecticut National Guard.

A dedicated member of our military, Major General Martin has influenced Connecticut for the better and set an impressive standard for the future of the Connecticut National Guard thanks to his decades of leadership and public service. He is well regarded by his peers and has consistently proven himself as a mindful and quick-thinking leader.

Major General Martin began his military service in 1977. He received his commission in the U.S. Air Force through officer training school in 1980 and completed training as an aircraft maintenance officer in 1981. Throughout his years on Active service, he held several squadron and wing-level assignments and completed a major command headquarters tour with Strategic Air Command.

After joining the Connecticut Air National Guard in 1990, he held command positions at the squadron, group, and wing level and completed a statutory tour with the National Guard Bureau. He also served as the assistant adjutant general for the Connecticut Air National Guard prior to becoming the adjutant general of the Connecticut National Guard.

Major General Martin is the longest currently tenured adjutant general in the Nation and the third longest serving adjutant general in Connecticut's history, having reached 13 years in the position last month. During his time as adjutant general, he oversaw the Connecticut National Guard with great integrity, addressing emergencies in the area, and offering military support on behalf of the United States wherever necessary. Major General Martin's decades of service to our Nation enabled him to diligently and tirelessly carry out his responsibilities of providing forces for the Governor and Chief of the National Guard Bureau that were always mission-ready. As the direct link to National Guard State resources, he routinely worked to better prepare Connecticut and the Guard to face new challenges.

Already in his first year as adjutant general, he dealt with challenges from the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure Commission. Major General Martin played a key role in establishing a lasting flying mission for Connecticut by helping to organize the transition from the A-10 Warthog to the C-130H Hercules tactical airlift platform. This flying mission recently marked its first-ever large-scale overseas deployment as a C-130 unit.

Over the past 13 years, the Connecticut National Guard has assisted

with relief efforts resulting from a number of natural disasters, including Hurricanes Katrina, Harvey, and Maria, along with Superstorm Sandy, by providing essential supplies, equipment, and personnel. Additionally, over 6,000 Connecticut Army and Air guardsmen deployed in order to support international efforts. All of this was accomplished under the leadership of Major General Martin.

The Connecticut National Guard is a critical part of our State, and the unfailing commitment and leadership of Major General Martin during his tenure as adjutant general leaves his successor with an impressive and accomplished Guard that will undoubtedly continue to valiantly serve Connecticut and the Nation in the future.

I applaud his lifetime of service and hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating Major General Martin on his well-earned retirement. •

TRICENTENNIAL OF FALMOUTH, MAINE

• Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the town of Falmouth, ME, which is celebrating its 300th anniversary this year. Falmouth is renowned for its jagged coastline, vibrant rural area, and picturesque forest preserve. Located on the coast of southern Maine and spanning approximately 32 square miles, Falmouth is proudly home to roughly 11,000 residents. The town's rich history dates back to 1718, when Falmouth was incorporated as a part of New Casco. For its third centennial, Falmouth community members have dedicated 2018 to honoring their past, celebrating their present, and investing in their future.

Around the time of the Revolutionary War, Falmouth separated from New Casco and became the settlement that we are familiar with today. In 1820, Falmouth was among the towns that voted with an overwhelming majority to secede from Massachusetts and become the State of Maine. At the time of its establishment, the townspeople's primary occupations were forestry, agriculture, and fishing. The original settlers of Falmouth possessed a strong work ethic that ensured their families' survival in the northern wilderness.

Today, the town of Falmouth prides itself on fostering a colorful, modern and ever-changing environment. Town officers effectively balance the scenic atmosphere of the coastal Maine town with the 21st century need for economic development to keep Falmouth a thriving and innovative community. This year, a series of events including charitable fundraisers, outdoor education activities, and historical learning opportunities will be held to celebrate Falmouth's local businesses and organizations as integral members of the community. These efforts create a comfortable environment to live, work, and learn.

In the coming years, this Falmouth community will continue to celebrate

the accomplishments of the town's remarkable schools, stunning geography, and outstanding local businesses. I commend the people of Falmouth for drawing attention to the town's esteemed history and providing a driving force to propel it into the future. A special recognition goes out to the Falmouth 300 planning committee. These dedicated residents have spent the last 2 years planning a mix of educational and entertaining events that will take place in the coming year. The work that the Falmouth 300 committee has done is sure to have a lasting effect that will be felt for years to come.●

REMEMBERING CLIFFORD CARWOOD LIPTON

● Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the life and legacy of Clifford Carwood Lipton, a West Virginian and a national hero who fought on D-Day and at the Battle of the Bulge, a story made famous on the HBO series *Band of Brothers*. In the years since his passing, his heroism as one of the greatest Easy Company soldiers has remained a treasure to the Huntington community.

Carwood was born and raised in Huntington. He attended a year at Marshall University before joining the war effort as a paratrooper in 1942, and he quickly worked his way up the ranks. He was the jumpmaster of one of the C-47 Skytrains used to jump into Normandy. Eventually, Carwood received his battlefield commission as a second lieutenant. He and the rest of the Easy Company later liberated one of the Nazi camps at Landsberg.

Carwood remained with the Easy Company for the rest of the war and remained in the Reserves through the Korean war. Among the many recognitions he has received for his service are the Purple Heart, Bronze Star, World War II Victory Medal, Presidential Unit Citation, and the Orange Lanyard of the Royal Netherlands army.

After the war he was able to return to Marshall University and complete a degree in engineering. Carwood got a job with Owens Illinois, Inc., a glass and plastic production facility, where, staying true to his character, he quickly worked his way through the ranks until he became chief operator in 1952. He moved to New Jersey to work in a similar factory and then to London with his wife, where he was the director of manufacturing for eight different glass companies in England and Scotland for many years. In the early eighties, he moved to Toledo, OH, and retired as director of international development.

When visitors come to West Virginia, I jump at the chance to tell them we have more veterans per capita than most any State in the Nation. We have fought in more wars, shed more blood, and lost more lives for the cause of freedom than most any State. We have always done the heavy lifting and never complained. We have mined the

coal and forged the steel that built the guns, ships, and factories that have protected and continue to protect our country to this day. I am so deeply proud of what West Virginians have accomplished and what they will continue to accomplish to preserve the freedoms we hold dear—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I am honored to recognize Carwood's memory, as well as the unwavering love he had for our home State and our great Nation.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. EDWIN WELCH

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Dr. Edwin Welch upon his retirement as president of the University of Charleston after a 29-year legacy of innovation that has advanced the university into a world-class institution.

As a former White House employee during the Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon administrations, an ordained minister, a college professor, provost, and president, Dr. Welch brought a wealth of experience and drive to the Mountain State.

Since his first days at U.C. in 1989, Dr. Welch had a clear vision for the university, keeping in mind the needs of the Charleston community and of West Virginia. Our State is so unique to the rest of the Nation. We are home to the most hard-working, creative, hospitable people in the country—very much self-made people. Dr. Welch knows what a college education means to them and to their families, and so he has spent his career developing new opportunities for them to use to their advantage. Together, with faculty, staff, and the community, Dr. Welch sought to forecast challenges and opportunities and to create the best possible strategies for maintaining a strong institution. His collaborative vision brought the university back from the brink of financial peril and allowed it to grow and thrive.

Under his leadership, more than 20 construction projects have reinvigorated U.C., which has also seen a dramatic increase in enrollment throughout the years. In 1994, he secured one of the largest gifts in the university's history, which led to the construction of the Clay Tower Building. More recently, he oversaw the \$20 million Russell and Martha Wehrle Innovation Center project, which serves to create a strong campus base for innovation that will extend into Charleston and the Greater Kanawha region. Additionally, Dr. Welch's wife, Dr. Janet Welch, has made exceptional contributions to education and the arts at U.C. and throughout the community. She received national recognition for the creation of the Erma Byrd Galley for West Virginia Women Artists, among her many accomplishments.

For his efforts, Dr. Welch has earned numerous recognitions, such as the YMCA's Spirit of the Valley Award for his community service efforts, and he

was also the first recipient of the Charles L. Foreman Award for Innovation in Private Higher Education by the Foundation for Independent Higher Education. In fact, he's so beloved by the community that there is even a towboat named after him, which you can occasionally see floating down the Kanawha River.

Furthermore, one of the most respected aspects of Dr. Welch's tenure is his relationship with students, faculty, and staff. He once said that the life and work of the university is not what goes on in his office. It is what goes on in the interactions students have with faculty members, staff, and administrators. He frequently walked the campus or sat down for lunch in the cafeteria to hear students' concerns, problems, accomplishments, and their dreams. He kept all of this in the back of his mind when making any significant decision for the university.

Dr. Welch sees education for the ever-changing environment that it is. He has truly laid the groundwork for all who will follow in his footsteps, who will constantly strive to bring the very best opportunities to U.C. students and to strengthen the Kanawha Valley region. The effects of this close-knit city-university relationship are profound and serve as an outstanding model for all educational establishments.

While he is retiring and everyone is certain to miss his strong leadership, Dr. Welch's dedication and commitment to excellence will leave a lasting legacy with the countless lives he has touched.

Again, I congratulate and thank Dr. Welch for his remarkable years of service. I am honored to wish good health and much happiness to him and Dr. Janet Welch in the days and years ahead.

RECOGNIZING ABI'S ARTISAN ICE CREAM

● Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, America's entrepreneurs are known to strive to go above and beyond by producing uniquely high-quality goods to better serve their local communities. Our Nation's small businesses are often led by people who are not afraid to innovate and bring new ideas to the marketplace. Many small businesses in my home State of Idaho harness this creative spirit and are well known for their locally sourced, all-natural products. Today, it is my distinct pleasure to recognize a small business from Couer d'Alene, ID, that displays such forward thinking in the food service industry. As chairman of the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, I am proud to recognize Abi's Artisan Ice Cream as the Small Business of the Month for June 2018. This family-owned and operated business is dedicated to providing fresh, wholesome, and natural products to their customers.

Previously a healthcare consultant, Maren Scoggins founded Abi's as a way

to bring together her love of cooking and her desire to bring happiness to the lives of others. She named her ice cream shop after her daughter Abigail. Better known as Abi, she can often be found in the shop's kitchen sampling her mother's latest flavors. Abi, who has a peanut allergy, inspired her mother to create a selection of flavors free of nuts and legumes, to allow as many people as possible to enjoy her creations.

In addition to being legume and nut-free, Maren wanted to provide ice cream that customers loved without artificial flavors or preservatives. Abi's is technically a specialty kitchen, as everything is made by hand and on-site. The kitchen is open and customers are invited to observe the process of how the ice cream is made. In pursuit of her goal for all-natural, great-tasting ice cream, Maren works hard to ensure that her creations can be enjoyed by all. By exclusively using natural and in-season ingredients, customers are able to enjoy healthy and seasonal ice cream. Maren is always experimenting with new and unique flavors for the community to enjoy. While they have a selection of staple flavors, Abi's also creates rotating seasonal flavors to ensure that their customers always have the opportunity to try something new and innovative. Whether it is their "fan favorite" malted vanilla with coffee and chocolate chips or just a simple ice cream sandwich, her customers always remain confident in Maren's all-natural recipe. In each one of her creations, Maren prides herself on using as few ingredients as possible and believes that the simplest recipes can be the best tasting. As a result of their hard work and dedication, Abi's Artisan Ice Cream was named a top 10 ice cream shop in Idaho by OnlyInYourState.

Maren's ice cream shop is also heavily involved in the Coeur d'Alene community. Aside from being locally owned and operated, the ice cream shop works closely with the Coeur d'Alene Downtown Association to organize and contribute to the annual Coeur d'Alene street fair. In addition, Maren's small business supports other local businesses in the area by making a concerted effort to procure their ingredients from local sources. Their ice cream can also be found around Coeur d'Alene in several coffee shops and art galleries. Art from these galleries is displayed on the walls of Abi's, and coffee from local coffee shops are used in Abi's creations. This is a great example of a small business having an integral role in the community and supporting other groups and enterprises to create the best experience possible for their local customers.

The State of Idaho is proud to be a home for creative small businesses like Abi's Artisan Ice Cream. Through their commitment to providing hand-crafted, flavorful ice cream, customers are able to enjoy an excellent product, produced in their own community. Earlier

this year, Abi's celebrated its 2-year anniversary.

I would like to congratulate them on their achievement and extend my sincerest congratulations to Maren, Abigail, and all of the employees at Abi's Artisan Ice Cream. I wish you nothing but the best and I look forward to watching your continued growth and success.●

TRIBUTE TO DENNIS NIXON

● Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the career of one of Rhode Island's most respected ocean and coastal experts, my friend Dennis Nixon. Throughout his career, he has demonstrated a deep commitment to Rhode Island and ocean and coastal issues more broadly.

Mr. Nixon first arrived at the University of Rhode Island in 1975 to pursue his master's in marine affairs. Thankfully for us, he received his degree and then decided to stay in the Ocean State as a professor at the university. Since then he has been a mainstay on the University of Rhode Island's campus, teaching courses in maritime and coastal law and publishing over 50 articles and a casebook on the topic.

He served as associate dean of academic Affairs for the College of Environment and Life Sciences and then for 4 years as associate dean for research and administration at the University of Rhode Island's Graduate School of Oceanography. In that position, Mr. Nixon managed the school's beautiful Narragansett Bay campus and the 185-foot National Science Foundation research vessel *Endeavor*. Mr. Nixon also serves as the risk manager and legal advisor to the University National Oceanographic Laboratory System, based at URI's Graduate School of Oceanography, which coordinates among oceanographic universities for research time on vessels like *Endeavor*.

His influence does not stop at URI; he has lectured on 6 continents and in more than 25 States. Mr. Nixon was instrumental in the creation of the unique dual degree program in marine affairs and law between the University of Rhode Island's Department of Marine Affairs and Roger Williams University Law School. Outside academics, he cofounded Point Club, an insurance cooperative for fishing vessels.

I first encountered Mr. Nixon when the tanker *World Prodigy* crashed into Brenton Reef, causing an oilspill. I was a young staffer in the Rhode Island attorney general's office, and Mr. Nixon joined the team as our maritime law expert. Later, I was U.S. attorney when the tug-and-barge *Scandia/North Cape* caused another massive oilspill, and I turned again to Mr. Nixon's professional advice. We worked well together and became friends.

In 2013, Mr. Nixon was appointed director of Rhode Island Sea Grant. His deep connections to Rhode Island and expertise in ocean and coastal issues have helped Rhode Island Sea Grant

further its reach into the State's coastal communities and raise its profile nationwide. Among its priorities, the State's Sea Grant Program is currently supporting research into the causes and consequences of harmful algal blooms and the effects of the Block Island Wind Farm on fishing interests and home values. Mr. Nixon's regard in the State was on display when he was tapped to moderate the marine debris symposia put on in conjunction with the Volvo Ocean Race's stopovers in Newport in 2015 and 2018.

His drive to ensure Rhode Island maintains its leadership in marine scholarship, development, and conservation is evident throughout his career. Mr. Nixon obviously cares deeply about ocean and coastal resources and the fishermen, businesses, and communities that rely on these resources. He is even a fairly presentable sailor himself. For over 40 years, the Ocean State has benefited from Mr. Nixon's passion and leadership, and for this sincere dedication to Rhode Island and coastal communities around the world, I stand today to recognize and salute him.

Fair winds and following seas, my friend.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:02 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2083. An act to allow for the taking of pinnipeds on the Columbia River and its tributaries to protect endangered and threatened species of salmon and other nonlisted fish species.

H.R. 4294. An act to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to provide a criminal penalty for unauthorized disclosures by officers or employees of a Federal agency of certain living will and stress test determinations.

H.R. 5841. An act to modernize and strengthen the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States to more effectively guard against the risk to the national security of the United States posed by certain types of foreign investment, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH) announced that on today, June 27, 2018, he has signed the following enrolled bill, which was previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

H.R. 931. An act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a voluntary registry to collect data on cancer incidence among firefighters.

At 4:52 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5515) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military

personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, and asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the following Members be the managers of the conference on the part of the House:

From the Committee on Armed Services, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. Thornberry, Wilson of South Carolina, LoBiondo, Bishop of Utah, Turner, Rogers of Alabama, Shuster, Conaway, Lamborn, Wittman, Coffman, Mrs. Hartzler, Messrs. Austin Scott of Georgia, Cook, Byrne, Ms. Stefanik, Messrs. Bacon, Banks of Indiana, Smith of Washington, Mrs. Davis of California, Messrs. Langevin, Cooper, Ms. Bordallo, Mr. Courtney, Ms. Tsongas, Mr. Garamendi, Ms. Speier, Mr. Veasey, Ms. Gabbard, Mr. O'Rourke, and Mrs. Murphy of Florida.

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of title XVII of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. Latta, Johnson of Ohio, and Pallone.

From the Committee on Financial Services, for consideration of title XVII of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. Hensarling, Barr, and Ms. Maxine Waters of California.

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of title XVII of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. Royce of California, Kinzinger, and Engel.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2083. An act to allow for the taking of pinnipeds on the Columbia River and its tributaries to protect endangered and threatened species of salmon and other nonlisted fish species; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 4294. An act to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to provide a criminal penalty for unauthorized disclosures by officers or employees of a Federal agency of certain living will and stress test determinations; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 5841. An act to modernize and strengthen the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States to more effectively guard against the risk to the national security of the United States posed by certain types of foreign investment, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 27, 2018, she had

presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 1091. An act to establish a Federal Advisory Council to Support Grandparents Raising Grandchildren.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-5630. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Tolfenpyrad; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9976-21) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5631. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Thiencazabone-methyl; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9978-50) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5632. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Oxirane, 2-methyl-, polymer with oxirane, mono[2-[2-(2-methoxymethylethoxy)methylethoxy] methylether] ether; Tolerance Exemption" (FRL No. 9978-08) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5633. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fluroxypyr; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9978-70) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5634. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Benzovindiflupyr; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9977-94) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5635. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Acetochlor; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9976-41) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5636. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to violations of the Antideficiency Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-5637. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of two (2) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the

grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5638. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of nine (9) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5639. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to serious human rights abuse or corruption that was declared in Executive Order 13818 of December 20, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5640. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Securities Transaction Settlement Cycle" (RIN1557-AE24) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5641. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Unverified List (UVL); Correction" (RIN0694-AH54) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5642. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Office of Cybersecurity, Energy Security and Emergency Response, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Vulnerability of the Electric Grid to an Electromagnetic Pulse and the Potential Impact on Electric Power Delivery and Reliability"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-5643. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Coordination of Protection Systems for Performance During Faults and Specific Training for Personnel Reliability Standards" (Docket No. RM16-22-000) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2018; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-5644. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Previously-Incurred Costs in the WIFIA Program" (FRL No. 9979-90-OW) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5645. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations Update to Include New Jersey State Requirements" (FRL No. 9977-64-Region 2) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5646. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Ocean Dumping; Withdrawal of Designated Disposal Site; Grays Harbor, Washington" (FRL No. 9979-31-Region 10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June

22, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5647. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Mercury; Reporting Requirements for the TSCA Mercury Inventory" (FRL No. 9979-74) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5648. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; New Hampshire; Delegation of Authority" (FRL No. 9979-29-Region 1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5649. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Nebraska Air Quality Implementation Plans; Adoption of a New Chapter under the Nebraska Administrative Code" (FRL No. 9979-85-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5650. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Minnesota; Regional Haze Progress Report" (FRL No. 9980-09-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5651. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; South Dakota; Revisions to the Permitting Rules" (FRL No. 9979-69-Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5652. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Montana; Revisions to PSD Permitting Rules" (FRL No. 9979-76-Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5653. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Iowa; Amendment to the Administrative Consent Order, Grain Processing Corporation, Muscatine, Iowa; Final Rule" (FRL No. 9979-97-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5654. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule en-

titled "Air Plan Approval; SC: Multiple Revisions to Air Pollution Control Standards" (FRL No. 9979-80-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5655. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; SC; Definitions and Open Burning" (FRL No. 9979-78-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5656. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; SC; VOC Definition" (FRL No. 9979-92-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5657. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Alaska; Interstate Transport Requirements for the 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS" (FRL No. 9980-00-Region 10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5658. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; AK; Interstate Transport Requirements for the 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide and Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards" (FRL No. 9979-87-Region 10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5659. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Consolidated Guidance About Materials Licenses: Program-Specific Guidance About Possession Licenses for Production of Radioactive Material Using an Accelerator" (NUREG-1556, Volume 21, Revision 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5660. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Chief Financial Officer, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revision of Fee Schedules, Fee Recovery for Fiscal Year 2018" ((RIN3150-AJ95) (NRC-2017-0026)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5661. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Beginning of Construction for the Investment Tax Credit under Section 48" (Notice 2018-59) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5662. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Designated Qualified Opportunity Zones under Revenue Code

1400Z-2" (Notice 2018-48) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5663. A communication from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits" (29 CFR Parts 4022 and 4044) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5664. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's fiscal year 2017 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5665. A communication from the Director of the Peace Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Inspector General's Semiannual Report for the period of October 1, 2017 through March 31, 2018; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5666. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Use of Spectrum Bands Above 24 GHz for Mobile Radio Services" ((WT Docket No. 10-112) (FCC 18-73)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5667. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Protecting Consumers from Unauthorized Carrier Changes and Related Unauthorized Charges" ((CC Docket No. 17-169) (FCC 18-78)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5668. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2018-0492)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5669. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A310 Series Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2018-0071)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5670. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-1100)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5671. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of

EC-5696. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Lockheed Martin Corporation Lockheed Martin Aeronautics Company” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2018-0447)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5697. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Saab AB, Saab Aeronautics (Formerly Known as Saab AB, Saab Aerosystems)” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2018-0450)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5698. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; CFM International S.A. Turbofan Engines” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2018-0429)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5699. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Helicopters” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2018-0238)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5700. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Diamond Aircraft Industries GmbH Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2018-0188)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5701. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment of Class E Airspace; Paris, ID” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0973)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5702. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment of Class E Airspace; Manley Hot Springs, AK” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0970)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5703. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class D Airspace and Class E Airspace; Erie, PA” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-1195)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5704. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class D & E Airspace and Revocation of Class E; Pocatello, ID” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0855)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5705. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class E Airspace; Charlotte, MI” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0721)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5706. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class E Airspace; Milwaukee, WI” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0740)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5707. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class E Airspace; Muscatine, IA” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-1002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5708. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class E Airspace; Hamilton, NY” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-1089)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5709. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class D Airspace and Class E Airspace; Greenwood, MS” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0994)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5710. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (171)” ((RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5711. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (103)” ((RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5712. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscella-

neous Amendments (98)” ((RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5713. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (45)” ((RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5714. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Modification of VOR Federal Airway V-312; Northeast United States” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2018-0149)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5715. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Modification of Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes in the Vicinity of Richmond, IN” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-1144)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5716. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries” ((RIN0648-XF577) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5717. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area” ((RIN0648-XF832) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5718. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher/Processors Using Trawl Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska” ((RIN0648-XF653) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5719. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; 2017-2018 Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments” ((RIN0648-BH20) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5720. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher/Processors Using Trawl Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska” ((RIN0648-XF653) received in the Office of the President of the

Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5721. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XF675) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5722. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XF655) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5723. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XF671) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5724. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XF656) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5725. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; 2017 Commercial Pacific Bluefin Tuna Fishery Closure in the Eastern Pacific Ocean" (RIN0648-XF630) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5726. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; 2017 Bigeye Tuna Longline Fishery Closure in the Eastern Pacific Ocean" (RIN0648-XF605) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5727. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries in the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region; Amendment 37; Correction" (RIN0648-BG33) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5728. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Deep-Sea Red Crab Fishery; 2017-2019 Atlantic Deep-Sea Red Crab Spec-

ifications" (RIN0648-XE900) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5729. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands; 2017 and 2018 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish" (RIN0648-XE989) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5730. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska: Deep-Water Species Fishery by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XG109) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5731. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska: Northern Rockfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XG120) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5732. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska: Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XF169) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5733. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; Quota Transfer" (RIN0648-XF834) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5734. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer" (RIN0648-XF835) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5735. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts" (RIN0648-XF550) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5736. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer" (RIN0648-XF806) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June

26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5737. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Sablefish in the Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XF537) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5738. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod in the Western Aleutian Islands District of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XF576) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5739. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Non-American Fisheries Act Crab Vessels Operating as Catcher Vessels Using Pot Gear in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XF941) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5740. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Small-Mesh Multispecies Fishery; Adjustment to the Northern Red Hake Inseason Possession Limit" (RIN0648-XF471) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5741. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 620 in the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XG077) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5742. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fraser River Sockeye and Pink Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Orders" (RIN0648-XF775) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5743. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Chinook Salmon Prohibited Species Catch Limits in the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XF786) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5744. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2017 Commercial Accountability Measures and Closure for Bluefin Tilefish in the South Atlantic Region" (RIN0648-XF525) received in the Office

of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5745. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions #1 Through #4” (RIN0648-XF355) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5746. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2017 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Golden Tilefish Hook-and-Line Component” (RIN0648-XF854) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5747. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area” (RIN0648-XF851) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5748. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; 2017 Recreational Accountability Measures and Closure for Gulf of Mexico Gray Triggerfish” (RIN0648-XF005) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5749. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Resources of the South Atlantic; 2018-2019 Recreational Fishing Season for Black Sea Bass” (RIN0648-XG056) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5750. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries” (RIN0648-XF615) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5751. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries; Temporary Rule; Inseason Quota Transfer” (RIN0648-XF724) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5752. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; North Atlantic Swordfish Fishery” (RIN0648-XF416) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5753. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reappointment of the 2017 Gulf of Alaska Pacific Halibut Prohibited Species Catch Limits for the Trawl Deep-Water and Shallow-Water Fishery Categories” (RIN0648-XF558) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5754. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Trip Limit Increase for the Common Pool Fishery” (RIN0648-XF256) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5755. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Region; 2017-2018 Commercial Closure for King Mackerel in the Gulf of Mexico Northern Zone” (RIN0648-XF920) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5756. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; 2017-2018 Biennial Specifications and Management Measures” (RIN0648-BG95) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5757. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska” (RIN0648-XF798) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5758. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Tri-mester 2 Georges Bank Cod Total Allowable Catch Area Closure; Updated 2017 Georges Bank Cod Annual Catch Limit for the Common Pool; Possession Prohibition for the Common Pool Fishery” (RIN0648-XF747) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5759. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Exchange of Flatfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area” (RIN0648-XF733) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5760. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled

“Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Northern Rockfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area” (RIN0648-XF296) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5761. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; 2017 Recreational and Commercial Closures for the Florida Keys/East Florida Stock of Hogfish in the South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico” (RIN0648-XF602) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5762. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Longnose Skate in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska” (RIN0648-XF707) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5763. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Trawl Catcher Vessels in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska” (RIN0648-XF896) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5764. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer” (RIN0648-XF722) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5765. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Resources of the South Atlantic Commercial Trip Limit Reduction for Vermilion Snapper” (RIN0648-XF683) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5766. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska” (RIN0648-XF572) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5767. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Sablefish in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska” (RIN0648-XF573) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5768. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled

“Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area; Correction” (RIN0648-XF654) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5769. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Region; 2017-2018 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for King Mackerel in the Gulf of Mexico Western Zone” (RIN0648-XF735) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5770. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2017 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Vermilion Snapper” (RIN0648-XF730) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5771. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2017 Commercial Accountability Measures and Closure for South Atlantic Greater Amberjack” (RIN0648-XF729) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5772. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pollock in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands” (RIN0648-XF209) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5773. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Yellowfin Sole for Vessels Participating in the BSAI Trawl Limited Access Fishery on the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area” (RIN0648-XF468) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5774. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer” (RIN0648-XF408) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5775. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries” (RIN0648-XF472) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5776. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fish-

eries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Greenland Turbot in the Aleutian Islands Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area” (RIN0648-XF389) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5777. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2017 Accountability Measure-Based Closures for Recreational Species in the U.S. Caribbean off Puerto Rico” (RIN0648-XF344) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2842. A bill to prohibit the marketing of bogus opioid treatment programs or products (Rept. No. 115-285).

S. 2848. A bill to improve Department of Transportation controlled substances and alcohol testing, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-286).

By Mr. SHELBY, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Special Report entitled “Further Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals for Fiscal Year 2019” (Rept. No. 115-287).

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1158. A bill to help prevent acts of genocide and other atrocity crimes, which threaten national and international security, by enhancing United States Government capacities to prevent, mitigate, and respond to such crises.

S. 2463. A bill to establish the United States International Development Finance Corporation, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

*Heidi R. King, of California, to be Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

*Peter A. Feldman, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission for the remainder of the term expiring October 26, 2019.

*Karen Dunn Kelley, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Secretary of Commerce.

*Geoffrey Adam Starks, of Kansas, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of five years from July 1, 2017.

*Peter A. Feldman, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission for a term of seven years from October 27, 2019.

*Coast Guard nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Andrew S. McKinley, to be Rear Admiral.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed sub-

ject to the nominee’s commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. McCASKILL:

S. 3144. A bill to require the Federal Air Marshal Service to utilize risk-based strategies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. SASSE):

S. 3145. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for lifelong learning accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARPER:

S. 3146. A bill to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to allow the District of Columbia to receive Federal funding under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 3147. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permanently appropriate funding for the administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 3148. A bill to prohibit certain business concerns from receiving assistance from the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. McCASKILL, Ms. HASSAN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 3149. A bill to modify the penalties for violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1993; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr.

WYDEN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. REED, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. KING, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. KAINE, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. NELSON, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. JONES, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. WARNER, Mr. COONS, and Mr. DONNELLY):

S. 3150. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, Super PACs and other entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. WARREN, Mr. REED, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. PETERS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. VAN

HOLLEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. HASSAN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 3151. A bill to secure the rights of public employees to organize, act concertedly, and bargain collectively, which safeguard the public interest and promote the free and unobstructed flow of commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 3152. A bill to establish a pilot grant program to support career and technical education exploration programs in middle schools and high schools; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. TILLIS, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. Res. 557. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the strategic importance of NATO to the collective security of the transatlantic region and urging its member states to work together at the upcoming summit to strengthen the alliance; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 197

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 197, a bill to amend the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act to improve compensation for workers involved in uranium mining, and for other purposes.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 479, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 514

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 514, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to provide access to magnetic EEG/EKG-guided resonance therapy to veterans.

S. 805

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 805, a bill to impose a tax on certain trading transactions to invest in our families and communities, improve our infrastructure and our environment, strengthen our financial security, expand opportunity and reduce market volatility.

S. 1092

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1092, a bill to protect the right of law-abiding citizens to transport knives interstate, notwithstanding a patchwork of local and State prohibitions.

S. 1112

At the request of Ms. HETTKAMP, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1112, a bill to support States in their work to save and sustain the health of mothers during pregnancy, childbirth, and in the postpartum period, to eliminate disparities in maternal health outcomes for pregnancy-related and pregnancy-associated deaths, to identify solutions to improve health care quality and health outcomes for mothers, and for other purposes.

S. 1212

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1212, a bill to provide family members of an individual who they fear is a danger to himself, herself, or others, and law enforcement, with new tools to prevent gun violence.

S. 1520

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1520, a bill to expand recreational fishing opportunities through enhanced marine fishery conservation and management, and for other purposes.

S. 2009

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2009, a bill to require a background check for every firearm sale.

S. 2095

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2095, a bill to regulate assault weapons, to ensure that the right to keep and bear arms is not unlimited, and for other purposes.

S. 2415

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2415, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to streamline enrollment of certain Medicaid providers and suppliers across State lines, and for other purposes.

S. 2463

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2463, a bill to establish the United States International Development Finance Corporation, and for other purposes.

S. 2465

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2465, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a sickle cell disease prevention and treatment demonstration program and to provide for sickle cell disease research, surveillance, prevention, and treatment.

S. 2471

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2471, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to improve the compassionate release process of the Bureau of Prisons, and for other purposes.

S. 2497

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2497, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriations of funds to Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 2694

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2694, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to lengthen the statute of limitations for enforcing robocall violations, and for other purposes.

S. 2842

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2842, a bill to prohibit the marketing of bogus opioid treatment programs or products.

S. 2881

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 2881, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to seek to enter into an agreement with the city of Vallejo, California, for the transfer of Mare Island Naval Cemetery in Vallejo, California, and for other purposes.

S. 2941

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2941, a bill to improve the Cooperative Observer Program of the National Weather Service, and for other purposes.

S. 2961

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2961, a bill to reauthorize subtitle A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990.

S. 2971

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms.

CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2971, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to prohibit animal fighting in the United States territories.

S. 3014

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3014, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to support rural residency training funding that is equitable for all States, and for other purposes.

S. 3038

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3038, a bill to assist in the conservation of the North Atlantic right whale by supporting and providing financial resources for North Atlantic right whale conservation programs and projects of persons with expertise required for the conservation of North Atlantic right whales.

S. 3040

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3040, a bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to clarify Federal law with respect to reporting certain positive consumer credit information to consumer reporting agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 3046

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3046, a bill to allow the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into self-determination contracts with Indian Tribes and Tribal organizations to carry out supplemental nutrition assistance programs.

S. 3051

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3051, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to establish a working group to study regulatory and legislative improvements for the livestock, insect, and agricultural commodities transport industries, and for other purposes.

S. 3057

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3057, a bill to provide for the processing by U.S. Customs and Border Protection of certain international mail shipments and to require the provision of advance electronic information on international mail shipments of mail.

S. 3067

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3067, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit nurse practitioners and physician assistants to satisfy the documentation

requirement under the Medicare program for coverage of certain shoes for individuals with diabetes.

S. 3080

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3080, a bill to reauthorize certain agricultural programs through 2023, and for other purposes.

S. 3090

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3090, a bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to clarify that a State may not use an individual's failure to vote as the basis for initiating the procedures provided under such Act for the removal of the individual from the official list of registered voters in the State on the grounds that the individual has changed residence, and for other purposes.

S. 3122

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3122, a bill to support coding education.

S. RES. 432

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 432, a resolution congratulating the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania on the 100th anniversary of their declarations of independence.

S. RES. 508

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 508, a resolution supporting the goals of Myalgic Encephalomyelitis/Chronic Fatigue Syndrome International Awareness Day.

AMENDMENT NO. 3070

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3070 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3074

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3074 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3075

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Massachu-

setts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3075 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3076

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3076 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3083

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3083 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3091

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3091 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3097

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3097 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3102

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3102 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3103

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3103 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3116

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3116 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3127

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3127 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3129

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3129 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3134

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3134 proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3138

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3138 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3143

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3143 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3146

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3146 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3147

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota

(Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3147 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3161

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3161 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3162

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3162 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3163

At the request of Mr. SASSE, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3163 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3169

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3169 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3171

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3171 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3179

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3179 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3180

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Nebraska

(Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3180 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3181

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3181 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3209

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3209 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3215

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3215 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3216

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3216 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3218

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3218 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3219

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3219 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CARPER:

S. 3146. A bill to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to allow the District of Columbia to receive

Federal funding under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to allow the District of Columbia to receive funding and other benefits under the Coastal Zone Management Act. I am pleased to offer this companion legislation to a bill, H.R. 2540, introduced by the Congresswoman from the District of Columbia, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

Few of us realize that 70 percent of the District is located within the coastal plain. Similar to my State of Delaware, sea level rise, upstream sources of water and degraded infrastructure mean that the District could experience serious future cleanup and repair costs due to flooding—including damage to federal property, which makes up almost 30 percent of the District. Since 1950, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) reports there has been a 343 percent increase in nuisance flooding in the District. And, since 2006, DC has experienced two 100-year flooding events, and District officials estimate that a future 100-year flood event could cause over \$1.2 billion in damages. Needless to say, these events will become more and more common due to climate change and sea level rise.

The District of Columbia would use funding from the Coastal Zone Management Program for flood risk planning and environmental restoration to prevent and mitigate future flood damage. At the same time, this work would help to restore and conserve the District's coastal resources such as habitat, fisheries, and endangered species.

If included in the Coastal Zone Management Program, the District of Columbia would be eligible for \$1 million or more of federal funding annually to assist in coastal flood-control projects, to combat non-point source water pollution, and to develop special area management plans in areas experiencing environmental justice and/or flooding issues.

The National Coastal Zone Management Program, housed in NOAA, was established through the passage of the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972. At the time, Congress recognized the need to manage the effects of increased growth in the nation's coastal zone, which includes jurisdictions bordering the oceans and the Great Lakes.

There are currently 34 jurisdictional coastal zone management programs, including both states and territories. In order for the District of Columbia to participate in the program, Congress must pass this amendment to the Coastal Zone Management Act that would include the District under the definition of a "coastal State." Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 3146

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Flood Prevention Act of 2018".

SEC. 2. ELIGIBILITY OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR FEDERAL FUNDING UNDER THE COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1972.

Section 304(4) of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1453(4)) is amended by inserting "the District of Columbia," after "the term also includes".

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 557—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE OF NATO TO THE COLLECTIVE SECURITY OF THE TRANSATLANTIC REGION AND URGING ITS MEMBER STATES TO WORK TOGETHER AT THE UPCOMING SUMMIT TO STRENGTHEN THE ALLIANCE

Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. TILLIS, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 557

Whereas the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (referred to in this Resolution as "NATO") will hold its next Summit meeting July 11-12, 2018, in Brussels, Belgium;

Whereas the security of the United States remains inextricably linked to the security of Europe and NATO's founding purpose remains as valid today as it has been since NATO was created;

Whereas our NATO allies have contributed significantly to military operations led by the United States around the world, and actively contribute to current Alliance missions, including the reinforcement of NATO's eastern flank by leading 3 of the 4 battlegroups of NATO's Enhanced Forward Presence;

Whereas while an increasing number of NATO member states are fulfilling their pledges at the 2014 NATO summit in Wales to allocate 2 percent of their gross domestic product towards defense spending, all NATO member states should be urged to meet the 2 percent target and to allocate 20 percent of their annual defense spending on major new equipment, including related research and development, in order to more fairly share the burden of transatlantic defense;

Whereas United States force deployments to Europe as part of the European Deterrence Initiative, and the corresponding measures by NATO member states in the Enhanced Forward Presence, are contributing to enhanced security on NATO's eastern flank;

Whereas the Russian Federation's aggression towards its neighbors, its breach of international norms, and its noncompliance with its arms control commitments have severely impacted European security and will continue to pose a security threat for the foreseeable future;

Whereas administrative and logistical obstacles to the mobility of military assets across Europe, and the potential mismatch

between the speed of NATO-level decision making and the speed of a crisis, have been shown to constitute potential challenges to the successful defense of NATO's territorial integrity;

Whereas the cyber domain is a crucial aspect of NATO operations and a key tool at potential adversaries' disposal;

Whereas NATO member states collectively face a continued and persistent threat from terrorism and our NATO allies are making significant commitments in keeping terrorist networks from interfering in any NATO territory;

Whereas NATO member states—

(1) have collectively identified corruption and poor governance, including within member states, as "security challenges which undermine democracy, the rule of law, and economic development"; and

(2) in recognition of this challenge, adopted a Building Integrity Policy, which is intended to support transparent and accountable defense institutions under democratic control;

Whereas NATO's enlargement has delivered enhanced security and stability to all NATO member states, including Montenegro (the newest NATO member), while remaining incomplete and underlining the need for NATO's Open Door Policy to remain in effect for all aspiring countries and for invitations to join NATO to be issued as soon as an aspirant country has met the conditions for membership;

Whereas the first of 10 Principles Guiding Relations between participating States contained in the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, done at Helsinki August 1, 1975 (commonly known as the "Helsinki Final Act") recognizes the right to be or not to be a party to treaties of alliance as a right inherent in sovereignty to be respected on an equal basis among the signatory states;

Whereas the commitment made by NATO in the Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security Between NATO and the Russian Federation, done at Paris May 27, 1997 (commonly known as the "NATO-Russia Founding Act") to "carry out its collective defence and other missions by ensuring the necessary interoperability, integration, and capability for reinforcement rather than by additional permanent stationing of substantial combat forces" was predicated on "the current and foreseeable security environment" that existed in 1997, which has been fundamentally altered by the aggression directed by the leaders of the Russian Federation;

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms the enduring commitment of the United States to NATO's collective defense, enshrined in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, done at Washington April 4, 1949 (commonly known as the "Washington Treaty");

(2) emphasizes the need for all NATO member states to be prepared to meet their respective obligations under Article 5 of the Washington Treaty;

(3) pledges its support for all appropriate measures collectively taken to deter and defend against, if necessary, Russian aggression against the territory of any NATO member state, including the explicit aim of the leaders of the Russian Federation to fracture the unity between NATO member states;

(4) emphasizes its commitment to a North Atlantic alliance based on shared values, including the rule of law, to prevent internal forces from eroding NATO's foundation;

(5) encourages all NATO member states to clearly commit to further enlargement of the alliance, including extending invitations

to any aspirant country which has met the conditions required to join NATO; and

(6) urges leaders who will be meeting at the 2018 NATO summit in Brussels, Belgium to ensure that NATO—

(A) meets urgent security threats;

(B) continues to transform to counter emerging and evolving challenges, including hybrid warfare, terrorism, cyberattacks, and renewed challenges to sea lines of communication between North America and Europe; and

(C) adopts a rapid reinforcement plan that—

(i) expedites political decision making;

(ii) reinvigorates the NATO command structure;

(iii) streamlines the capacity to mobilize forces across national borders; and

(iv) improves joint readiness goals.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3224. Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

SA 3225. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. NELSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3226. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3227. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3228. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3229. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3230. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3231. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. ENZI, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3232. Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3233. Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3234. Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3235. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3236. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3237. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3238. Ms. SMITH (for herself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3239. Mr. KING (for himself, Mr. DAINES, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3240. Mr. HEINRICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3241. Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. DAINES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3242. Mr. JONES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3243. Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. CORKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3244. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3245. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3246. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3247. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3248. Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. SASSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3249. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3250. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3251. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3252. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3253. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3254. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3255. Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3256. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3257. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3258. Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3259. Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3260. Mr. KING (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. BOOZMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3261. Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3262. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3263. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3264. Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. KING, Mr. JONES, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mrs. FISCHER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3265. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him

SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3317. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3318. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3319. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3320. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3321. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3322. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3323. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3324. Mrs. HYDE-SMITH (for herself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BURR, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. JONES, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3325. Mrs. HYDE-SMITH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3326. Mrs. HYDE-SMITH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3327. Mrs. HYDE-SMITH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3328. Mr. KING (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3329. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. LANKFORD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3330. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3331. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3332. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to

be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3333. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3334. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3335. Mr. PERDUE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3336. Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3337. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3338. Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3339. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3340. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3341. Mr. BENNET (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3342. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3343. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3344. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3345. Mr. PERDUE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3224. Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018”.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Definition of Secretary.

TITLE I—COMMODITIES

Subtitle A—Commodity Policy

Sec. 1101. Payment acres.
Sec. 1102. Producer election.
Sec. 1103. Price loss coverage.
Sec. 1104. Agriculture risk coverage.
Sec. 1105. Repeal of transition assistance for producers of upland cotton.

Subtitle B—Marketing Loans

Sec. 1201. Extensions.
Sec. 1202. Repeal; unshorn pelts.
Sec. 1203. Economic adjustment assistance for upland cotton users.

Subtitle C—Sugar

Sec. 1301. Sugar program.

Subtitle D—Dairy

PART I—DAIRY RISK COVERAGE

Sec. 1401. Dairy risk coverage.

PART II—REAUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER

DAIRY-RELATED PROVISIONS

Sec. 1411. Reauthorizations.
Sec. 1412. Class I skim milk price.
Sec. 1413. Milk donation program.

Subtitle E—Supplemental Agricultural

Disaster Assistance

Sec. 1501. Supplemental agricultural disaster assistance.

Subtitle F—Noninsured Crop Assistance

Sec. 1601. Noninsured crop assistance program.

Subtitle G—Administration

Sec. 1701. Regulations.
Sec. 1702. Suspension of permanent price support authority.
Sec. 1703. Implementation.
Sec. 1704. Definition of significant contribution of active personal management.
Sec. 1705. Actively engaged in farming requirement.
Sec. 1706. Adjusted gross income limitation.
Sec. 1707. Base acres review.
Sec. 1708. Farm Service Agency accountability.
Sec. 1709. Technical corrections.
Sec. 1710. Use of Commodity Credit Corporation.

TITLE II—CONSERVATION

Subtitle A—Conservation Reserve Program

Sec. 2101. Extension and enrollment requirements of conservation reserve program.
Sec. 2102. Farmable wetland program.
Sec. 2103. Duties of the Secretary.
Sec. 2104. Payments.
Sec. 2105. Conservation reserve enhancement program.
Sec. 2106. Contracts.
Sec. 2107. Conservation reserve easements.
Sec. 2108. Eligible land; State law requirements.

Subtitle B—Conservation Stewardship Program

Sec. 2201. Definitions.
Sec. 2202. Establishment.
Sec. 2203. Stewardship contracts.
Sec. 2204. Duties of Secretary.

Subtitle C—Environmental Quality Incentives Program

Sec. 2301. Purposes.
Sec. 2302. Definitions.
Sec. 2303. Establishment and administration.
Sec. 2304. Evaluation of applications.

- Sec. 2305. Duties of the Secretary.
 Sec. 2306. Environmental quality incentives program plan.
 Sec. 2307. Limitation on payments.
 Sec. 2308. Conservation innovation grants and payments.
 Sec. 2309. Soil health demonstration pilot project.
- Subtitle D—Other Conservation Programs
 Sec. 2401. Wetland conservation.
 Sec. 2402. Conservation security program.
 Sec. 2403. Conservation of private grazing land.
 Sec. 2404. Soil health and income protection program.
 Sec. 2405. Grassroots source water protection program.
 Sec. 2406. Soil testing and remediation assistance.
 Sec. 2407. Voluntary public access and habitat incentive program.
 Sec. 2408. Agriculture conservation experienced services program.
 Sec. 2409. Remote telemetry data system.
 Sec. 2410. Agricultural conservation easement program.
 Sec. 2411. Regional conservation partnership program.
 Sec. 2412. Wetland conversion.
 Sec. 2413. Delineation of wetlands.
 Sec. 2414. Emergency conservation program.
 Sec. 2415. Watershed protection and flood prevention.
 Sec. 2416. Small watershed rehabilitation program.
 Sec. 2417. Repeal of Conservation Corridor Demonstration Program.
 Sec. 2418. Repeal of cranberry acreage reserve program.
 Sec. 2419. Repeal of National Natural Resources Foundation.
 Sec. 2420. Repeal of flood risk reduction.
 Sec. 2421. Repeal of study of land use for expiring contracts and extension of authority.
 Sec. 2422. Repeal of Integrated Farm Management Program Option.
 Sec. 2423. Repeal of clarification of definition of agricultural lands.
 Sec. 2424. Resource conservation and development program.
 Sec. 2425. Wildlife management.
 Sec. 2426. Healthy forests reserve program.
 Sec. 2427. Watershed protection.
 Sec. 2428. Sense of Congress relating to increased watershed-based collaboration.
 Sec. 2429. Modifications to conservation easement program.
- Subtitle E—Funding and Administration
 Sec. 2501. Funding.
 Sec. 2502. Delivery of technical assistance.
 Sec. 2503. Administrative requirements for conservation programs.
 Sec. 2504. Definition of acequia.
 Sec. 2505. Authorization of appropriations for water bank program.
 Sec. 2506. Report on land access, tenure, and transition.
 Sec. 2507. Report on small wetlands.
 Sec. 2508. State technical committees.
- Subtitle F—Technical Corrections
 Sec. 2601. Farmable wetland program.
 Sec. 2602. Report on program enrollments and assistance.
 Sec. 2603. Delivery of technical assistance.
 Sec. 2604. State technical committees.
- TITLE III—TRADE
 Subtitle A—Food for Peace Act
 Sec. 3101. Food aid quality.
 Sec. 3102. Generation and use of currencies by private voluntary organizations and cooperatives.
 Sec. 3103. Minimum levels of assistance.
 Sec. 3104. Food Aid Consultative Group.
- Sec. 3105. Oversight, monitoring, and evaluation.
 Sec. 3106. Assistance for stockpiling and rapid transportation, delivery, and distribution of shelf-stable prepackaged foods.
 Sec. 3107. Allowance of distribution costs.
 Sec. 3108. Prepositioning of agricultural commodities.
 Sec. 3109. Annual report regarding food aid programs and activities.
 Sec. 3110. Deadline for agreements to finance sales or to provide other assistance.
 Sec. 3111. Nonemergency food assistance.
 Sec. 3112. Micronutrient fortification programs.
 Sec. 3113. John Ogonowski and Doug Bereuter Farmer-to-Farmer Program.
- Subtitle B—Agricultural Trade Act of 1978
 Sec. 3201. Priority trade promotion, development, and assistance.
- Subtitle C—Other Agricultural Trade Laws
 Sec. 3301. Food for Progress Act of 1985.
 Sec. 3302. Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust Act.
 Sec. 3303. Promotion of agricultural exports to emerging markets.
 Sec. 3304. Cochran emerging market fellowship program.
 Sec. 3305. Borlaug International Agricultural Science and Technology Fellowship Program.
 Sec. 3306. International food security technical assistance.
 Sec. 3307. McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program.
 Sec. 3308. Global Crop Diversity Trust.
 Sec. 3309. Local and regional food aid procurement projects.
 Sec. 3310. Foreign trade missions.
- TITLE IV—NUTRITION
 Subtitle A—Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program
 Sec. 4101. Definition of certification period.
 Sec. 4102. Food distribution program on Indian reservations.
 Sec. 4103. Work requirements for supplemental nutrition assistance program.
 Sec. 4104. Improvements to electronic benefit transfer system.
 Sec. 4105. Retail incentives.
 Sec. 4106. Required action on data match information.
 Sec. 4107. Income verification.
 Sec. 4108. Pilot projects to improve healthy dietary patterns related to fluid milk in the supplemental nutrition assistance program.
 Sec. 4109. Interstate data matching to prevent multiple issuances.
 Sec. 4110. Quality control.
 Sec. 4111. Requirement of live-production environments for certain pilot projects relating to cost sharing for computerization.
 Sec. 4112. Authorization of appropriations.
 Sec. 4113. Assistance for community food projects.
 Sec. 4114. Nutrition education State plans.
 Sec. 4115. Emergency food assistance program.
 Sec. 4116. Technical and conforming amendments.
- Subtitle B—Commodity Distribution Programs
 Sec. 4201. Commodity distribution program.
 Sec. 4202. Commodity supplemental food program.
 Sec. 4203. Distribution of surplus commodities; special nutrition projects.
- Subtitle C—Miscellaneous
 Sec. 4301. Purchase of specialty crops.
- Sec. 4302. Seniors farmers' market nutrition program.
 Sec. 4303. The Gus Schumacher food insecurity nutrition incentive.
 Sec. 4304. Harvesting health pilot projects.
- TITLE V—CREDIT
 Subtitle A—Farm Ownership Loans
 Sec. 5101. Modification of the 3-year experience requirement for purposes of eligibility for farm ownership loans.
 Sec. 5102. Conservation loan and loan guarantee program.
 Sec. 5103. Limitations on amount of farm ownership loans.
- Subtitle B—Operating Loans
 Sec. 5201. Limitations on amount of operating loans.
 Sec. 5202. Cooperative lending pilot projects.
- Subtitle C—Administrative Provisions
 Sec. 5301. Beginning farmer and rancher individual development accounts pilot program.
 Sec. 5302. Loan authorization levels.
 Sec. 5303. Loan fund set-asides.
 Sec. 5304. Equitable relief.
 Sec. 5305. Socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers; qualified beginning farmers and ranchers.
- Sec. 5306. Emergency loan eligibility.
- Subtitle D—Miscellaneous
 Sec. 5401. State agricultural mediation programs.
 Sec. 5402. Socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers.
 Sec. 5403. Sharing of privileged and confidential information.
 Sec. 5404. Removal and prohibition authority; industry-wide prohibition.
 Sec. 5405. Jurisdiction over institution-affiliated parties.
 Sec. 5406. Definition of institution-affiliated party.
 Sec. 5407. Repeal of obsolete provisions; technical corrections.
 Sec. 5408. Corporation as conservator or receiver; certain other powers.
 Sec. 5409. Reporting.
 Sec. 5410. Sense of the Senate.
- TITLE VI—RURAL DEVELOPMENT
 Subtitle A—Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act
 Sec. 6101. Water, waste disposal, and wastewater facility grants.
 Sec. 6102. Rural water and wastewater technical assistance and training programs.
 Sec. 6103. Rural water and wastewater circuit rider program.
 Sec. 6104. Tribal college and university essential community facilities.
 Sec. 6105. Community facilities direct loans and grants for substance use disorder treatment services.
 Sec. 6106. Emergency and imminent community water assistance grant program.
 Sec. 6107. Water systems for rural and native villages in Alaska.
 Sec. 6108. Rural decentralized water systems.
 Sec. 6109. Solid waste management grants.
 Sec. 6110. Rural business development grants.
 Sec. 6111. Rural cooperative development grants.
 Sec. 6112. Locally or regionally produced agricultural food products.
 Sec. 6113. Appropriate technology transfer for rural areas program.
 Sec. 6114. Rural economic area partnership zones.
 Sec. 6115. Intermediary relending program.
 Sec. 6116. Single application for broadband.
 Sec. 6117. Loan guarantee loan fees.

- Sec. 6118. Rural Business-Cooperative Service programs technical assistance and training.
- Sec. 6119. National rural development partnership.
- Sec. 6120. Grants for NOAA weather radio transmitters.
- Sec. 6121. Rural microentrepreneur assistance program.
- Sec. 6122. Health care services.
- Sec. 6123. Strategic economic and community development.
- Sec. 6124. Delta Regional Authority.
- Sec. 6125. Rural business investment program.
- Subtitle B—Rural Electrification Act of 1936
- Sec. 6201. Electric loan refinancing.
- Sec. 6202. Technical assistance for rural electrification loans.
- Sec. 6203. Loans for telephone service.
- Sec. 6204. Cushion of credit payments program.
- Sec. 6205. Guarantees for bonds and notes issued for electrification or telephone purposes.
- Sec. 6206. Access to broadband telecommunications services in rural areas.
- Sec. 6207. Community Connect Grant Program.
- Sec. 6208. Transparency in the Telecommunications Infrastructure Loan Program.
- Sec. 6209. Refinancing of broadband and telephone loans.
- Sec. 6210. Cybersecurity and grid security improvements.
- Subtitle C—Miscellaneous
- Sec. 6301. Distance learning and telemedicine.
- Sec. 6302. Rural energy savings program.
- Sec. 6303. Rural health and safety education programs.
- Sec. 6304. Northern Border Regional Commission reauthorization.
- TITLE VII—RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND RELATED MATTERS**
- Subtitle A—National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977
- Sec. 7101. Purposes of agricultural research, extension, and education.
- Sec. 7102. Matters relating to certain school designations and declarations.
- Sec. 7103. National Agricultural Research, Extension, Education, and Economics Advisory Board.
- Sec. 7104. Citrus disease subcommittee of specialty crop committee.
- Sec. 7105. Veterinary services grant program.
- Sec. 7106. Grants and fellowships for food and agriculture sciences education.
- Sec. 7107. Research equipment grants.
- Sec. 7108. Agricultural and food policy research centers.
- Sec. 7109. Education grants to Alaska Native serving institutions and Native Hawaiian serving institutions.
- Sec. 7110. Next generation agriculture technology challenge.
- Sec. 7111. Nutrition education program.
- Sec. 7112. Authorization for appropriations for Federal agricultural research facilities.
- Sec. 7113. Continuing animal health and disease research programs.
- Sec. 7114. Extension at 1890 land-grant colleges, including Tuskegee University; report.
- Sec. 7115. Report on agricultural research at 1890 land-grant colleges, including Tuskegee University.
- Sec. 7116. Grants to upgrade agricultural and food sciences facilities at 1890 land-grant colleges, including Tuskegee University.
- Sec. 7117. Grants to upgrade agriculture and food sciences facilities and equipment at insular area land-grant institutions.
- Sec. 7118. New Beginning for Tribal Students.
- Sec. 7119. Hispanic-serving institutions.
- Sec. 7120. Binational agricultural research and development.
- Sec. 7121. Partnerships to build capacity in international agricultural research, extension, and teaching.
- Sec. 7122. Competitive grants for international agricultural science and education programs.
- Sec. 7123. University research.
- Sec. 7124. Extension service.
- Sec. 7125. Supplemental and alternative crops; hemp.
- Sec. 7126. New Era Rural Technology program.
- Sec. 7127. Capacity building grants for NLGCA institutions.
- Sec. 7128. Agriculture Advanced Research and Development Authority pilot.
- Sec. 7129. Aquaculture assistance programs.
- Sec. 7130. Repeal of rangeland research programs.
- Sec. 7131. Special authorization for biosecurity planning and response.
- Sec. 7132. Distance education and resident instruction grants program for insular area institutions of higher education.
- Sec. 7133. Limitation on designation of entities eligible to receive funds under a capacity program.
- Sec. 7134. Scholarship program for students attending 1890 Institutions.
- Subtitle B—Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990
- Sec. 7201. Best utilization of biological applications.
- Sec. 7202. Integrated management systems.
- Sec. 7203. Sustainable agriculture technology development and transfer program.
- Sec. 7204. National training program.
- Sec. 7205. National strategic germplasm and cultivar collection assessment and utilization plan.
- Sec. 7206. National Genetics Resources Program.
- Sec. 7207. National Agricultural Weather Information System.
- Sec. 7208. Agricultural genome to phenome initiative.
- Sec. 7209. High-priority research and extension initiatives.
- Sec. 7210. Organic agriculture research and extension initiative.
- Sec. 7211. Farm business management.
- Sec. 7212. Urban, indoor, and other emerging agricultural production research, education, and extension initiative.
- Sec. 7213. Centers of excellence at 1890 Institutions.
- Sec. 7214. Assistive technology program for farmers with disabilities.
- Sec. 7215. National Rural Information Center Clearinghouse.
- Subtitle C—Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998
- Sec. 7301. National food safety training, education, extension, outreach, and technical assistance program.
- Sec. 7302. Integrated research, education, and extension competitive grants program.
- Sec. 7303. Support for research regarding diseases of wheat, triticale, and barley caused by *Fusarium graminearum* or by *Tilletia indica*.
- Sec. 7304. Grants for youth organizations.
- Sec. 7305. Specialty crop research initiative.
- Sec. 7306. Food Animal Residue Avoidance Database program.
- Sec. 7307. Office of Pest Management Policy.
- Sec. 7308. Forestry products advanced utilization research.
- Subtitle D—Other Laws
- Sec. 7401. Critical Agricultural Materials Act.
- Sec. 7402. Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994.
- Sec. 7403. Research Facilities Act.
- Sec. 7404. Agricultural and food research initiative.
- Sec. 7405. Extension design and demonstration initiative.
- Sec. 7406. Renewable Resources Extension Act of 1978.
- Sec. 7407. National Aquaculture Act of 1980.
- Sec. 7408. Repeal of review of Agricultural Research Service.
- Sec. 7409. Biomass research and development.
- Sec. 7410. Reinstatement of matching requirement for Federal funds used in extension work at the University of the District of Columbia.
- Sec. 7411. Enhanced use lease authority pilot program.
- Sec. 7412. Transfer of administrative jurisdiction over portion of Henry A. Wallace Beltsville Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, Maryland.
- Sec. 7413. Foundation for food and agriculture research.
- Sec. 7414. Assistance for forestry research under the McIntire-Stennis Cooperative Forestry Act.
- Sec. 7415. Legitimacy of industrial hemp research.
- Sec. 7416. Collection of data relating to barley area planted and harvested.
- Sec. 7417. Collection of data relating to the size and location of dairy farms.
- Sec. 7418. Agriculture innovation center demonstration program.
- Sec. 7419. Smith-Lever community extension program.
- Subtitle E—Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008
- PART I—AGRICULTURAL SECURITY**
- Sec. 7501. Agricultural biosecurity communication center.
- Sec. 7502. Assistance to build local capacity in agricultural biosecurity planning, preparation, and response.
- Sec. 7503. Research and development of agricultural countermeasures.
- Sec. 7504. Agricultural biosecurity grant program.
- PART II—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS**
- Sec. 7511. Farm and Ranch Stress Assistance Network.
- Sec. 7512. Natural products research program.
- Sec. 7513. Sun grant program.
- Sec. 7514. Mechanization and automation for specialty crops.
- Subtitle F—Matching Funds Requirement
- Sec. 7601. Matching funds requirement.
- TITLE VIII—FORESTRY**
- Subtitle A—Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978
- Sec. 8101. State and private forest landscape-scale restoration program.
- Subtitle B—Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act of 1978
- Sec. 8201. Repeal of recycling research.

- Sec. 8202. Repeal of forestry student grant program.
 Subtitle C—Global Climate Change Prevention Act of 1990
- Sec. 8301. Repeals.
 Subtitle D—Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003
- Sec. 8401. Promoting cross-boundary wild-fire mitigation.
- Sec. 8402. Authorization of appropriations for hazardous fuel reduction on Federal land.
- Sec. 8403. Repeal of biomass commercial utilization grant program.
- Sec. 8404. Water Source Protection Program.
- Sec. 8405. Watershed Condition Framework.
- Sec. 8406. Authorization of appropriations to combat insect infestations and related diseases.
- Sec. 8407. Healthy Forests Reserve Program reauthorization.
- Sec. 8408. Authorization of appropriations for designation of treatment areas.
- Sec. 8409. Administrative review of collaborative restoration projects.
 Subtitle E—Repeal or Reauthorization of Miscellaneous Forestry Programs
- Sec. 8501. Repeal of revision of strategic plan for forest inventory and analysis.
- Sec. 8502. Semiarid agroforestry research center.
- Sec. 8503. National Forest Foundation Act.
- Sec. 8504. Conveyance of Forest Service administrative sites.
 Subtitle F—Forest Management
- Sec. 8601. Definitions.
- PART I—EXPEDITED ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS AND AVAILABILITY OF CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS TO EXPEDITE FOREST MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES
- Sec. 8611. Categorical exclusion for greater sage-grouse and mule deer habitat.
- PART II—MISCELLANEOUS FOREST MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES
- Sec. 8621. Additional authority for sale or exchange of small parcels of National Forest System land.
- Sec. 8622. Forest Service participation in ACES program.
- Sec. 8623. Authorization for lease of Forest Service sites.
- Sec. 8624. Good neighbor authority.
- Sec. 8625. Wildland-urban interface.
- Sec. 8626. Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forest land adjustment.
- Sec. 8627. Tennessee wilderness.
- Sec. 8628. Additions to Rough Mountain and Rich Hole Wildernesses.
- Sec. 8629. Kisatchie National Forest land conveyance.
- Sec. 8630. Purchase of Natural Resources Conservation Service property, Riverside County, California.
- Sec. 8631. Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program.
- Sec. 8632. Utility infrastructure rights-of-way vegetation management pilot program.
- Sec. 8633. Okhissa Lake rural economic development land conveyance.
- Sec. 8634. Prairie dogs.
 PART III—TIMBER INNOVATION
- Sec. 8641. Definitions.
- Sec. 8642. Clarification of research and development program for wood building construction.
- Sec. 8643. Wood innovation grant program.
- TITLE IX—ENERGY
- Sec. 9101. Definitions.
- Sec. 9102. Biobased markets program.
- Sec. 9103. Biorefinery assistance.
- Sec. 9104. Repowering assistance program.
- Sec. 9105. Bioenergy program for advanced biofuel.
- Sec. 9106. Biodiesel fuel education program.
- Sec. 9107. Rural Energy for America Program.
- Sec. 9108. Rural energy self-sufficiency initiative.
- Sec. 9109. Feedstock flexibility program for bioenergy producers.
- Sec. 9110. Biomass Crop Assistance Program.
- Sec. 9111. Biogas research and adoption of biogas systems.
- Sec. 9112. Community Wood Energy Program.
- Sec. 9113. Carbon utilization education program.
- TITLE X—HORTICULTURE
- Sec. 10101. Specialty crops market news allocation.
- Sec. 10102. Local Agriculture Market Program.
- Sec. 10103. Organic production and market data initiatives.
- Sec. 10104. Organic certification.
- Sec. 10105. National organic certification cost-share program.
- Sec. 10106. Food safety education initiatives.
- Sec. 10107. Specialty crop block grants.
- Sec. 10108. Plant variety protection.
- Sec. 10109. Multiple crop and pesticide use survey.
- Sec. 10110. Clarification of use of funds for technical assistance.
- Sec. 10111. Hemp production.
- Sec. 10112. Rule of construction.
- TITLE XI—CROP INSURANCE
- Sec. 11101. Definitions.
- Sec. 11102. Data collection.
- Sec. 11103. Sharing of records.
- Sec. 11104. Use of resources.
- Sec. 11105. Specialty crops.
- Sec. 11106. Insurance period.
- Sec. 11107. Cover crops.
- Sec. 11108. Underserved producers.
- Sec. 11109. Expansion of performance-based discount.
- Sec. 11110. Enterprise units.
- Sec. 11111. Pasture, rangeland, and forage policy for members of Indian tribes.
- Sec. 11112. Submission of policies and materials to board.
- Sec. 11113. Whole farm revenue agent incentives.
- Sec. 11114. Crop production on native sod.
- Sec. 11115. Use of national agricultural statistics service data to combat waste, fraud, and abuse.
- Sec. 11116. Submission of information to corporation.
- Sec. 11117. Acreage report streamlining initiative.
- Sec. 11118. Continuing education for loss adjusters and agents.
- Sec. 11119. Funding for information technology.
- Sec. 11120. Agricultural commodity.
- Sec. 11121. Reimbursement of research, development, and maintenance costs.
- Sec. 11122. Research and development authority.
- Sec. 11123. Education assistance.
- Sec. 11124. Cropland report annual updates.
- TITLE XII—MISCELLANEOUS
- Subtitle A—Livestock
- Sec. 12101. Sheep production and marketing grant program.
- Sec. 12102. National animal health laboratory network.
- Sec. 12103. National Animal Disease Preparedness, Response, and Recovery Program; National Animal Vaccine and Veterinary Countermeasures Bank.
- Sec. 12104. Study on livestock dealer statutory trust.
- Sec. 12105. Definition of livestock.
 Subtitle B—Agriculture and Food Defense
- Sec. 12201. Repeal of Office of Homeland Security.
- Sec. 12202. Office of Homeland Security.
- Sec. 12203. Agriculture and food defense.
- Sec. 12204. Biological agents and toxins list.
- Sec. 12205. Authorization of appropriations.
 Subtitle C—Historically Underserved Producers
- Sec. 12301. Farming opportunities training and outreach.
- Sec. 12302. Urban agriculture.
- Sec. 12303. Office of Advocacy and Outreach.
- Sec. 12304. Tribal Advisory Committee.
- Sec. 12305. Experienced services program.
- Sec. 12306. Youth outreach and beginning farmer coordination.
- Sec. 12307. Availability of Department of Agriculture programs for veteran farmers and ranchers.
 Subtitle D—Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 Amendments
- Sec. 12401. Office of Congressional Relations and Intergovernmental Affairs.
- Sec. 12402. Military Veterans Agricultural Liaison.
- Sec. 12403. Civil rights analyses.
- Sec. 12404. Farm Service Agency.
- Sec. 12405. Under Secretary of Agriculture for Farm Production and Conservation.
- Sec. 12406. Under Secretary of Agriculture for Rural Development.
- Sec. 12407. Administrator of the Rural Utilities Service.
- Sec. 12408. Rural Health Liaison.
- Sec. 12409. Healthy Food Financing Initiative.
- Sec. 12410. Natural Resources Conservation Service.
- Sec. 12411. Office of the Chief Scientist.
- Sec. 12412. Trade and foreign agricultural affairs.
- Sec. 12413. Repeals.
- Sec. 12414. Technical corrections.
- Sec. 12415. Effect of subtitle.
- Sec. 12416. Termination of authority.
 Subtitle E—Other Miscellaneous Provisions
- Sec. 12501. Acer access and development program.
- Sec. 12502. South Carolina inclusion in Virginia/Carolina peanut producing region.
- Sec. 12503. Pet and Women Safety.
- Sec. 12504. Data on conservation practices.
- Sec. 12505. Marketing orders.
- Sec. 12506. Study on food waste.
- Sec. 12507. Report on business centers.
- Sec. 12508. Information technology modernization.
- Sec. 12509. Report on personnel.
- Sec. 12510. Report on absent landlords.
- Sec. 12511. Restriction on use of certain poisons for predator control.
- Sec. 12512. Century farms program.
- Sec. 12513. Report on the importation of live dogs.
- Sec. 12514. Establishment of technical assistance program.
- Sec. 12515. Promise Zones.
- Sec. 12516. Precision agriculture connectivity.
- Sec. 12517. Improved soil moisture and precipitation monitoring.
- Sec. 12518. Study of marketplace fraud of unique traditional foods.
- Sec. 12519. Dairy business innovation initiatives.
 Subtitle F—General Provisions
- Sec. 12601. Expedited exportation of certain species.
- Sec. 12602. Baiting of migratory game birds.

- Sec. 12603. Pima agriculture cotton trust fund.
- Sec. 12604. Agriculture wool apparel manufacturers trust fund.
- Sec. 12605. Wool research and promotion.
- Sec. 12606. Emergency Citrus Disease Research and Development Trust Fund.
- Sec. 12607. Extension of merchandise processing fees.
- Sec. 12608. Conforming changes to Controlled Substances Act.
- Sec. 12609. National Flood Insurance Program reauthorization.
- Sec. 12610. Emergency assistance for livestock, honey bees, and farm-raised fish.
- Sec. 12611. Administrative units.
- Sec. 12612. Drought and water conservation agreements.
- Sec. 12613. Encouragement of pollinator habitat development and protection.
- Sec. 12614. Repair or replacement of fencing; cost share payments.
- Sec. 12615. Food donation standards.
- Sec. 12616. Micro-grants for food security.
- Sec. 12617. Use of additional Commodity Credit Corporation funds for direct operating microloans under certain conditions.
- Sec. 12618. Business and innovation services essential community facilities.
- Sec. 12619. Rural innovation stronger economy grant program.
- Sec. 12620. Dryland farming agricultural systems.
- Sec. 12621. Remote sensing technologies.
- Sec. 12622. Buy American requirements.
- Sec. 12623. Eligibility for operators on heirs property land to obtain a farm number.
- Sec. 12624. Loans to purchasers of land with undivided interest and no administrative authority.
- Sec. 12625. Farmland ownership data collection.
- Sec. 12626. Rural business investment program.
- Sec. 12627. National Oilheat Research Alliance.

SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF SECRETARY.

In this Act, the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

TITLE I—COMMODITIES

Subtitle A—Commodity Policy

SEC. 1101. PAYMENT ACRES.

Section 1114(e) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9014(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) RECALCULATION OF BASE ACRES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary recalculates base acres for a farm while a farm is engaged in planting and production of fruits, vegetables, or wild rice on base acres for which a reduction in payment acres was made under this subsection, that planting and production shall be considered to be the same as the planting and production of a covered commodity.

“(B) PROHIBITION.—Nothing in this paragraph provides authority for the Secretary to recalculate base acres for a farm.”.

SEC. 1102. PRODUCER ELECTION.

Section 1115 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9015) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “Except as provided in subsection (g), for the 2014 through 2018 crop years” and inserting “For the 2014 through 2018 crop years (except as provided in subsection (g)) and for the 2019 through 2023 crop years”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “or the 2019 crop year, as applicable” after “2014 crop year”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by inserting “or the 2019 crop year, as applicable,” after “2014 crop year”; and

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “elected price” and inserting the following: “elected, as applicable—“(A) price”;

and

(ii) in subparagraph (A) (as so designated), by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “; and

“(B) county coverage for all covered commodities on the farm for the 2020 through 2023 crop years.”; and

(3) in subsection (g)(1), by inserting “for the 2018 crop year,” before “all of the producers”.

SEC. 1103. PRICE LOSS COVERAGE.

Section 1116 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9016) is amended—

(1) in subsections (a) and (d) by striking “2018” each place it appears and inserting “2023”; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(B) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) (as so redesignated), by striking “The payment” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The payment”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) ANNOUNCEMENT.—Not later than 30 days after the end of each applicable 12-month marketing year for each covered commodity, the Secretary shall publish the payment rate determined under paragraph (1).”.

SEC. 1104. AGRICULTURE RISK COVERAGE.

Section 1117 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9017) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting “(beginning with the 2019 crop year, based on the physical location of the farm)” after “payments”; and

(B) by inserting “or the 2019 through 2023 crop years, as applicable” after “2014 through 2018 crop years”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “paragraph (4)” and inserting “paragraphs (4) and (5)”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “(5)” and inserting “(6)”; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “(5)” and inserting “(6)”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”;

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking “if” and inserting “Effective for the 2019 through 2023 crop years, if”; and

(ii) by striking “70 percent” each place it appears and inserting “75 percent”;

(D) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6); and

(E) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

“(5) TREND-ADJUSTED YIELD.—The Secretary shall calculate and use a trend-adjusted yield factor to adjust the yield determined under paragraph (2)(A) and subsection (b)(1)(A), taking into consideration, but not exceeding, the trend-adjusted yield factor that is used to increase yield history under the endorsement under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) for that crop and county.”;

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(C) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) (as so redesignated), by striking “The payment” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The payment”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) ANNOUNCEMENT.—Not later than 30 days after the end of each applicable 12-month marketing year for each covered commodity, the Secretary shall publish the payment rate determined under paragraph (1) for each county.”;

(4) in subsection (e), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”;

(5) in subsection (g)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “effective for the 2014 through 2018 crop years,” before “in the case of”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) effective for the 2019 through 2023 crop years, in the case of county coverage—

“(A) effective beginning with actual county yields for the 2019 crop year, assign an actual county yield for each planted acre for the crop year for the covered commodity by giving priority to—

“(i) the use of actual county yields in, to the maximum extent practicable, a single source of data that provides the greatest national coverage of county-level data;

“(ii) the use of a source of data that may be used to determine an average actual county yield under subsection (b)(1)(A) and an average historical county yield under subsection (c)(2)(A) for the same county; and

“(iii) in the case of a county not included in any source of data described in clauses (i) and (ii), the use of—

“(I) other sources of county yield information; or

“(II) the yield history of representative farms in the State, region, or crop reporting district, as determined by the Secretary; and

“(B) in the case of a farm that has a tract with base acres and that tract crosses a county boundary—

“(i) prorate the base acres based on the quantity of cropland of the tract in each county; and

“(ii) calculate any crop revenue on the basis described in clause (i).”;

(6) by adding at the end the following:

“(h) PUBLICATIONS.—

“(1) COUNTY GUARANTEE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For each crop year for a covered commodity, the Secretary shall publish information describing, for that crop year for the covered commodity in each county—

“(i) the agriculture risk coverage guarantee for county coverage determined under subsection (c)(1);

“(ii) the average historical county yield determined under subsection (c)(2)(A); and

“(iii) the national average market price determined under subsection (c)(2)(B).

“(B) TIMING.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clauses (ii) and (iii), not later than 30 days after the end of each applicable 12-month marketing year, the Secretary shall publish the information described in subparagraph (A).

“(ii) INSUFFICIENT DATA.—In the case of a covered commodity, such as temperate japonica rice, for which the Secretary cannot determine the national average market price for the most recent 12-month marketing year by the date described in clause (i) due to insufficient reporting of timely pricing data by 1 or more nongovernmental entities, including a marketing cooperative for the covered

commodity, as soon as practicable after the pricing data is made available, the Secretary shall publish information describing—

“(I) the agriculture risk coverage guarantee under subparagraph (A)(i); and
“(II) the national average market price under subparagraph (A)(iii).

“(iii) **TRANSITION.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, the Secretary shall publish the information described in subparagraph (A) for the 2018 crop year.

“(2) **ACTUAL AVERAGE COUNTY YIELD.**—As soon as practicable after each crop year, the Secretary shall determine and publish each actual average county yield for each covered commodity, as determined under subsection (b)(1)(A).

“(3) **DATA SOURCES FOR COUNTY YIELDS.**—For the 2018 crop year and each crop year thereafter, the Secretary shall make publicly available information describing, for the most recent crop year—

“(A) the sources of data used to calculate county yields under subsection (c)(2)(A) for each covered commodity—

“(i) by county; and

“(ii) nationally; and

“(B) the number and outcome of occurrences in which the Farm Service Agency reviewed, changed, or determined not to change a source of data used to calculate county yields under subsection (c)(2)(A).”.

SEC. 1105. REPEAL OF TRANSITION ASSISTANCE FOR PRODUCERS OF UPLAND COTTON.

Section 1119 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9019) is repealed.

Subtitle B—Marketing Loans

SEC. 1201. EXTENSIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1201(b)(1) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9031(b)(1)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

(b) **LOAN RATES.**—Section 1202(a) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9032(a)) is amended by striking “2018” each place it appears and inserting “2023”.

(c) **REPAYMENT.**—Section 1204 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9034) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e)(2)(B), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “2019” and inserting “2024”; and

(2) in subsection (g), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

(d) **LOAN DEFICIENCY PAYMENTS.**—

(1) **EXTENSION.**—Section 1205(a)(2)(B) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9035(a)(2)(B)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

(2) **PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF LDPS.**—Section 1206 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9036) is amended in subsections (a) and (d) by striking “2018” each place it appears and inserting “2023”.

(3) **SPECIAL COMPETITIVE PROVISIONS.**—Section 1208(a) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9038(a)) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “2019” and inserting “2024”.

(4) **AVAILABILITY OF RECOURSE LOANS.**—Section 1209 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9039) is amended in subsections (a)(2) and (b) by striking “2018” each place it appears and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 1202. REPEAL; UNSHORN PELTS.

Section 1205 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9035) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “UNSHORN PELTS, HAY,” and inserting “HAY”;

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “non-graded wool in the form of unshorn pelts and”; and

(C) in subparagraph (B) (as amended by section 1201(d)(1)), by striking “unshorn pelts or”; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking paragraph (2); and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

SEC. 1203. ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR UPLAND COTTON USERS.

(a) **2008 AUTHORITY.**—Section 1207 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8737) is amended by striking subsection (c).

(b) **2014 AUTHORITY.**—Section 1207(c) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9037(c)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) **VALUE OF ASSISTANCE.**—

“(A) **EFFECTIVE PERIOD.**—During the period beginning on August 1, 2013, and ending on July 31, 2020, the value of the assistance provided under paragraph (1) shall be 3 cents per pound.

“(B) **SUBSEQUENT PERIOD.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Beginning on the first day after the end of the period described in subparagraph (A), and subject to the availability of appropriations under clause (ii), the value of the assistance provided under paragraph (1) shall be 3 cents per pound.

“(ii) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out clause (i).”.

Subtitle C—Sugar

SEC. 1301. SUGAR PROGRAM.

(a) **EXTENSION.**—Section 156 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(4), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”;

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”; and

(3) in subsection (i), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

(b) **ALLOTMENTS.**—

(1) **ESTIMATES.**—Section 359b(a)(1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359bb(a)(1)) is amended in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

(2) **EFFECTIVE PERIOD.**—Section 359l(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359ll(a)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

Subtitle D—Dairy

PART I—DAIRY RISK COVERAGE

SEC. 1401. DAIRY RISK COVERAGE.

(a) **DAIRY RISK COVERAGE.**—Part I of subtitle D of title I of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9051 et seq.) is amended in the part heading by striking “**MARGIN PROTECTION PROGRAM**” and inserting “**DAIRY RISK COVERAGE**”.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—Section 1401 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9051) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (10) as paragraphs (5) through (11), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) **CATASTROPHIC COVERAGE.**—The term ‘catastrophic coverage’ means coverage under section 1406(a)(2)(B).”;

(3) in paragraph (6) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “**MARGIN PROTECTION PROGRAM**” and inserting “**DAIRY RISK COVERAGE**”;

(B) by striking “margin protection program” the first place it appears and inserting “dairy risk coverage”; and

(C) by striking “the margin protection program” and inserting “dairy risk coverage”;

(4) in paragraph (7) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “**MARGIN PROTECTION PROGRAM**” and inserting “**DAIRY RISK COVERAGE**”;

(B) by striking “margin protection program” the first place it appears and inserting “dairy risk coverage”; and

(C) by striking “the margin protection program pursuant to”; and

(5) in paragraphs (8) and (9) (as so redesignated), by striking “the margin protection program” each place it appears and inserting “dairy risk coverage”.

(c) **CALCULATION OF ACTUAL DAIRY PRODUCTION MARGIN.**—Section 1402(b)(1) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9052(b)(1)) is amended in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking “the margin protection program” and inserting “dairy risk coverage”.

(d) **DAIRY RISK COVERAGE ADMINISTRATION.**—Section 1403 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9053) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 1403. DAIRY RISK COVERAGE ADMINISTRATION.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Beginning with the 2019 calendar year, the Secretary shall administer dairy risk coverage under which participating dairy operations are paid a dairy risk coverage payment when actual dairy production margins are less than the threshold levels for a dairy risk coverage payment.

“(b) **REGULATIONS.**—Subpart A of part 1430 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018), shall remain in effect for dairy risk coverage beginning with the 2019 calendar year, except to the extent that the regulations are inconsistent with any provision of this Act.”.

(e) **PARTICIPATION OF DAIRY OPERATIONS IN DAIRY RISK COVERAGE.**—Section 1404 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9054) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “**MARGIN PROTECTION PROGRAM**” and inserting “**DAIRY RISK COVERAGE**”;

(2) in subsection (a), by striking “the margin” and all that follows through “payments” and inserting “dairy risk coverage to receive dairy risk coverage payments”;

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in each of paragraphs (1), (3), and (4), by striking “the margin protection program” and inserting “dairy risk coverage”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) **CATASTROPHIC COVERAGE.**—A participating dairy operation may elect to receive catastrophic coverage instead of paying a premium under section 1407.”;

(4) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraphs (1)(A) and (3), by striking “the margin protection program” each place it appears and inserting “dairy risk coverage”;

(B) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “of the margin protection program”; and

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “The administrative” and inserting the following:

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The administrative”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) **CATASTROPHIC COVERAGE.**—In addition to the administrative fee under subparagraph (A), a participating dairy operation that elects to receive catastrophic coverage shall pay an additional administrative fee of \$100.”; and

(5) in subsection (d), by striking “the margin protection program” and inserting “dairy risk coverage”.

(f) **PRODUCTION HISTORY OF PARTICIPATING DAIRY OPERATIONS.**—Section 1405 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9055) is amended—

(1) in subsections (a) and (c), by striking “the margin protection program” each place

it appears and inserting “dairy risk coverage”; and

(2) in subsection (a)(2), by striking “In subsequent years” and inserting “During each of the 2014 through 2019 calendar years”.

(g) DAIRY RISK COVERAGE PAYMENTS.—Section 1406 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9056) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “MARGIN PROTECTION” and inserting “DAIRY RISK COVERAGE”;

(2) by striking “margin protection” each place it appears and inserting “dairy risk coverage”;

(3) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “to \$4.00” and all that follows through “\$5.50” and inserting the following: “to—

“(A) in the case of catastrophic coverage, \$5.00;

“(B) \$5.50”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) in the case of production subject to premiums under section 1407(b), any amount described in subparagraph (B), \$8.50, or \$9.00; and”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “(2) a percentage” and inserting the following:

“(2)(A) a percentage”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A) (as so designated)—

(I) by striking “beginning with 25 percent and not exceeding” and inserting “that does not exceed”; and

(II) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) in the case of catastrophic coverage, a coverage level of 40 percent of the production history of the participating dairy operation.”; and

(4) in subsection (c), in the subsection heading, by striking “MARGIN PROTECTION” and inserting “DAIRY RISK COVERAGE”.

(h) PREMIUMS FOR DAIRY RISK COVERAGE.—Section 1407 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9057) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “MARGIN PROTECTION PROGRAM” and inserting “DAIRY RISK COVERAGE”;

(2) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “the margin protection program” and inserting “dairy risk coverage”;

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “Except as” and all that follows through “the” and inserting “The”;

(ii) by striking the rows relating to the \$4.00, \$4.50, and \$5.00 coverage levels;

(iii) by striking “\$0.009” and inserting “\$0.02”;

(iv) by striking “\$0.016” and inserting “\$0.04”;

(v) by striking “\$0.040” and inserting “\$0.07”;

(vi) by striking “\$0.063” and inserting “\$0.10”;

(vii) by striking “\$0.087” and inserting “\$0.12”;

(viii) by striking “\$0.142” and inserting “\$0.14”; and

(ix) by adding at the end of the table the following:

“\$8.50	“\$0.16
“\$9.00	“\$0.18”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (3);

(4) in subsection (c)(2)—

(A) by striking the rows relating to the \$4.00, \$4.50, and \$5.00 coverage levels;

(B) by striking “\$0.100” and inserting “\$0.144”;

(C) by striking “\$0.155” and inserting “\$0.24”;

(D) by striking “\$0.290” and inserting “\$0.42”;

(E) by striking “\$0.830” and inserting “\$1.08”;

(F) by striking “\$1.060” and inserting “\$1.32”;

(G) by striking “\$1.360” and inserting “\$1.68”;

(5) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “the margin protection program” and inserting “dairy risk coverage”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “A participating dairy operation in the margin protection program” and inserting “A dairy operation participating in dairy risk coverage”; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) SMALL AND MEDIUM FARM DISCOUNT.—The premium per hundredweight specified in the tables contained in subsections (b) and (c) for each coverage level shall be reduced by—

“(1) 50 percent for a participating dairy operation with a production history that is less than 2,000,000 pounds; and

“(2) 25 percent for a participating dairy operation with a production history that is not less than 2,000,000 pounds and not greater than 10,000,000 pounds.

“(g) REPAYMENT OF PREMIUMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall repay each dairy operation that participated in the margin protection program, as in effect for each of calendar years 2014 through 2017, an amount equal to the difference between—

“(A) the total amount of premiums paid by the participating dairy operation under this section for the applicable calendar year; and

“(B) the total amount of payments made to the participating dairy operation under section 1406 for that calendar year.

“(2) APPLICABILITY.—Paragraph (1) shall only apply to a calendar year for which the amount described in subparagraph (A) of that paragraph is greater than the amount described in subparagraph (B) of that paragraph.”.

(i) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO PAY ADMINISTRATIVE FEES OR PREMIUMS.—Section 1408 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9058) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by striking “margin protection” and inserting “dairy risk coverage”; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “the margin protection program” and inserting “dairy risk coverage”.

(j) DURATION.—Section 1409 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9059) is amended—

(1) by striking “The margin protection program” and inserting “Dairy risk coverage”; and

(2) by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

(k) ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT.—Section 1410 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9060) is amended—

(1) in subsections (a) and (c), by striking “the margin protection program” each place it appears and inserting “dairy risk coverage”; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “margin protection” and inserting “dairy risk coverage”.

PART II—REAUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER DAIRY-RELATED PROVISIONS

SEC. 1411. REAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) FORWARD PRICING.—Section 1502(e) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8772(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “2021” and inserting “2026”.

(b) INDEMNITY PROGRAM.—Section 3 of Public Law 90-484 (7 U.S.C. 4553) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

(c) PROMOTION AND RESEARCH.—Section 113(e)(2) of the Dairy Production Stabilization Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 4504(e)(2)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 1412. CLASS I SKIM MILK PRICE.

(a) CLASS I SKIM MILK PRICE.—Section 8c(5)(A) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (7 U.S.C. 608c(5)(A)), reenacted with amendments by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, is amended by striking “Throughout” in the third sentence and all that follows through the period at the end of the fourth sentence and inserting “Throughout the 2-year period beginning on the effective date of this sentence (and subsequent to such 2-year period unless modified by amendment to the order involved), for purposes of determining prices for milk of the highest use classification, the Class I skim milk price per hundredweight specified in section 1000.50(b) of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), shall be the sum of the adjusted Class I differential specified in section 1000.52 of such title 7 (or successor regulations), plus the adjustment to Class I prices specified in sections 1005.51(b), 1006.51(b), and 1007.51(b) of such title 7 (or successor regulations), plus the simple average of the advanced pricing factors computed in sections 1000.50(q)(1) and 1000.50(q)(2) of such title 7 (or successor regulations), plus \$0.74.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE AND IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the first day of the first month beginning more than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—Implementation of the amendment made by subsection (a) shall not be subject to any of the following:

(A) The notice and comment provisions of section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

(B) The notice and hearing requirements of section 8c(3) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (7 U.S.C. 608c(3)), reenacted with amendments by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937.

(C) The order amendment requirements of section 8c(17) of that Act (7 U.S.C. 608c(17)).

(D) A referendum under section 8c(19) of that Act (7 U.S.C. 608c(19)).

SEC. 1413. MILK DONATION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part III of subtitle D of title I of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9071) is amended to read as follows:

“PART III—MILK DONATION PROGRAM

“SEC. 1431. MILK DONATION PROGRAM.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ELIGIBLE DAIRY ORGANIZATION.—The term ‘eligible dairy organization’ means a dairy farmer (either individually or as part of a cooperative), or a dairy processor, who—

“(A) accounts to a Federal milk marketing order marketwide pool; and

“(B) incurs qualified expenses under subsection (e).

“(2) ELIGIBLE DISTRIBUTOR.—The term ‘eligible distributor’ means a public or private nonprofit organization that distributes donated eligible milk.

“(3) ELIGIBLE MILK.—The term ‘eligible milk’ means Class I fluid milk products produced and processed in the United States.

“(4) ELIGIBLE PARTNERSHIP.—The term ‘eligible partnership’ means a partnership between an eligible dairy organization and an eligible distributor.

“(5) PARTICIPATING PARTNERSHIP.—The term ‘participating partnership’ means an eligible partnership for which the Secretary has approved a donation and distribution plan for eligible milk under subsection (c)(2).

“(b) PROGRAM REQUIRED; PURPOSES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of

2018, the Secretary shall establish and administer a milk donation program for the purposes of—

“(1) encouraging the donation of eligible milk;

“(2) providing nutrition assistance to individuals in low-income groups; and

“(3) reducing food waste.

“(c) DONATION AND DISTRIBUTION PLANS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive reimbursement under subsection (d), an eligible partnership shall submit to the Secretary a donation and distribution plan that—

“(A) describes the process that the eligible partnership will use for the donation, processing, transportation, temporary storage, and distribution of eligible milk;

“(B) includes an estimate of the quantity of eligible milk that the eligible partnership will donate each year, based on—

“(i) preplanned donations; and

“(ii) contingency plans to address unanticipated donations; and

“(C) describes the rate at which the eligible partnership will be reimbursed, which shall be based on a percentage of the limitation described in subsection (e)(2).

“(2) REVIEW AND APPROVAL.—Not less frequently than annually, the Secretary shall—

“(A) review donation and distribution plans submitted under paragraph (1); and

“(B) determine whether to approve or disapprove each of those donation and distribution plans.

“(d) REIMBURSEMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—On receipt of appropriate documentation under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall reimburse an eligible dairy organization that is a member of a participating partnership on a regular basis for qualified expenses described in subsection (e).

“(2) DOCUMENTATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible dairy organization shall submit to the Secretary such documentation as the Secretary may require to demonstrate the qualified expenses described in subsection (e) of the eligible dairy organization.

“(B) VERIFICATION.—The Secretary may verify the accuracy of documentation submitted under subparagraph (A) by spot checks and audits.

“(3) RETROACTIVE REIMBURSEMENT.—In providing reimbursements under paragraph (1), the Secretary may provide reimbursements for qualified expenses incurred before the date on which the donation and distribution plan for the applicable participating partnership was approved by the Secretary.

“(e) QUALIFIED EXPENSES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount of a reimbursement under subsection (d) shall be an amount equal to the product of—

“(A) the quantity of eligible milk donated by the eligible dairy organization under a donation and distribution plan approved by the Secretary under subsection (c); and

“(B) subject to the limitation under paragraph (2), the rate described in that donation and distribution plan under subsection (c)(1)(C).

“(2) LIMITATION.—Expenses eligible for reimbursement under subsection (d) shall not exceed the value that an eligible dairy organization incurred by accounting to the Federal milk marketing order pool at the difference in the Class I milk value and the lowest classified price for the applicable month (either Class III milk or Class IV milk).

“(f) PREAPPROVAL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

“(A) establish a process for an eligible partnership to apply for preapproval of donation and distribution plans under subsection (c); and

“(B) not less frequently than annually, preapprove an amount for qualified expenses

described in subsection (e) that the Secretary will allocate for reimbursement under each donation and distribution plan preapproved under subparagraph (A), based on an assessment of—

“(i) the feasibility of the plan; and

“(ii) the extent to which the plan advances the purposes described in subsection (b).

“(2) PREFERENCE.—In preapproving amounts for reimbursement under paragraph (1)(B), the Secretary shall give preference to eligible partnerships that will provide funding and in-kind contributions in addition to the reimbursements.

“(3) ADJUSTMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall adjust or increase amounts preapproved for reimbursement under paragraph (1)(B) based on performance and demand.

“(B) REQUESTS FOR INCREASE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a procedure for a participating partnership to request an increase in the amount preapproved for reimbursement under paragraph (1)(B) based on changes in conditions.

“(ii) INTERIM APPROVAL; INCREMENTAL INCREASE.—The Secretary may provide an interim approval of an increase requested under clause (i) and an incremental increase in the amount of reimbursement to the applicable participating partnership to allow time for the Secretary to review the request without interfering with the donation and distribution of eligible milk by the participating partnership.

“(g) PROHIBITION ON RESALE OF PRODUCTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible distributor that receives eligible milk donated under this section may not sell the products back into commercial markets.

“(2) PROHIBITION ON FUTURE PARTICIPATION.—An eligible distributor that the Secretary determines has violated paragraph (1) shall not be eligible for any future participation in the program established under this section.

“(h) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary shall publicize opportunities to participate in the program established under this section.

“(i) REVIEWS.—The Secretary shall conduct appropriate reviews or audits to ensure the integrity of the program established under this section.

“(j) FUNDING.—Of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary shall use to carry out this section \$8,000,000 for fiscal year 2019, and \$5,000,000 for each fiscal year thereafter, to remain available until expended.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1401 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9051) is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “and part III”.

Subtitle E—Supplemental Agricultural Disaster Assistance

SEC. 1501. SUPPLEMENTAL AGRICULTURAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE.

(a) MEMBERS OF INDIAN TRIBES.—Section 1501(a)(1)(B) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9081(a)(1)(B)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating clauses (iii) and (iv) as clauses (iv) and (v), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

“(iii) an Indian tribe or tribal organization (as those terms are defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304));”.

(b) LIVESTOCK INDEMNITY PROGRAM.—Section 1501(b) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9081(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “cold.” and inserting “cold, on the condition that in the case of the death loss of unweaned livestock due to that adverse weather, the Secretary may disregard any management prac-

tice, vaccination protocol, or lack of vaccination by the eligible producer on a farm.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) SHARING OF BISON MARKET VALUE DATA.—To ensure that payments made under this subsection relating to bison are consistent with the market value of bison, the Secretary shall annually seek input and data from the bison industry (including bison producer groups) relating to the market value of bison.”.

(c) TREE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—Section 1501(e) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9081(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “paragraph (4)” and inserting “paragraphs (4) and (5)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) PAYMENT RATE FOR BEGINNING AND VETERAN PRODUCERS.—Subject to paragraph (4), in the case of a beginning farmer or rancher or a veteran farmer or rancher (as those terms are defined in section 2501(a) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(a)) that is eligible to receive assistance under this subsection, the Secretary shall provide reimbursement of 75 percent of the costs under subparagraphs (A)(i) and (B) of paragraph (3).”.

Subtitle F—Noninsured Crop Assistance

SEC. 1601. NONINSURED CROP ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 196 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7333) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following:

“(C) DATA COLLECTION AND SHARING.—The Secretary shall coordinate with the Administrator of the Risk Management Agency on the type and format of data received under the noninsured crop disaster assistance program that—

“(i) best facilitates the use of that data in developing policies or plans of insurance offered under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.); and

“(ii) ensures the availability of that data on a regular basis.

“(D) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate between the agencies of the Department that provide programs or services to farmers and ranchers that are potentially eligible for the noninsured crop disaster assistance program under this section—

“(i) to make available coverage under—

“(I) the fee waiver under subsection (k)(2); or

“(II) the premium discount under subsection (l)(3); and

“(ii) to share eligibility information to reduce paperwork and avoid duplication.”; and

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

“(i) IN GENERAL.—

“(I) AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 2014.—As determined by the Secretary, native sod acreage that has been tilled for the production of a covered crop during the period beginning on February 8, 2014, and ending on the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 shall be subject to 4 cumulative years of a reduction in benefits under this section as described in this subparagraph.

“(II) SUBSEQUENT YEARS.—

“(aa) NON-HAY AND NON-FORAGE CROPS.—During the first 4 crop years of planting, as determined by the Secretary, native sod acreage that has been tilled for the production of a covered crop other than a hay or forage crop after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 shall be subject to 4 cumulative years of a

reduction in benefits under this section as described in this subparagraph.

“(bb) HAY AND FORAGE CROPS.—During each crop year of planting, as determined by the Secretary, native sod acreage that has been tilled for the production of a hay or forage crop after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 shall be subject to 4 cumulative years of a reduction in benefits under this section as described in this subparagraph.”;

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D);

(iii) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) NATIVE SOD CONVERSION CERTIFICATION.—

“(i) CERTIFICATION.—As a condition on the receipt of benefits under this section, a producer that has tilled native sod acreage for the production of an insurable crop as described in subparagraph (B)(i) shall certify to the Secretary that acreage using—

“(I) an acreage report form of the Farm Service Agency (FSA-578 or any successor form); and

“(II) 1 or more maps.

“(ii) CORRECTIONS.—Beginning on the date on which a producer submits a certification under clause (i), as soon as practicable after the producer discovers a change in tilled native sod acreage described in that clause, the producer shall submit to the Secretary any appropriate corrections to a form or map described in subclause (I) or (II) of that clause.

“(iii) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than January 1, 2019, and each January 1 thereafter through January 1, 2023, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the tilled native sod acreage that has been certified under clause (i) in each county and State as of the date of submission of the report.”; and

(iv) in subparagraph (D) (as so redesignated)—

(I) by striking “This paragraph” and inserting the following:

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), this paragraph”; and

(II) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) ELECTION.—A governor of a State other than a State described in clause (i) may elect to have this paragraph apply to the State.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “not later than 30 days” and inserting “by an appropriate deadline”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) STREAMLINED SUBMISSION PROCESS.—The Secretary shall establish a streamlined process for the submission of records and acreage reports under paragraphs (2) and (3) for—

“(A) diverse production systems such as those typical of urban production systems, other small-scale production systems, and direct-to-consumer production systems; and

“(B) additional coverage under subsection (1)—

“(i) for maximum liabilities not greater than \$100,000; and

“(ii) that is equivalent to the process described in the regulations for microloan operating loans under parts 761 and 764 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018).”;

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), respectively;

(B) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(1) the producer’s share of the total acres devoted to the eligible crop; by”; and

(C) in paragraph (2) (as so redesignated), by striking “established yield for the crop” and inserting “approved yield for the crop, as determined by the Secretary”;

(4) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “farm” and inserting “approved”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the second sentence—

(I) by inserting “approved” before “yield”; and

(II) by striking “Subject” and inserting the following:

“(B) CALCULATION.—Subject”; and

(ii) in the matter preceding subparagraph (B) (as so designated)—

(I) by striking “yield coverage” and inserting “an approved yield”; and

(II) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”; and

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking “transitional yield of the producer” and inserting “county expected yield”;

(5) in subsection (i)(2), by striking “exceed \$125,000” and inserting the following: “exceed—

“(A) in the case of catastrophic coverage under subsection (c), \$125,000; and

“(B) in the case of additional coverage under subsection (1), \$300,000”;

(6) in subsection (k)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “\$250” and inserting “\$325”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “\$750” and inserting “\$825”; and

(ii) by striking “\$1,875” and inserting “\$1,950”; and

(7) in subsection (l)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D), respectively;

(ii) by inserting before subparagraph (B) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(A) the producer’s share of the total acres devoted to the crop;”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (C) (as so redesignated), by inserting “, contract price, or other premium price (such as a local, organic, or direct market price, as elected by the producer)” after “price”;

(B) by striking paragraphs (3) and (5); and

(C) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3).

Subtitle G—Administration

SEC. 1701. REGULATIONS.

Section 1601(c)(2) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9091(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “title and sections 11003 and 11017” and inserting “title, sections 11003 and 11017, title I of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 and the amendments made by that title, and section 10109 of that Act”;

(2) in subparagraph (A), by adding “and” at the end;

(3) in subparagraph (B), by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(4) by striking subparagraph (C).

SEC. 1702. SUSPENSION OF PERMANENT PRICE SUPPORT AUTHORITY.

Section 1602 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9092) is amended by striking “2018” each place it appears and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 1703. IMPLEMENTATION.

Section 1614 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9097) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) STREAMLINING.—In implementing this title, the Secretary shall—

“(1) reduce administrative burdens and costs to producers by streamlining and re-

ducing paperwork, forms, and other administrative requirements, including through the implementation of the Acreage Crop Reporting and Streamlining Initiative that, in part, shall ensure that—

“(A) a producer (or an agent of a producer) may report information electronically (including geospatial data) or conventionally to the Department of Agriculture;

“(B) the Department of Agriculture collects and collates producer information that allows cross-agency collation, including by—

“(i) using farm numbers, common-land-unit identifiers, or other common identifiers to enable data across the farm production and conservation mission area to be collated by farm, field, and operator or owner;

“(ii) recording and making available data at the smallest possible unit, such as field-level; and

“(iii) harmonizing methods for determining yields and property descriptions; and

“(C) on the request of the producer (or agent thereof), the Department of Agriculture electronically shares with the producer (or agent) in real time and without cost to the producer (or agent) the common land unit data, related farm level data, conservation practices and other information of the producer through a single Department-wide login;

“(2) improve coordination, information sharing, and administrative work with the Farm Service Agency, the Risk Management Agency, the Natural Resources Conservation Service, and other agencies, as determined appropriate by the Secretary, including by—

“(A) streamlining processes and reducing paperwork for cross-agency interactions, such as acreage reports and conservation compliance determinations; and

“(B) utilizing common acreage reporting processes to collect relevant field-level data such that a producer—

“(i) has the option to report—

“(I) to any of those agencies; and

“(II) electronically; and

“(ii) does not need to report duplicative information; and

“(3) take advantage of new technologies to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of program delivery to producers, including by—

“(A) providing an option, as practicable, for uploading other farm- or field-level data that is unrelated to program requirements, such as input costs or field characteristics, such as soil test results;

“(B) maintaining historical information and allowing users to examine trends on a field- or farm-level;

“(C) providing access to agency tools, such as farm- or field-level estimates of benefits of existing or prospective conservation practices;

“(D) developing data standards and security procedures to allow optional precision agriculture or other third-party providers to develop applications to use or feed into the datasets and analysis; and

“(E) developing methods to summarize the improved yield or reduced risk relating to conservation best practices through cooperative extension services or other similar means, while ensuring the privacy of individual producers.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(e) DEOBLIGATION OF UNLIQUIDATED OBLIGATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), any payment obligated or otherwise made available by the Secretary under this title on or after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 that is not disbursed to the recipient by the date that is 5 years after the date on which the payment is obligated or otherwise made available shall—

“(A) be deobligated; and
 “(B) revert to the Treasury.

“(2) OUTSTANDING PAYMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), any payment obligated or otherwise made available by the Farm Service Agency (or any predecessor agency of the Department of Agriculture) under the laws described in subparagraph (B) before the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, that is not disbursed by the date that is 5 years after the date on which the payment is obligated or otherwise made available shall—

“(i) be deobligated; and

“(ii) revert to the Treasury.

“(B) LAWS DESCRIBED.—The laws referred to in subparagraph (A) are any of the following:

“(i) This title.

“(ii) Title I of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8702 et seq.).

“(iii) Title I of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 7901 et seq.).

“(iv) The Agricultural Market Transition Act (7 U.S.C. 7201 et seq.).

“(v) Titles I through XI of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-624; 104 Stat. 3374) and the amendments made by those titles.

“(vi) Titles I through X of the Food Security Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-198; 99 Stat. 1362) and the amendments made by those titles.

“(vii) Titles I through XI of the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 (Public Law 97-98; 95 Stat. 1218) and the amendments made by those titles.

“(viii) Titles I through X of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 (Public Law 95-113; 91 Stat. 917) and the amendments made by those titles.

“(3) WAIVER.—The Secretary may delay the date of the deobligation and reversion under paragraph (1) or (2) of any payment—

“(A) that is the subject of—

“(i) ongoing administrative review or appeal;

“(ii) litigation; or

“(iii) the settlement of an estate; or

“(B) for which the Secretary otherwise determines that the circumstances are such that the delay is equitable.”.

SEC. 1704. DEFINITION OF SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION OF ACTIVE PERSONAL MANAGEMENT.

Section 1001(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION OF ACTIVE PERSONAL MANAGEMENT.—The term ‘significant contribution of active personal management’ means active personal management activities performed by a person with a direct or indirect ownership interest in the farming operation on a regular, continuous, and substantial basis to the farming operation, and that meet at least one of the following to be considered significant:

“(A) Are performed for at least 25 percent of the total management hours required for the farming operation on an annual basis.

“(B) Are performed for at least 500 hours annually for the farming operation.”.

SEC. 1705. ACTIVELY ENGAGED IN FARMING REQUIREMENT.

Section 1001A(b) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308-1(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) ACTIVELY ENGAGED IN FARMING REQUIREMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, section 1001, and sections 1001B through 1001F, and any regulations to implement those provisions or sections, the Secretary shall consider not more than 1 person or legal entity per farm-

ing operation to be actively engaged in farming using active personal management.

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary may only consider a person or legal entity to be actively engaged in farming using active personal management under subparagraph (A) if the person or legal entity—

“(i) together with other persons or legal entities in the farming operation qualifying as actively engaged in farming under paragraph (2), does not collectively receive, directly or indirectly, an amount equal to more than the limitation under section 1001(b);

“(ii) does not use the active management contribution allowed under this section to qualify as actively engaged in farming in more than 1 farming operation; and

“(iii) manages a farming operation that does not substantially share equipment, labor, or management with persons or legal entities that, together with the person or legal entity, collectively receive, directly or indirectly, an amount equal to more than the limitation under section 1001(b).”.

SEC. 1706. ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME LIMITATION.

Section 1001D(b)(1) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308-3a(b)(1)) is amended by striking “\$900,000” and inserting “\$700,000”.

SEC. 1707. BASE ACRES REVIEW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall review the establishment, calculation, reallocation, adjustment, and reduction of base acres under part II of subtitle A of title I of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9011 et seq.).

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report describing the results of the review under subsection (a).

SEC. 1708. FARM SERVICE AGENCY ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Inspector General of the Department of Agriculture, shall establish policies, procedures, and plans to improve program accountability and integrity through targeted and coordinated activities, including utilizing data mining to identify and reduce errors, waste, fraud, and abuse in programs administered by the Farm Service Agency.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter through fiscal year 2023, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report describing a summary of—

(1) the existing efforts of the Department of Agriculture to eliminate errors, waste, fraud, and abuse, including efforts that involve coordination with other departments or agencies;

(2) identified weaknesses or program integrity issues that contribute to errors, waste, fraud, and abuse in Farm Service Agency programs and plans for actions to be taken to address and reduce those weaknesses or program integrity issues;

(3) the existing and planned data sampling and mining activities of the Farm Service Agency;

(4) errors, waste, fraud, or abuse identified through activities under subsection (a); and

(5) any plans for administrative actions or recommendations for legislative changes relating to reducing errors, waste, fraud, and abuse in programs of the Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 1709. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) Section 1112(c)(2) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9012(c)(2)) is amended by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) Any acreage on the farm enrolled in—
 “(i) the conservation reserve program established under subchapter B of chapter 1 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831 et seq.); or

“(ii) a wetland reserve easement under section 1265C of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3865c).”.

(b) Section 1614(d) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9097(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “pursuant to section 251(a) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(a))”; and

(2) by striking “subtitles B” each place it appears and inserting “subtitle B”.

SEC. 1710. USE OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall use the funds, facilities, and authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out this title and the amendments made by this title.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—Of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary shall make available to the Administrator of the Farm Service Agency to carry out this title and the amendments made by this title \$100,000,000, to remain available until expended.

TITLE II—CONSERVATION

Subtitle A—Conservation Reserve Program

SEC. 2101. EXTENSION AND ENROLLMENT REQUIREMENTS OF CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM.

Section 1231 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”;

(2) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking “or” at the end and inserting “and”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “Agricultural Act of 2014” and inserting “Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018”;

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (D), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, not more than 25,000,000 acres.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “limitations” and inserting “limitation”; and

(II) by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking “may” and inserting “shall”;

(II) by striking “land with expiring” and inserting the following: “land, as determined by the Secretary—

“(i) with expiring”;

(III) in clause (i) (as so designated), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(IV) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) at risk of conversion or development; or

“(iii) of ecological significance, including land that—

“(I) may assist in the restoration of threatened or endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);

“(II) may assist in preventing a species from being listed as a threatened or endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); or

“(III) improves or creates wildlife habitat corridors.”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) by striking “the Secretary shall make” and inserting “the Secretary shall—

“(i) make”;

(II) in clause (i) (as so designated), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(III) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) offer enrollment under subparagraph (A) during any period that any other land may be enrolled in the conservation reserve.”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) ADDITIONAL ENROLLMENT PROCEDURE.—“(A) GRASSLANDS AND CONTINUOUS SIGN-UP.—With respect to enrollment in the conservation reserve program using continuous sign-up under section 1234(d)(2)(A)(ii) or of grassland described in subsection (b)(3), the Secretary shall allow producers to submit applications for enrollment on a continuous basis.

“(B) ANNUAL ENROLLMENT.—Subject to the availability of acreage for enrollment in the conservation reserve program for a fiscal year in accordance with paragraph (1), the Secretary shall enter into contracts under the conservation reserve program for each fiscal year.

“(4) STATE ACRES FOR WILDLIFE ENHANCEMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For the purposes of applying the limitations in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall give priority to land—

“(i) enrolled in the conservation reserve program using continuous sign-up under section 1234(d)(2)(A)(ii); and

“(ii) on which practices to maintain, enhance, or restore wildlife habitat on land designated as a State acres for wildlife enhancement area under subsection (j)(1) shall be conducted.

“(B) ACREAGE.—Of the acres maintained in the conservation reserve in accordance with paragraph (1), to the maximum extent practicable, not less than 30 percent of acres enrolled in the conservation reserve using continuous sign-up under section 1234(d)(2)(A)(ii) shall be of land described in subparagraph (A).

“(5) ENROLLMENT OF WATER QUALITY PRACTICES TO FOSTER CLEAN LAKES, ESTUARIES, AND RIVERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of applying the limitation in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall give priority to the enrollment in the conservation reserve program under this subchapter of land that, as determined by the Secretary—

“(i) will have a positive impact on water quality; and

“(ii) (I) will be devoted to—

“(aa) a grass sod waterway;

“(bb) a contour grass sod strip;

“(cc) a prairie strip;

“(dd) a filterstrip;

“(ee) a riparian buffer;

“(ff) a wetland or a wetland buffer;

“(gg) a saturated buffer;

“(hh) a bioreactor; or

“(ii) another similar water quality practice, as determined by the Secretary; or

“(II) will be enrolled in the conservation reserve program using continuous sign-up under section 1234(d)(2)(A)(ii).

“(B) SEDIMENT AND NUTRIENT LOADINGS.—In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall consider land that—

“(i) is located in a watershed impacted by sediment and nutrient; and

“(ii) if enrolled, will reduce sediment loadings, nutrient loadings, and harmful algal blooms, as determined by the Secretary.

“(C) ACREAGE.—Of the acres maintained in the conservation reserve in accordance with paragraph (1), to the maximum extent practicable, not less than 40 percent of acres enrolled in the conservation reserve using continuous sign-up under section 1234(d)(2)(A)(ii) shall be of land described in subparagraph (A).

“(D) REPORT.—The Secretary shall—

“(i) in the monthly publication of the Secretary describing conservation reserve program statistics, include a description of enrollments through the priority under this paragraph; and

“(ii) publish on the website of the Farm Service Agency an annual report describing a summary of, with respect to the enrollment priority under this paragraph—

“(I) new enrollments;

“(II) expirations;

“(III) geographic distribution; and

“(IV) estimated water quality benefits.”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(j) STATE ACRES FOR WILDLIFE ENHANCEMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A State or Indian Tribe, in consultation with the applicable State technical committee established under section 1261(a), may submit to the Secretary a request to designate within the State or territory of the Indian Tribe a State acres for wildlife enhancement area (referred to in this subsection as a ‘SAFE area’) in accordance with this subsection.

“(2) REQUESTS.—A request submitted under paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) include a description of—

“(i) the specific wildlife species that would benefit from the creation of the habitat;

“(ii) the number of acres requested for enrollment;

“(iii) the geographic area where the habitat would be created; and

“(iv) the 1 or more specific practices to be conducted for the benefit of the wildlife species described in clause (i);

“(B) be in accordance with State or national wildlife habitat plans or goals; and

“(C) include a wildlife monitoring and evaluation plan.

“(3) PRIORITY.—The Secretary may give priority to requests submitted under paragraph (1)—

“(A) that cover an area—

“(i) on which the habitat for a particular species may be declining or in danger of declining;

“(ii) the designation of which would help—

“(I) to prevent the listing of a species as a threatened species or an endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); or

“(II) to remove a species from the list of threatened species or endangered species under that Act;

“(iii) that is adjacent to other conservation land, including to establish wildlife corridors and large blocks of conservation land; or

“(iv) that provides economic or social value to the local community for outdoor recreation activities; or

“(B) that include a commitment of funds from which to pay for incentive payments to an agricultural producer that enrolls land in the conservation reserve program within a SAFE area.

“(4) REGIONAL BALANCE.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall maintain a regional balance in the designation of SAFE areas.

“(5) REPORT.—The Secretary shall—

“(A) in the monthly publication of the Secretary describing conservation reserve pro-

gram statistics, include a description of enrollments in SAFE areas; and

“(B) publish on the website of the Farm Service Agency an annual report describing a summary of, with respect to SAFE areas—

“(i) new enrollments;

“(ii) expirations;

“(iii) geographic distribution; and

“(iv) estimated wildlife benefits.”.

SEC. 2102. FARMABLE WETLAND PROGRAM.

Section 1231(b)(1) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831b(a)(1)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 2103. DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY.

(a) COST-SHARE AND RENTAL PAYMENTS.—Section 1233(a)(1) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3833(a)(1)) is amended by inserting “, including the cost of fencing and other water distribution practices, if applicable” after “interest”.

(b) SPECIFIED ACTIVITIES PERMITTED.—Section 1233(b) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3833(b)) is amended by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) harvesting, grazing, or other commercial use of the forage, without any reduction in the rental rate, in response to—

“(A) drought;

“(B) flooding;

“(C) a state of emergency caused by drought or wildfire that—

“(i) is declared by the Governor, in consultation with the State Committee of the Farm Service Agency, of the State in which the land that is subject to a contract under the conservation reserve program is located;

“(ii) covers any part of the State or the entire State; and

“(iii) the Secretary does not object to the declaration under clause (i) by not later than 5 business days after the date of declaration; or

“(D) other emergency.”.

(c) HARVESTING AND GRAZING.—Section 1233 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3833) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) HARVESTING AND GRAZING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may permit harvesting and grazing in accordance with paragraphs (2) through (5) of subsection (b) on any land subject to a contract under the conservation reserve program.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary, in coordination with the applicable State technical committee established under section 1261(a), may determine for any year that harvesting or grazing described in paragraph (1) shall not be permitted on land subject to a contract under the conservation reserve program in a particular county if harvesting or grazing for that year would cause long-term damage to vegetative cover on that land.”.

SEC. 2104. PAYMENTS.

Section 1234 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3834) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(B) by inserting before subparagraph (A) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(1) SIGNING AND PRACTICE INCENTIVE PAYMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a continuous enrollment contract, the Secretary may make an incentive payment to an owner or operator of eligible land in an amount sufficient to encourage participation in the program established under this subchapter.

“(B) LIMITATION ON MAKING PAYMENTS.—The Secretary may only make an incentive payment under subparagraph (A) if the national average market price received by producers during the previous 12-month marketing year for major covered commodities is greater than the national average market

price received by producers during the most recent 10 marketing years for major covered commodities.

“(2) TREE THINNING AND OTHER PRACTICES.—”; and

(C) in paragraph (2)(B) (as so designated), by striking “paragraph (1)” and inserting “subparagraph (A)”;

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (3)(A)—

(i) by striking “Secretary may” and inserting the following: “Secretary—

“(i) may”;

(ii) in clause (i) (as so designated), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) shall prioritize the enrollment of marginal and environmentally sensitive land that is the subject of the contract offer.”; and

(B) in paragraph (5)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “other” before “year.”;

(ii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) by striking “The Secretary may use” and inserting “Subject to paragraph (3)(A)(ii), with respect to”;

(II) by striking “rental rates” the first place it appears and inserting the following: “rental rates, the Secretary—

“(i) shall apply the limitation described in subsection (g)(1); and

“(ii) may use the estimates”;

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) RENTAL RATE LIMITATION.—Except in the case of an incentive payment under subsection (c), a payment under this subchapter shall not exceed 88.5 percent of the estimated rental rate determined under subparagraph (A).”;

(3) in subsection (g)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “The total” and inserting “Except as provided in paragraph (2), the total”;

(B) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) WELLHEAD PROTECTION.—Paragraph (1) and section 1001D(b) shall not apply to rental payments received by a rural water district or association for land that is enrolled under this subchapter for the purpose of protecting a wellhead.”.

SEC. 2105. CONSERVATION RESERVE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter B of chapter 1 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 is amended by inserting after section 1231 (16 U.S.C. 3831) the following:

“SEC. 1231A. CONSERVATION RESERVE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ELIGIBLE LAND.—The term ‘eligible land’ means land that is eligible to be included in the program established under this subchapter.

“(2) ELIGIBLE PARTNER.—The term ‘eligible partner’ means—

“(A) a State;

“(B) a political subdivision of a State;

“(C) an Indian tribe (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304));

“(D) a nongovernmental organization;

“(E) an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)));

“(F) a State cooperative extension service;

“(G) a research institute; and

“(H) any other entity, as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

“(3) MANAGEMENT.—The term ‘management’ means an activity conducted by an owner or operator under a contract entered into under this subchapter after the establishment of a conservation practice on eligible land, to regularly maintain or enhance

the vegetative cover established by the conservation practice—

“(A) throughout the term of the contract; and

“(B) consistent with the conservation plan that covers the eligible land.

“(4) PROGRAM.—The term ‘program’ means a conservation reserve enhancement program carried out under an agreement under subsection (b)(1).

“(b) AGREEMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into an agreement with an eligible partner to carry out a conservation reserve enhancement program—

“(A) to assist in enrolling eligible land in the program established under this subchapter; and

“(B) that the Secretary determines will advance the purposes of this subchapter.

“(2) CONTENTS.—An agreement entered into under paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) describe—

“(i) 1 or more specific State or nationally significant conservation concerns to be addressed by the agreement;

“(ii) quantifiable environmental goals for addressing the concerns under clause (i);

“(iii) a suitable acreage goal for enrollment of eligible land under the agreement, as determined by the Secretary;

“(iv) the location of eligible land to be enrolled in the project area identified under the agreement;

“(v) the payments to be offered by the Secretary and eligible partner to an owner or operator; and

“(vi) an appropriate list of conservation reserve program conservation practice standards, including any modifications to the practice standards, that are appropriate to meeting the concerns described under clause (i), as determined by the Secretary in consultation with eligible partners; and

“(B) require the eligible partner to provide funds.

“(3) EFFECT ON EXISTING AGREEMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), an agreement under this subsection shall not affect, modify, or interfere with existing agreements under this subchapter.

“(B) MODIFICATION OF EXISTING AGREEMENTS.—To implement this section, the signatories to an agreement under this subsection may mutually agree to a modification of an agreement entered into before the date of enactment of this section under the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program established by the Secretary under this subchapter.

“(c) PAYMENTS.—

“(1) FUNDING REQUIREMENT.—Funds provided by an eligible partner may be in cash, in-kind contributions, or technical assistance.

“(2) MARGINAL PASTURELAND COST-SHARE PAYMENTS.—The Secretary shall ensure that cost-share payments to an owner or operator to install stream fencing, crossings, and alternative water development on marginal pastureland under a program reflect the fair market value of the cost of installation.

“(3) COST-SHARE AND PRACTICE INCENTIVE PAYMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—On request of an owner or operator, the Secretary shall provide cost-share payments when a major conservation practice component is completed under a program, as determined by the Secretary.

“(B) ASSIGNMENT TO ELIGIBLE PARTNER.—An owner or operator may assign cost-share and practice incentive payments to an eligible partner if the eligible partner installs the conservation practice or conducts the ongoing management of the conservation practice on behalf of the owner or operator.

“(4) RIPARIAN BUFFER MANAGEMENT PAYMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an agreement under subsection (b)(1) that includes riparian buffers as an eligible practice, the Secretary shall make cost-share payments to encourage the regular management of the riparian buffer throughout the term of the agreement, consistent with the conservation plan that covers the eligible land.

“(B) LIMITATION.—The amount of payments received by an owner or operator under subparagraph (A) shall not be greater than 100 percent of the normal and customary projected management cost, as determined by the Secretary, in consultation with the applicable State technical committee established under section 1261(a).

“(d) FORESTED RIPARIAN BUFFER PRACTICE.—

“(1) FOOD-PRODUCING WOODY PLANTS.—In the case of an agreement under subsection (b)(1) that includes forested riparian buffers as an eligible practice, the Secretary shall allow an owner or operator—

“(A) to plant food-producing woody plants in the forested riparian buffers, on the conditions that—

“(i) the plants shall contribute to the conservation of soil, water quality, and wildlife habitat; and

“(ii) the planting shall be consistent with—

“(I) recommendations of the applicable State technical committee established under section 1261(a); and

“(II) technical guide standards of the applicable field office of the Natural Resources Conservation Service; and

“(B) to harvest from plants described in subparagraph (A), on the conditions that—

“(i) the harvesting shall not damage the conserving cover or otherwise have a negative impact on the conservation concerns targeted by the program; and

“(ii) only native plant species appropriate to the region shall be used within 35 feet of the watercourse.

“(2) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—For the purpose of enrolling forested riparian buffers in a program, the Administrator of the Farm Service Agency, in consultation with the Chief of the Forest Service—

“(A) shall provide funds for technical assistance directly to a State forestry agency; and

“(B) is encouraged to partner with a nongovernmental organization—

“(i) to make recommendations for conservation practices under the program;

“(ii) to provide technical assistance necessary to carry out the conservation practices recommended under clause (i); and

“(iii) to implement riparian buffers by—

“(I) pooling and submitting applications on behalf of owners and operators in a specific watershed; and

“(II) carrying out management activities for the duration of the program.

“(e) ACREAGE.—Of the acres of land maintained in the conservation reserve in accordance with section 1231(d)(1), to the maximum extent practicable, not less than 20 percent of the acres enrolled in the conservation reserve program using continuous sign-up under section 1234(d)(2)(A)(ii) shall be enrolled under an agreement under subsection (b)(1).

“(f) STATUS REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that describes, with respect to each agreement entered into under subsection (b)(1)—

“(1) the status of the agreement;

“(2) the purposes and objectives of the agreement;

“(3) the Federal and eligible partner commitments made under the agreement; and

“(4) the progress made in fulfilling those commitments.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1240R(c)(3) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839bb-5(c)(3)) is amended by striking “a special conservation reserve enhancement program described in section 1234(f)(4)” and inserting “the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program under section 1231A”.

(2) Section 1244(f)(3) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3844(f)(3)) is amended by striking “subsection (d)(2)(A)(ii) or (g)(2) of section 1234” and inserting “section 1231A or 1234(d)(2)(A)(ii)”.

SEC. 2106. CONTRACTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1235 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3835) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (e);
 (2) by redesignating subsections (f) through (h) as subsections (e) through (g), respectively;

(3) in subsection (e) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “retired farmer or rancher” and inserting “contract holder”;

(ii) by striking “retired or retiring owner or operator” each place it appears and inserting “contract holder”;

(iii) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “1 year” and inserting “2 years”;

(iv) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “purchase, including a lease with a term of less than 5 years and an option to” before “purchase”;

(v) in subparagraph (D), by striking “and” at the end;

(vi) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (F); and

(vii) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:

“(E) give priority to the enrollment of the land in—

“(i) the conservation stewardship program established under subchapter B of chapter 2;

“(ii) the environmental quality incentives program established under chapter 4; or

“(iii) the agricultural conservation easement program established under subtitle H; and”;

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “under the” and inserting the following: “under—

“(i) the conservation reserve program for grasslands described in section 1231(b)(3); or

“(ii) the”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(h) OWNER OR OPERATOR ELECTION RELATING TO CONSERVATION RESERVE EASEMENTS.—

“(1) DEFINITION OF COVERED CONTRACT.—In this subsection, the term ‘covered contract’ means a contract entered into under this subchapter—

“(A) during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this subsection and ending on September 30, 2023; and

“(B) that covers land enrolled in the conservation reserve program—

“(i) under the clean lakes, estuaries, and rivers priority described in section 1231(d)(5); or

“(ii) that is located in a State acres for wildlife enhancement area under section 1231(j).

“(2) ELECTION.—On the expiration of a covered contract, an owner or operator party to the covered contract shall elect—

“(A) not to reenroll the land under the contract;

“(B) to reenroll the land under the contract, on the conditions that—

“(i) the annual rental payment shall be decreased by 40 percent; and

“(ii) no incentive payments shall be provided under the contract; or

“(C) not to reenroll the land under the contract and to enroll the land under the con-

tract in a conservation reserve easement under section 1231C.

“(3) EXCEPTION.—On the expiration of a covered contract, if land enrolled in the conservation reserve program under that contract is determined by the Secretary to not be suitable for permanent protection through a conservation reserve easement under section 1231C, notwithstanding paragraph (2)(B), the Secretary shall allow the land to be reenrolled under the terms of the conservation reserve program in effect on the date of expiration.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1241(a)(1)(B) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841(a)(1)(B)) is amended by striking “1235(f)” and inserting “1235(e)”.

SEC. 2107. CONSERVATION RESERVE EASEMENTS.

Subchapter B of chapter 1 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 is amended by inserting after section 1231B (16 U.S.C. 3831b) the following:

“SEC. 1231C. CONSERVATION RESERVE EASEMENTS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) ENROLLMENT.—The Secretary shall offer to enroll land in the conservation reserve program through a conservation reserve easement in accordance with this section.

“(2) EXCLUSION OF ACREAGE LIMITATION.—For purposes of applying the limitations in section 1231(d)(1), the Secretary shall not count acres of land enrolled under this section.

“(b) ELIGIBLE LAND.—Only land subject to an expired covered contract (as defined in section 1235(h)(1)) shall be eligible for enrollment through a conservation reserve easement under this section.

“(c) TERM.—The term of a conservation reserve easement shall be—

“(1) permanent; or

“(2) the maximum period allowed by State law.

“(d) AGREEMENTS.—To be eligible to enroll land in the conservation reserve program through a conservation reserve easement, the owner of the land shall enter into an agreement with the Secretary—

“(1) to grant an easement on the land to the Secretary;

“(2) to implement a conservation reserve easement plan developed for the land under subsection (h)(1);

“(3) to create and record an appropriate deed restriction in accordance with applicable State law to reflect the easement;

“(4) to provide a written statement of consent to the easement signed by any person holding a security interest in the land;

“(5) to comply with the terms and conditions of the easement and any related agreements; and

“(6) to permanently retire any existing base history for the land covered by the easement.

“(e) TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF EASEMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A conservation reserve easement shall include terms and conditions that—

“(A) permit—

“(i) repairs, improvements, and inspections on the land that are necessary to maintain existing public drainage systems; and

“(ii) owners to control public access on the land while identifying access routes to be used for restoration activities and management and easement monitoring;

“(B) prohibit—

“(i) the alteration of wildlife habitat and other natural features of the land, unless specifically authorized by the Secretary as part of the conservation reserve easement plan;

“(ii) the spraying of the land with chemicals or the mowing of the land, except where

the spraying or mowing is authorized by the Secretary or is necessary—

“(I) to comply with Federal or State noxious weed control laws;

“(II) to comply with a Federal or State emergency pest treatment program; or

“(III) to meet habitat needs of specific wildlife species;

“(iii) any activity to be carried out on the land of the owner or successor that is immediately adjacent to, and functionally related to, the land that is subject to the easement if the activity will alter, degrade, or otherwise diminish the functional value of the land; and

“(iv) the adoption of any other practice that would tend to defeat the purposes of the conservation reserve program, as determined by the Secretary; and

“(C) include any additional provision that the Secretary determines is appropriate to carry out this section or facilitate the practical administration of this section.

“(2) VIOLATION.—On the violation of a term or condition of a conservation reserve easement—

“(A) the conservation reserve easement shall remain in force; and

“(B) the Secretary may require the owner to refund all or part of any payments received by the owner under the program, with interest on the payments, as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

“(3) COMPATIBLE USES.—Land subject to a conservation reserve easement may be used for compatible economic uses, including hunting and fishing, managed timber harvest, or periodic haying or grazing, if the use—

“(A) is specifically permitted by the conservation reserve easement plan developed for the land; and

“(B) is consistent with the long-term protection and enhancement of the conservation resources for which the easement was established.

“(f) COMPENSATION.—

“(1) DETERMINATION.—

“(A) PERMANENT EASEMENTS.—The Secretary shall pay as compensation for a permanent conservation reserve easement acquired under this section an amount necessary to encourage enrollment of land in such a conservation reserve easement, based on the lowest of—

“(i) the fair market value of the land, as determined by the Secretary, using the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice or an areawide market analysis or survey;

“(ii) the amount corresponding to a geographical limitation, as determined by the Secretary in regulations prescribed by the Secretary; or

“(iii) the offer made by the landowner.

“(B) OTHER.—Compensation for a conservation reserve easement that is not permanent due to a restriction in applicable State law shall be not less than 50 percent, but not more than 75 percent, of the compensation that would be paid for a permanent conservation reserve easement.

“(2) FORM OF PAYMENT.—Compensation for a conservation reserve easement shall be provided by the Secretary in the form of a cash payment, in an amount determined under paragraph (1).

“(3) PAYMENTS.—The Secretary may provide payment under this paragraph to a landowner using—

“(A) 10 annual payments; or

“(B) 1 payment.

“(4) TIMING.—The Secretary shall provide any annual easement payment obligation under paragraph (3)(A) as early as practicable in each fiscal year.

“(5) PAYMENTS TO OTHERS.—The Secretary shall make a payment, in accordance with

regulations prescribed by the Secretary, in a manner as the Secretary determines is fair and reasonable under the circumstances, if an owner who is entitled to a payment under this section—

- “(A) dies;
- “(B) becomes incompetent;
- “(C) is succeeded by another person or entity who renders or completes the required performance; or
- “(D) is otherwise unable to receive the payment.

“(g) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall assist owners in complying with the terms and conditions of a conservation reserve easement.

“(2) CONTRACTS OR AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may enter into 1 or more contracts with private entities or agreements with a State, nongovernmental organization, or Indian Tribe to carry out necessary maintenance of a conservation reserve easement if the Secretary determines that the contract or agreement will advance the purposes of the conservation reserve program.

“(h) ADMINISTRATION.—

“(1) CONSERVATION RESERVE EASEMENT PLAN.—The Secretary shall develop a conservation reserve easement plan for any land subject to a conservation reserve easement, which shall include practices and activities necessary to maintain, protect, and enhance the conservation value of the enrolled land.

“(2) DELEGATION OF EASEMENT ADMINISTRATION.—

“(A) FEDERAL, STATE, OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES.—The Secretary may delegate any of the management, monitoring, and enforcement responsibilities of the Secretary under this section to other Federal, State, or local government agencies that have the appropriate authority, expertise, and resources necessary to carry out those delegated responsibilities.

“(B) CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS.—The Secretary may delegate any management responsibilities of the Secretary under this section to conservation organizations if the Secretary determines the conservation organization has similar expertise and resources.”.

SEC. 2108. ELIGIBLE LAND; STATE LAW REQUIREMENTS.

The Secretary shall revise paragraph (4) of section 1410.6(d) of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations, to provide that land shall not be ineligible for enrollment in the conservation reserve program established under subchapter B of chapter 1 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831 et seq.) under that paragraph if the Deputy Administrator (as defined in section 1410.2(b) of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations)), in consultation with the applicable State technical committee established under section 1261(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3861(a)) determines, under such terms and conditions as the Deputy Administrator, in consultation with the State technical committee, determines to be appropriate, that making that land eligible for enrollment in that program is in the best interests of that program.

Subtitle B—Conservation Stewardship Program

SEC. 2201. DEFINITIONS.

Section 1238D of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838d) is amended—

- (1) in paragraph (2)(B)—
 - (A) in clause (i), by striking “and” at the end;
 - (B) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and
 - (C) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) development of a comprehensive conservation plan, as defined in section 1238G(f)(1);

“(iv) soil health planning, including planning to increase soil organic matter; and

“(v) activities that will assist a producer to adapt to, or mitigate against, increasing weather volatility.”; and

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “through the use of—

“(A) quality criteria under a resource management system;

“(B) predictive analytics tools or models developed or approved by the Natural Resources Conservation Service;

“(C) data from past and current enrollment in the program; and

“(D) other methods that measure conservation and improvement in priority resource concerns, as determined by the Secretary.”.

SEC. 2202. ESTABLISHMENT.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 1238E(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838e(a)) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

(b) EXCLUSIONS.—Section 1238E(b)(2) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838e(b)(2)) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “the Agricultural Act of 2014” and inserting “the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2203. STEWARDSHIP CONTRACTS.

Section 1238F of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838f) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) RANKING OF APPLICATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In evaluating contract offers submitted under subsection (a), the Secretary shall rank applications based on—

“(i) the natural resource conservation and environmental benefits that result from the conservation treatment on all applicable priority resource concerns at the time of submission of the application;

“(ii) the degree to which the proposed conservation activities increase natural resource conservation and environmental benefits; and

“(iii) other consistent criteria, as determined by the Secretary.

“(B) ADDITIONAL CRITERION.—If 2 or more applications receive the same ranking under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall rank those contracts based on the extent to which the actual and anticipated conservation benefits from each contract are provided at the lowest cost relative to other similarly beneficial contract offers.”; and

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting “new or improved” after “integrate”; and

(ii) by inserting “demonstrating continued improvement during the additional 5-year period,” after “operation,”; and

(B) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking “to exceed the stewardship threshold of” and inserting “to adopt or improve conservation activities, as determined by the Secretary, to achieve higher levels of performance with respect to not less than”.

SEC. 2204. DUTIES OF SECRETARY.

Section 1238G of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838g) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

- (i) by striking “Agricultural Act of 2014, and ending on September 30, 2022” and inserting “Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, and ending on September 30, 2028”; and
- (ii) by striking “, to the maximum extent practicable”;

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting “to the maximum extent practicable,” before “enroll”; and

(ii) by striking “10,000,000” and inserting “8,797,000”; and

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting “notwithstanding any other provision of this subchapter,” before “manage”; and

(ii) by striking “all financial” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: “all—

“(A) financial assistance, including payments made under subsections (d)(5), (e), and (f);

“(B) technical assistance; and

“(C) any other expenses associated with enrollment or participation in the program.”;

(2) in subsection (d), by adding at the end the following:

“(5) PAYMENT FOR COVER CROP ACTIVITIES.—Subject to the restriction under subsection (c)(2), the amount of a payment under this subsection for cover crop activities shall be not less than 125 percent of the annual payment amount determined by the Secretary under paragraph (2).”;

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by inserting “AND ADVANCED GRAZING MANAGEMENT” after “ROTATIONS”;

(B) by striking paragraph (2);

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (4) as paragraphs (2) and (1), respectively, and moving the paragraphs so as to appear in numerical order;

(D) in paragraph (1) (as so redesignated)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (D) and (E) as clauses (i) through (iv) and (vi), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(ii) by striking the paragraph designation and all that follows through “the term” in the matter preceding clause (i) (as so redesignated) and inserting the following:

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection: “(A) ADVANCED GRAZING MANAGEMENT.—The term ‘advanced grazing management’ means the use of a combination of grazing practices (as determined by the Secretary), which may include management-intensive rotational grazing, that provide for—

“(i) improved soil health and carbon sequestration;

“(ii) drought resilience;

“(iii) wildlife habitat;

“(iv) wildfire mitigation;

“(v) control of invasive plants; and

“(vi) water quality improvement.

“(B) MANAGEMENT-INTENSIVE ROTATIONAL GRAZING.—The term ‘management-intensive rotational grazing’ means a strategic, adaptively managed multipasture grazing system in which animals are regularly and systematically moved to fresh pasture in a manner that—

“(i) maximizes the quantity and quality of forage growth;

“(ii) improves manure distribution and nutrient cycling;

“(iii) increases carbon sequestration from greater forage harvest;

“(iv) improves the quality and quantity of cover for wildlife;

“(v) provides permanent cover to protect the soil from erosion; and

“(vi) improves water quality.

“(C) RESOURCE-CONSERVING CROP ROTATION.—The term”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (C) (as so designated)—

(I) in clause (iv) (as so redesignated), by striking “and” at the end; and

(II) by inserting after clause (iv) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(v) builds soil organic matter; and”;

(E) in paragraph (2) (as so redesignated), by striking “improve resource-conserving” and all that follows through the period at the

end and inserting the following: “improve, manage, and maintain—

“(A) resource-conserving crop rotations; or
“(B) advanced grazing management.”;

(F) in paragraph (3)—

“(i) by striking “paragraph (1)” and inserting “paragraph (2)”;

“(ii) by striking “and maintain” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “or improve, manage, and maintain resource-conserving crop rotations or advanced grazing management for the term of the contract.”; and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) AMOUNT OF PAYMENT.—Subject to the restriction under subsection (c)(2), an additional payment provided under paragraph (2) shall be not less than 150 percent of the annual payment amount determined by the Secretary under subsection (d)(2).”;

(4) by redesignating subsections (f) through (j) as subsections (g) through (j), respectively;

(5) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

“(f) PAYMENT FOR COMPREHENSIVE CONSERVATION PLAN.—

“(1) DEFINITION OF COMPREHENSIVE CONSERVATION PLAN.—In this subsection, the term ‘comprehensive conservation plan’ means a conservation plan that meets or exceeds the stewardship threshold for each priority resource concern identified by the Secretary under subsection (a)(2).

“(2) PAYMENT FOR COMPREHENSIVE CONSERVATION PLAN.—Subject to the restriction under subsection (c)(2), the Secretary shall provide a 1-time payment to a producer that develops and implements a comprehensive conservation plan.

“(3) AMOUNT OF PAYMENT.—The Secretary shall determine the amount of payment under paragraph (2) based on—

“(A) the number of priority resource concerns addressed in the comprehensive conservation plan; and

“(B) the number of types of land uses included in the comprehensive conservation plan.”;

(6) in subsection (g) (as so redesignated)—
(A) by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2019 through 2023”;

(B) by inserting “or acequias” after “Indian tribes”;

(7) in subsection (i) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking the subsection designation and heading and all that follows through “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(i) ORGANIC CERTIFICATION.—

“(1) COORDINATION.—The Secretary”;

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) ALLOCATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Using funds made available for the program for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, the Secretary shall allocate funding to States to support organic production and transition to organic production through paragraph (1).

“(B) DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall determine the allocation to a State under subparagraph (A) based on—

“(i) the certified and transitioning organic operations of the State; and

“(ii) the organic acreage of the State.”;

(8) in subsection (j) (as so redesignated), by striking “subsection (f)” and inserting “subsection (g)”;

(9) by adding at the end the following:

“(k) STREAMLINING AND COORDINATION.—To the maximum extent feasible, the Secretary shall provide for streamlined and coordinated procedures for the program and the environmental quality incentives program under chapter 4, including applications, contracting, conservation planning, conservation practices, and related administrative procedures.

“(1) SOIL HEALTH.—To the maximum extent feasible, the Secretary shall manage the program to enhance soil health.

“(m) ANNUAL REPORT.—Each fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report describing—

“(1) the national average rate of funding per acre for the program for that fiscal year, including a description of whether the program is managed in accordance with the restriction under subsection (c)(2); and

“(2) the payment rates for conservation activities offered to producers under the program and an analysis of whether payment rates can be reduced for the most expensive conservation activities.”.

Subtitle C—Environmental Quality Incentives Program

SEC. 2301. PURPOSES.

Section 1240 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) adapting to, and mitigating against, increasing weather volatility; and”;

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking “to make beneficial, cost effective changes to production systems (including conservation practices related to organic production)” and inserting “to address identified, new, or expected resource concerns associated with changes to production systems, including conservation practices related to organic production”;

(B) by striking “livestock, pest or irrigation management” and inserting “crops and livestock, pest management, irrigation management, drought resiliency measures”.

SEC. 2302. DEFINITIONS.

Section 1240A of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa-1) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (4) and (5) as paragraphs (2) through (5) and (7), respectively;

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(1) CONSERVATION PLANNING SURVEY.—The term ‘conservation planning survey’ means a plan that—

“(A) is developed by—

“(i) a State or unit of local government (including a conservation district);

“(ii) a Federal agency; or

“(iii) a third-party provider certified under section 1242(e) (including a certified rangeland professional);

“(B) assesses rangeland or cropland function and describes conservation activities to enhance the economic and ecological management of that land;

“(C) can be incorporated into a comprehensive planning document required by the Secretary for enrollment in a conservation program of the Department of Agriculture; and

“(D) provides recommendations for enrollment in the program or other conservation programs of the Department of Agriculture.”;

(3) in paragraph (2) (as so redesignated), in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by redesignating clause (vi) as clause (vii);

(B) by inserting after clause (v) the following:

“(vi) Land that facilitates the avoidance of crossing an environmentally sensitive area, as determined by the Secretary.”;

(C) in clause (vii) (as so redesignated), by inserting “identified or expected” before “resource concerns”;

(4) in paragraph (5) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in clause (iv), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) by redesignating clause (v) as clause (vii); and

(iii) by inserting after clause (iv) the following:

“(v) soil tests for—

“(I) heavy metals, volatile organic compounds, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, and other contaminants; and

“(II) biological and physical soil health;

“(vi) scientifically based soil remediation practices to be carried out by the producer, as determined by the Secretary; and”;

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (v); and

(iii) by inserting after clause (i) the following:

“(ii) resource-conserving crop rotation planning;

“(iii) soil health planning, including planning to increase soil organic matter;

“(iv) a conservation planning survey; and”;

(5) by inserting after paragraph (5) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(6) PRODUCER.—The term ‘producer’ includes an acequia.”.

SEC. 2303. ESTABLISHMENT AND ADMINISTRATION.

Section 1240B of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa-2) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “2019” and inserting “2023”;

(2) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) by striking “A contract” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A contract”;

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) WILDLIFE PRACTICES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a contract under the program entered into solely for the establishment of 1 or more annual management practices for the benefit of wildlife, notwithstanding any maximum contract term established by the Secretary, the contract shall have a term that does not exceed 10 years.

“(ii) INCLUSIONS.—A contract under the program may include a practice that provides incentives to producers to—

“(I) carry out postharvest flooding to provide seasonal wetland habitat for waterfowl and migratory birds during the fall and winter months; and

“(II) maintain the hydrology of temporary and seasonal wetlands of not more than 2 acres in order to maintain waterfowl and migratory bird habitat on working cropland.”;

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (4)(B)—

(i) in clause (i)—

(I) by striking “Not more than” and inserting “The Secretary shall provide at least”;

(II) by striking “may be provided”;

(III) by striking “the purpose of” and inserting “all costs related to”;

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking “90-day” and inserting “180-day”;

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) OPTION TO OPT OUT.—A producer described in subparagraph (A) shall be given the opportunity to opt out of the advance payments under clause (i).”;

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) REVIEW AND GUIDANCE FOR COST SHARE RATES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 365 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall—

“(i) review the cost share rates of payments made to producers for practices on eligible land under this section; and

“(ii) evaluate whether those rates are the least costly rates of payment that—

“(I) encourage participation in the program; and

“(II) encourage implementation of the most effective practices to address local natural resource concerns on eligible land.

“(B) GUIDANCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall issue guidance to States to consider the use of the least costly rate of payment to producers for practices.

“(ii) CONSIDERATIONS.—In determining the least costly rate of payment to producers under clause (i), the Secretary shall consider the rate of payment that—

“(I) encourages participation in the program; and

“(II) most effectively addresses local natural resource concerns on eligible land.

“(8) REVIEW OF CONSERVATION PRACTICE STANDARDS.—

“(A) REVIEW.—Not later than 365 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall review conservation practice standards under the program to evaluate opportunities to increase flexibility within conservation practice standards while ensuring equivalent natural resource benefits.

“(B) GUIDANCE.—If the Secretary identifies under subparagraph (A) a conservation practice standard that can be modified to provide more flexibility without compromising natural resource benefits, the Secretary shall issue guidance for revising the applicable conservation practice standard.

“(9) INCREASED PAYMENTS FOR HIGH-PRIORITY PRACTICES.—

“(A) STATE DETERMINATION.—Each State, in consultation with the State technical committee established under section 1261(a) for the State, may designate 10 practices to be eligible for increased payments under subparagraph (B), on the condition that the practice, as determined by the Secretary—

“(i) has received a high Natural Resources Conservation Service evaluation score for addressing specific causes of impairment relating to excessive nutrients in groundwater or surface water or for addressing the conservation of water to advance drought mitigation;

“(ii) meets other environmental priorities; and

“(iii) is geographically targeted to address a natural resource concern in a specific watershed.

“(B) INCREASED PAYMENTS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), the Secretary may increase the amount that would otherwise be provided for a practice under this subsection to not more than 90 percent of the costs associated with planning, design, materials, equipment, installation, labor, management, maintenance, or training.”;

(4) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2019 through 2023”;

(ii) by striking “60” and inserting “50”; and

(iii) by striking “production.” and inserting “production, including grazing management practices.”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “For each” and inserting the following:

“(A) FISCAL YEARS 2014 THROUGH 2018.—For each”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) FISCAL YEARS 2019 THROUGH 2023.—For each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, at least 10 percent of the funds made available for payments under the program shall be targeted at practices benefitting wildlife habitat under subsection (g).”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) REVIEW OF PROCESS FOR DETERMINING ANNUAL FUNDING ALLOCATIONS TO STATES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 365 days after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, the Secretary shall review the process for determining annual funding allocations to States under the program.

“(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—In conducting the review under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall consider—

“(i) the roles of, in determining annual funding allocations to States—

“(I) relevant data on local natural resource concerns, including the outcomes of the Conservation Effects Assessment Project carried out by the Natural Resources Conservation Service; and

“(II) the recommendations of State technical committees established under section 1261(a) and other local stakeholder input;

“(ii) how to utilize the data and local input described in subclauses (I) and (II) of clause (i) such that, to the maximum extent practicable, consideration of local natural resource concerns is a leading factor when determining annual funding allocations to States; and

“(iii) the process used at the national level to evaluate State budget proposals and allocate funds to achieve priority natural resource objectives, including the factors considered in ranking State proposals.”;

(5) in subsection (h)—

(A) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) AVAILABILITY OF PAYMENTS.—The Secretary may provide water conservation and system efficiency payments under this subsection to an entity described in paragraph (2) or a producer for—

“(A) water conservation scheduling, water distribution efficiency, soil moisture monitoring, or an appropriate combination thereof;

“(B) irrigation-related structural or other measures that conserve surface water or groundwater, including managed aquifer recovery practices; or

“(C) a transition to water-conserving crops, water-conserving crop rotations, or deficit irrigation.”;

(B) by redesigning paragraph (2) as paragraph (3);

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN ENTITIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 1001(f)(6), the Secretary may enter into a contract under this subsection with a State, irrigation district, groundwater management district, acequia, or similar entity under a streamlined contracting process to implement water conservation or irrigation practices under a watershed-wide project that will effectively conserve water, provide fish and wildlife habitat, or provide for drought-related environmental mitigation, as determined by the Secretary.

“(B) IMPLEMENTATION.—Water conservation or irrigation practices that are the subject of a contract entered into under subparagraph (A) shall be implemented on—

“(i) eligible land of a producer; or

“(ii) land that is under the control of an irrigation district, a groundwater management district, an acequia, or a similar entity.

“(C) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may waive the applicability of the limitations in section 1001D(b) or section 1240G for a payment made under a contract entered into under this paragraph if the Secretary determines that the waiver is necessary to fulfill the objectives of the project.”;

(D) in paragraph (3) (as so redesignated)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “to a producer” and inserting “under this subsection”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking “the eligible land of the producer is located, there is a reduction in water use in the operation of the producer” and inserting “the land on which the practices will be implemented is located, there is a reduction in water use in the operation on that land”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “except in the case of an application under paragraph (2),” before “the producer agrees”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) EFFECT.—Nothing in this section authorizes the Secretary to modify the process for determining the annual allocation of funding to States under the program.”;

(6) in subsection (i)(3), by striking “\$20,000 per year or \$80,000 during any 6-year period” and inserting “\$160,000 during the period of fiscal years 2019 through 2023”; and

(7) by adding at the end the following:

“(j) MICRO-EQIP PILOT PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—On request of not more than 10 States, the Secretary may establish under the environmental quality incentives program a pilot program in that State under which the Secretary may—

“(A) provide financial and technical assistance to small-scale agricultural producers, including beginning farmers and ranchers and limited resource producers, that enter into contracts with the Secretary under the pilot program to address natural resource concerns relating to production on small-scale agricultural operations; and

“(B) conduct outreach to small-scale agricultural producers to increase participation in the pilot program.

“(2) PAYMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall determine whether a small-scale agricultural producer is eligible to receive payments under this subsection—

“(i) on a State-by-State basis;

“(ii) in consultation with the technical committee established under section 1261(a) of the State in which the small-scale agricultural producer is located; and

“(iii) based on factors that may include—

“(I) the operations of a small-scale agricultural producer, including with respect to adjusted gross income and gross sales;

“(II) demographic data relating to small-scale agricultural producers compiled by the National Agricultural Statistics Service; and

“(III) other relevant information, as determined by the Secretary.

“(B) AMOUNT.—The Secretary shall provide payments under this subsection to a producer that is eligible for the payments under subparagraph (A) in an amount that the Secretary determines is necessary to achieve the purpose described in paragraph (1)(A).

“(3) APPLICATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive financial and technical assistance under this subsection, a producer that is eligible for the assistance under paragraph (2)(A) shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

“(B) ADMINISTRATION.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall limit the administrative burdens, and the regulatory barriers that contribute to administrative burdens, on producers applying for payments under this subsection, including by streamlining the application and approval processes for payments.

“(4) PILOT PROGRAM COORDINATOR.—The Secretary may designate a pilot program coordinator in each State who—

“(A) at the time of designation is an employee of the Natural Resources Conservation Service in that State; and

“(B) shall be responsible for—

“(i) public outreach relating to the pilot program under this subsection;

“(ii) assisting producers in the submission of applications under the pilot program; and
“(iii) distributing financial and technical assistance under this subsection in that State.

“(5) REPORT.—Not later than May 1, 2022, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report describing the results of the pilot program under this subsection, including—

“(A) steps taken under paragraph (3)(B) to limit administrative burdens and regulatory barriers; and

“(B) to the maximum extent practicable, demographic information about each small-scale agricultural producer participating in the pilot program.”.

SEC. 2304. EVALUATION OF APPLICATIONS.

Section 1240C(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa-3(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “that will ensure” and inserting the following: “that shall—

“(1) ensure”;

(2) in paragraph (1) (as so designated), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) give priority to the consideration of the most effective practices to address natural resource concerns on eligible land.”.

SEC. 2305. DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY.

Section 1240F of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa-6) is amended—

(1) by striking “To the extent appropriate,” and inserting the following:

“(a) ASSISTANCE TO PRODUCERS.—To the extent appropriate,”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) STREAMLINING AND COORDINATION.—To the maximum extent feasible, the Secretary shall—

“(1) provide for streamlined and coordinated procedures for the program and the conservation stewardship program under subchapter B of chapter 2, including applications, contracting, conservation planning, conservation practices, and related administrative procedures; and

“(2) coordinate management of the program and the conservation stewardship program under subchapter B of chapter 2 to facilitate the ability of a participant in the program to enroll in the conservation stewardship program after meeting the stewardship threshold (as defined in section 1238D) for not less than 2 priority resource concerns under that program.

“(c) SOIL HEALTH.—To the maximum extent feasible, the Secretary shall manage the program to enhance soil health.”.

SEC. 2306. ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY INCENTIVES PROGRAM PLAN.

Section 1240E(a)(3) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa-5(a)(3)) is amended by inserting “progressive” before “implementation”.

SEC. 2307. LIMITATION ON PAYMENTS.

Section 1240G of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa-7) is amended by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2019 through 2023”.

SEC. 2308. CONSERVATION INNOVATION GRANTS AND PAYMENTS.

Section 1240H of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa-8) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (E) and (F) as subparagraphs (F) and (G), respectively;

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:

“(E) partner with farmers to develop innovative conservation practices for urban, indoor, or other emerging agricultural practices to increase—

“(i) green space;

“(ii) pollinator habitat;

“(iii) stormwater management;

“(iv) carbon sequestration; and

“(v) access to agricultural production sites through land tenure agreements and other contracts;”;

(C) in subparagraph (F) (as so redesignated), by striking “and” at the end;

(D) in subparagraph (G) (as so redesignated), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(H) utilize edge-of-field and other monitoring practices on farms—

“(i) to quantify the impacts of conservation practices utilized under the program; and

“(ii) to assist producers in making the best conservation investments for their operation.”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 2309. SOIL HEALTH DEMONSTRATION PILOT PROJECT.

Chapter 4 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1240L. SOIL HEALTH DEMONSTRATION PILOT PROJECT.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out a pilot project that provides financial incentives, as determined by the Secretary, to producers to adopt practices designed to improve soil health, including by increasing carbon levels in soil (or ‘soil carbon levels’).

“(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In establishing the pilot project under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

“(1) identify geographic regions of the United States, including not less than 1 drought prone region, based on factors such as soil type, cropping history, and water availability, in which to establish the pilot project;

“(2) establish payments to provide an incentive for the use of practices approved under the pilot project that—

“(A) improve soil health;

“(B) increase carbon levels in the soil; or

“(C) meet the goals described in subparagraphs (A) and (B); and

“(3) establish protocols for measuring carbon levels in soil to measure gains in soil health as a result of the practices used in the pilot project.

“(c) STUDY; REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

“(1) STUDY.—Not later than September 30, 2022, the Secretary shall conduct a study regarding changes in soil health, and, if feasible, economic outcomes, as a result of the practices used in the pilot project established under subsection (a).

“(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than September 30, 2023, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing and analyzing the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1).

“(d) FUNDING.—Of the funds made available to carry out this chapter, the Secretary may use to carry out the pilot project under subsection (a) \$15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”.

Subtitle D—Other Conservation Programs

SEC. 2401. WETLAND CONSERVATION.

Section 1222(c) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3822(c)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “in the presence of the affected person, as long as the affected person makes themselves available for the on-site visit”.

SEC. 2402. CONSERVATION SECURITY PROGRAM.

Subchapter A of chapter 2 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838 et seq.) is repealed.

SEC. 2403. CONSERVATION OF PRIVATE GRAZING LAND.

Section 1240M of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839bb) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(2), by adding at the end the following:

“(C) PARTNERSHIPS.—In carrying out the program under this section, the Secretary shall provide education and outreach activities through partnerships with—

“(i) land-grant colleges and universities (as defined in section 1404 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103)); and

“(ii) nongovernmental organizations.”; and

(2) in subsection (e), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 2404. SOIL HEALTH AND INCOME PROTECTION PROGRAM.

Chapter 5 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 is amended by inserting after section 1240M (16 U.S.C. 3839bb) the following:

“SEC. 1240N. SOIL HEALTH AND INCOME PROTECTION PROGRAM.

“(a) DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE LAND.—In this section:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘eligible land’ means land that—

“(A) is selected by the owner or operator of the land for proposed enrollment in the program under this section; and

“(B) as determined by the Secretary—

“(i) had a cropping history or was considered to be planted during the 3 crop years preceding the crop year described in subsection (b)(2); and

“(ii) is verified to be less-productive land, as compared to other land on the applicable farm.

“(2) EXCLUSION.—The term ‘eligible land’ does not include any land covered by a conservation reserve program contract under subchapter B of chapter 1 that expires during the crop year described in subsection (b)(2).

“(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a voluntary soil health and income protection program under which eligible land is enrolled through the use of agreements to assist owners and operators of eligible land to conserve and improve the soil, water, and wildlife resources of the eligible land.

“(2) DEADLINE FOR PARTICIPATION.—Eligible land may be enrolled in the program under this section only during the first crop year beginning after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018.

“(c) AGREEMENTS.—

“(1) REQUIREMENTS.—An agreement described in subsection (b) shall—

“(A) be entered into by the Secretary, the owner of the eligible land, and (if applicable) the operator of the eligible land; and

“(B) provide that, during the term of the agreement—

“(i) the lowest practicable cost perennial conserving use cover crop for the eligible land, as determined by the applicable State conservationist after considering the advice of the applicable State technical committee, shall be planted on the eligible land;

“(ii) except as provided in paragraph (5), the owner or operator of the eligible land shall pay the cost of planting the conserving use cover crop under clause (i);

“(iii) subject to paragraph (6), the eligible land may be harvested for seed, hayed, or grazed outside the nesting and brood-rearing period established for the applicable county;

“(iv) the eligible land may be eligible for a walk-in access program of the applicable State, if any; and

“(v) a nonprofit wildlife organization may provide to the owner or operator of the eligible land a payment in exchange for an agreement by the owner or operator not to harvest the conserving use cover.

“(2) PAYMENTS.—Except as provided in paragraphs (5) and (6)(B)(ii), the annual rental rate for a payment under an agreement described in subsection (b) shall be equal to 50 percent of the average rental rate for the applicable county under section 1234(d), as determined by the Secretary.

“(3) LIMITATION ON ENROLLED LAND.—Not more than 15 percent of the eligible land on a farm may be enrolled in the program under this section.

“(4) TERM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), each agreement described in subsection (b) shall be for a term of 3, 4, or 5 years, as determined by the parties to the agreement.

“(B) EARLY TERMINATION.—

“(i) SECRETARY.—The Secretary may terminate an agreement described in subsection (b) before the end of the term described in subparagraph (A) if the Secretary determines that the early termination of the agreement is necessary.

“(ii) OWNERS AND OPERATORS.—An owner and (if applicable) an operator of eligible land enrolled in the program under this section may terminate an agreement described in subsection (b) before the end of the term described in subparagraph (A) if the owner and (if applicable) the operator pay to the Secretary an amount equal to the amount of rental payments received under the agreement.

“(5) BEGINNING, SMALL, SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED, YOUNG, OR VETERAN FARMERS AND RANCHERS.—With respect to a beginning, small, socially disadvantaged, young, or veteran farmer or rancher, as determined by the Secretary—

“(A) an agreement described in subsection (b) shall provide that, during the term of the agreement, the beginning, underserved, or young farmer or rancher shall pay 50 percent of the cost of planting the conserving use cover crop under paragraph (1)(B)(i); and

“(B) the annual rental rate for a payment under an agreement described in subsection (b) shall be equal to 75 percent of the average rental rate for the applicable county under section 1234(d), as determined by the Secretary.

“(6) HARVESTING, HAYING, AND GRAZING OUTSIDE APPLICABLE PERIOD.—The harvesting for seed, haying, or grazing of eligible land under paragraph (1)(B)(iii) outside of the nesting and brood-rearing period established for the applicable county shall be subject to the conditions that—

“(A) with respect to eligible land that is so hayed or grazed, adequate stubble height shall be maintained to protect the soil on the eligible land, as determined by the applicable State conservationist after considering the advice of the applicable State technical committee; and

“(B) with respect to eligible land that is so harvested for seed—

“(i) the eligible land shall not be eligible to be insured or reinsured under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.); and

“(ii) the rental payment otherwise applicable to the eligible land under this subsection shall be reduced by 25 percent.

“(d) FUNDING.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.”

SEC. 2405. GRASSROOTS SOURCE WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM.

Section 12400 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839bb-2) is amended by strik-

ing subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”

SEC. 2406. SOIL TESTING AND REMEDIATION ASSISTANCE.

Chapter 5 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 is amended by inserting after section 12400 (16 U.S.C. 3839bb-2) the following:

“SEC. 1240P. SOIL TESTING AND REMEDIATION ASSISTANCE.

“(a) DEFINITION OF PRODUCER.—In this section, the term ‘producer’ includes a small-scale producer of food.

“(b) SOIL HEALTH AND QUALITY.—To improve the health and quality of the soil used for agricultural production, the Secretary shall work with producers to mitigate the presence of contaminants in soil, including by carrying out subsections (c), (d), and (e).

“(c) SOIL TESTING PROTOCOL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, shall establish a coordinated soil testing protocol to simplify the process used by producers to evaluate soil health, including testing for—

“(A) the optimal level of constituents in and characteristics of the soil, such as organic matter, nutrients, and the potential presence of soil contamination from heavy metals, volatile organic compounds, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, or other contaminants; and

“(B) biological and physical characteristics indicative of proper soil functioning.

“(2) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall make the soil testing protocol established under paragraph (1) available to the public.

“(d) SOIL ASSESSMENT AND REMEDIATION TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide technical assistance to a producer carrying out a soil assessment or soil remediation practice that shall include—

“(A) an overall review of the health of the soil used by the producer for agricultural production;

“(B) testing of the soil, if applicable, to determine the suitability of the soil for agricultural production;

“(C) based on the results of the soil tested under subparagraph (B), a consultation with the producer and a determination of the quality, health, and level of contamination of the soil adequate—

“(i) to protect against a health risk to producers;

“(ii) to limit contaminants from entering agricultural products for human consumption; and

“(iii) to regenerate and sustain the soil; and

“(D) recommendations on methods to conduct remediation or soil building efforts to improve soils and ensure that the producers—

“(i) are not growing products in soils with high levels of heavy metals, volatile organic compounds, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, or other contaminants;

“(ii) have appropriate information regarding financial resources and conservation practices available to keep soil healthy, including practices, as defined in section 1240A; and

“(iii) are given information about experts, including experts outside of the Natural Resources Conservation Service, that may provide assistance to producers to oversee and monitor soil under remediation or regeneration to ensure soils are suitable for agricultural production in the future.

“(2) EDUCATION AND OUTREACH.—The Secretary shall conduct education and outreach to producers regarding the uses of soil and methods of addressing soil contamination and soil health degradation.

“(e) REFERRAL.—On the request of a producer, where soil is found to pose an imminent hazard to human health, the Secretary may refer the producer to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency for additional assistance for remediation under section 104(k) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(k)).”

SEC. 2407. VOLUNTARY PUBLIC ACCESS AND HABITAT INCENTIVE PROGRAM.

(a) CONSERVATION INNOVATION GRANTS AND PAYMENTS.—Section 1240H of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa-8) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “GRANTS” and inserting “GRANTS, VOLUNTARY PUBLIC ACCESS AND HABITAT INCENTIVE PROGRAM,”; and

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d).

(b) MODIFICATIONS AND MERGING OF PROVISIONS.—Section 1240R of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839bb-5) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and indenting appropriately; and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(2) in subsection (c), by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (5) as subparagraphs (A) through (E), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “section” and inserting “subsection”; and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(4) in subsection (e), by striking “section” and inserting “subsection”; and

(5) by striking subsection (f);

(6) by redesignating subsections (a) through (e) as paragraphs (1) through (5), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(7) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) FUNDING.—Of the funds made available to carry out this chapter, the Secretary shall use to carry out this subsection \$40,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”

(8) by striking the section designation and heading and all that follows through “The Secretary shall establish a voluntary public access program” in paragraph (1) (as so redesignated) and inserting the following:

“(c) VOLUNTARY PUBLIC ACCESS AND HABITAT INCENTIVE PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Out of the funds made available to carry out this chapter, the Secretary shall carry out a voluntary public access program (referred to in this subsection as the ‘program’); and

(9) by moving subsection (c) (as so amended and redesignated) so as to appear after subsection (b) of section 1240H (16 U.S.C. 3839aa-8) (as amended by subsection (a)(2)).

SEC. 2408. AGRICULTURE CONSERVATION EXPERIENCED SERVICES PROGRAM.

Section 1252 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3851) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) TERMINATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.—The authority provided by this section terminates effective October 1, 2023.”

SEC. 2409. REMOTE TELEMETRY DATA SYSTEM.

The Food Security Act of 1985 is amended by inserting after section 1252 (16 U.S.C. 3851) the following:

SEC. 1253. REMOTE TELEMETRY DATA SYSTEM.

“(a) FINDING.—Congress finds that a remote telemetry data system, as used for irrigation scheduling—

“(1) combines the use of field, weather, crop, soil, and irrigation data to ensure that the precise quantity of necessary water is applied to crops; and

“(2) saves water and energy while sustaining or increasing crop yields.

“(b) BEST PRACTICE.—In carrying out the environmental quality incentives program established under chapter 4 of subtitle D, the Secretary shall encourage as a best management practice the use of remote telemetry data systems for irrigation scheduling.”

SEC. 2410. AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION EASEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) PURPOSES.—Section 1265(b)(3) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3865(b)) is amended by inserting “that may negatively impact the agricultural uses and conservation values” before “; and”.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 1265A of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3865a) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “subject to an agricultural land easement plan, as approved by the Secretary”;

(2) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “government or an Indian tribe” and inserting “government, an Indian tribe, or an acequia”; and

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking “entity;” and inserting “entity, unless the land will be enrolled in an agricultural land easement under subparagraph (B);”;

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) in the case of an agricultural land easement, agricultural land that meets the conditions described in clauses (ii) and (iii) of subparagraph (A) that is owned by an organization described in paragraph (2)(B), on the conditions that—

“(i) if the organization that owns the land is also the eligible entity that would hold the agricultural land easement, the organization that owns the land shall certify to the Secretary on submission of the application that the land will be owned by a farmer or rancher that is not an organization described in paragraph (2)(B) on acquisition of the agricultural land easement;

“(ii) if the organization that owns the land is not the eligible entity that would hold the agricultural land easement, the organization that owns the land shall certify, through an agreement, contract, or guarantee with the Secretary on submission of the application, that the organization will identify a farmer or rancher that is not an organization described in paragraph (2)(B) and effect the timely subsequent transfer of the ownership of the land to that farmer or rancher after the date of acquisition of the agricultural land easement; and

“(iii) if the organization that certified the timely subsequent transfer of the ownership of the land under clause (ii) breaches the agreement, contract, or guarantee without justification and without a plan to effect the timely transfer of the land, that organization shall reimburse the Secretary for the entire amount of the Federal share of cost of each applicable agricultural land easement.”

(c) AGRICULTURAL LAND EASEMENTS.—Section 1265B of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3865b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by striking “provide” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “implement the program, including technical assistance with

the development of a conservation plan under subsection (b)(3);” and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “paragraph (4)” and inserting “paragraph (5)”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

“(ii) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share provided by an eligible entity under clause (i) may comprise—

“(I) a charitable donation or qualified conservation contribution (as defined in section 170(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) from the private landowner from which the agricultural land easement will be purchased;

“(II) costs associated with securing a deed to the agricultural land easement, including the cost of appraisal, survey, inspection, and title; and

“(III) other costs, as determined by the Secretary.”;

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (5) as paragraphs (4) through (6), respectively;

(C) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) CONDITION ON ASSISTANCE.—An eligible entity applying for cost-share assistance under this subsection shall develop an agricultural land easement plan—

“(A) with the landowner of the eligible land subject to the agricultural land easement; and

“(B) that—

“(i) describes the natural resource concerns on the eligible land subject to the agricultural land easement;

“(ii) describes the conservation measures and practices that the landowner of the eligible land subject to the agricultural land easement may employ to address the concerns under clause (i);

“(iii) in the case of grasslands of special environmental significance, requires the management of grasslands according to a grasslands management plan; and

“(iv) in the case of highly erodible cropland, requires the implementation of a conservation plan that includes, at the option of the Secretary, the conversion of highly erodible cropland to less intensive uses.”;

(D) in paragraph (4) (as so redesignated)—

(i) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in clause (i), by striking “and” at the end;

(II) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(III) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) consultation with the appropriate State technical committee established under section 1261 to adjust evaluation and ranking criteria to account for geographic nuances if those adjustments—

“(I) meet the purposes of the program; and

“(II) continue to maximize the benefits of Federal investment under the program.”;

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) PRIORITY.—In evaluating applications under the program, the Secretary may give priority to an application for the purchase of an agricultural land easement that, as determined by the Secretary, maintains agricultural viability.”;

(E) in paragraph (5) (as so redesignated)—

(i) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking “paragraph (5)” and inserting “paragraph (6)”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) in clause (i), by inserting “and the agricultural activities to be conducted on the eligible land” after “program”; and

(II) by striking clause (iv) and inserting the following:

“(iv) exclude a right of inspection, unless the eligible entity fails to provide monitoring reports to the Secretary.”;

(iii) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) and (E) as subparagraphs (E) and (F), respectively; and

(iv) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) ADDITIONAL PERMITTED TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—An eligible entity may include terms and conditions for an agricultural land easement that—

“(i) are intended to keep the land subject to the agricultural land easement in farmer ownership, as determined by the Secretary; and

“(ii) include other relevant activities relating to the agricultural land easement, as determined by the Secretary.”; and

(F) in paragraph (6) (as so redesignated)—

(i) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in clause (iii), by redesignating subparagraphs (I) through (III) as items (aa) through (cc), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(II) by redesignating clauses (i) through (iii) as subclauses (I) through (III), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(III) in the matter preceding subclause (I) (as so redesignated), by striking “entity will” and inserting the following: “eligible entity—

“(i) will”;

(IV) in clause (i)(III)(cc) (as so redesignated), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(V) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) has—

“(I) been accredited by the Land Trust Accreditation Commission, or by an equivalent accrediting body, as determined by the Secretary; and

“(II) acquired not fewer than 10 agricultural land easements under the program; and

“(III) successfully met the responsibilities of the eligible entity under the applicable agreements with the Secretary, as determined by the Secretary, relating to agricultural land easements that the eligible entity has acquired under the program; or

“(iii) is a State department of agriculture or other State agency with statutory authority for farm and rangeland protection that has—

“(I) acquired not fewer than 10 agricultural land easements under the program; and

“(II) successfully met the responsibilities of the eligible entity under the applicable agreements with the Secretary, as determined by the Secretary, relating to agricultural land easements that the eligible entity has acquired under the program.”;

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D); and

(iii) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (5)(C), to account for geographic and other differences among States and regions, an eligible entity certified under subparagraph (A) may use terms and conditions established by the eligible entity for agricultural land easements, on the condition that those terms and conditions shall be consistent with the purposes of the program.”

(d) WETLAND RESERVE EASEMENTS.—Section 1265C of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3865c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(D), by inserting “and acequias” after “Indian tribes”; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (B)—

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

(II) by redesignating clause (iv) as clause (v); and

(III) by inserting after clause (iii) the following:

“(iv) the ability of the land to sequester carbon; and”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “and improving water quality” before the period at the end;

(2) in subsection (d)(2), by striking “or Indian tribe” and inserting “Indian tribe, or acequia”;

(3) in subsection (e), by striking “or Indian tribe” and inserting “Indian tribe, or acequia”; and

(4) in subsection (f)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) NATIVE VEGETATION.—The Secretary may allow the establishment or restoration of an alternative vegetative community on the entirety of the eligible land subject to a wetland reserve easement if that alternative vegetative community—

“(A) will substantially support or benefit migratory waterfowl or other wetland wildlife; or

“(B) will meet local resource concerns or needs (including as an element of a regional, State, or local wildlife initiative or plan).”.

(e) ADMINISTRATION.—Section 1265D of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3865d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by inserting “subject to paragraph (2),” before “lands owned”; and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (4) as subparagraphs (A) through (D), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(C) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) (as so redesignated), by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) LAND OWNED BY ACEQUIAS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1)(B), the Secretary may use program funds for the purpose of acquiring an easement on land owned by an acequia.”; and

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “transferred into the program” and inserting “enrolled in an easement under section 1265C(b)”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) AGRICULTURAL LAND EASEMENTS.—A farmer or rancher who owns eligible land subject to an agricultural land easement may enter into a contract under subchapter B of chapter 1.”.

SEC. 2411. REGIONAL CONSERVATION PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSES.—Section 1271 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3871) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “, including grant agreements under section 1271C(d),” after “partnership agreements”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “contracts with producers” and inserting “program contracts with eligible producers”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “use covered programs” and inserting “carry out conservation activities”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) To further the conservation, protection, restoration, and sustainable use of soil, water (including sources of drinking water), wildlife, agricultural land, and related natural resources on eligible land on a regional or watershed scale.”;

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “eligible” before “producers”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “installation,” and inserting “adoption, installation,”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) To encourage the flexible and streamlined delivery of conservation assistance to eligible producers through partnership agreements.

“(5) To encourage alignment of partnership projects with other Federal, State, and local agencies and programs addressing similar natural resource or environmental concerns in a coordinated manner.

“(6) To engage eligible producers in conservation projects to achieve greater conservation outcomes and benefits for eligible producers than would otherwise be achieved.

“(7) To advance conservation and rural community development goals simultaneously.”.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 1271A of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3871a) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “a purpose, activity, or agreement under any of” after “means”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) The conservation reserve program established under subchapter B of chapter 1 of subtitle D.

“(F) The program established by the Secretary to carry out the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), except for any program established by the Secretary to carry out section 14 (16 U.S.C. 1012) of that Act.”;

(2) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting the following:

“(2) ELIGIBLE ACTIVITY.—The term ‘eligible activity’ means—

“(A) an eligible activity under the statutory authority for a covered program; and

“(B) any other related activity that an eligible partner determines will help address natural resource concerns, subject to the approval of the Secretary.

“(3) ELIGIBLE LAND.—The term ‘eligible land’ means—

“(A) eligible land under the statutory authority for a covered program; and

“(B) any other agricultural or nonindustrial private forest land or associated land on which the Secretary determines an eligible activity would help address natural resource concerns.”;

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (E), by inserting “acequia,” after “irrigation district.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(I) An organization described in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of section 1265A(2)(B).

“(J) A conservation district.”;

(4) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively;

(5) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

“(5) ELIGIBLE PRODUCER.—The term ‘eligible producer’ means a person, legal entity, or Indian tribe that is an owner or operator on eligible land.”; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) PROGRAM CONTRACT.—The term ‘program contract’ means the contract established by the Secretary under section 1271C(b)(1).”.

(c) REGIONAL CONSERVATION PARTNERSHIPS.—Section 1271B of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3871b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “eligible” before “producers”; and

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) MAXIMUM LENGTH.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the term of a partnership agreement shall not be longer than 5 years.

“(2) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(A) CONCURRENT PROGRAM DEADLINE.—Subject to approval by the Secretary, the term of a partnership agreement may be longer than 5 years if the longer period is concurrent with a deadline established under a State or Federal program that relates specifically to the project.

“(B) SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES.—In the case of special circumstances outside the control of an eligible partner (as determined by the Secretary) that have created a delay in the implementation of a project of the eligible partner, the eligible partner may request an extension of the term of the partnership agreement.

“(3) PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT RENEWALS.—If an eligible partner demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the eligible partner has made progress in addressing 1 or more natural resource concerns defined in the partnership agreement, not earlier than 1 year before the date of expiration of the partnership agreement, the eligible partner may request from the Secretary a renewal of the partnership agreement, including a renewal of funding, through an expedited approval process—

“(A) to continue to implement the partnership agreement;

“(B) to expand the scope of the partnership agreement;

“(C) to enroll additional eligible producers; or

“(D) to carry out other conservation activities relating to the project, including the assessment of the project under subsection (c)(1)(E), as mutually agreed by the Secretary and the eligible partner.”;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by redesignating clauses (iii) and (iv) as clauses (iv) and (v), respectively; and

(II) by striking clauses (i) and (ii) and inserting the following:

“(i) 1 or more natural resource concerns that the project shall address;

“(ii) the eligible activities on eligible land to be conducted under the project to address the natural resource concerns;

“(iii) the implementation timeline for carrying out the project, including any interim milestones.”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “eligible” before “producers”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “a producer” each place it appears and inserting “an eligible producer”; and

(iv) in subparagraph (D), by inserting “or in-kind contributions” after “additional funds”; and

(v) in subparagraph (E), by striking “of the project’s effects; and” and inserting the following: “of—

“(i) the progress made by the project in addressing each natural resource concern defined in the partnership agreement, including in a quantified form; and

“(ii) as appropriate, other environmental, economic, or social outcomes of the project; and”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “An eligible” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) FORM.—A contribution of an eligible partner under this paragraph may be in the form of—

“(i) direct funding;

“(ii) in-kind support; or

“(iii) a combination of direct funding and in-kind support.

“(C) TREATMENT.—Any amounts expended during the period beginning on the date on which the Secretary announces the approval of an application under subsection (e) and ending on the day before the effective date of the partnership agreement by an eligible partner for staff salaries or development of the partnership agreement shall be considered to be a part of the contribution of the eligible partner under this paragraph.”;

(4) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e);

(5) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) DUTIES OF SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall—

“(1) establish a timeline for carrying out the duties of the Secretary under a partnership agreement, including—

“(A) entering into contracts with eligible producers;

“(B) providing financial assistance to eligible producers; and

“(C) in the case of a partnership agreement that is a grant agreement under section 1271C(d), providing the grant amounts to the eligible partner;

“(2) establish in each State a program coordinator for the State, who shall be responsible solely for providing assistance to eligible partners and eligible producers under the program;

“(3) establish guidance to assist eligible partners with carrying out the assessment required under subsection (c)(1)(E);

“(4) provide to each eligible partner that has entered into a partnership agreement—

“(A) a semiannual report describing the status of each pending and obligated contract under the project of the eligible partner; and

“(B) an annual report describing how the Secretary used amounts reserved by the Secretary for that year for technical assistance under section 1271D(f);

“(5) allow an eligible partner to use a new or modified conservation practice standard under a partnership agreement, if the Secretary ensures that the new or modified conservation practice standard—

“(A) is based on the best available science;

“(B) is implemented after consultation with the Secretary at the local level to assess the anticipated effectiveness of the new or modified conservation practice standard; and

“(C) effectively addresses natural resource concerns; and

“(6) ensure that any eligible activity effectively addresses natural resource concerns.”; and

(6) in subsection (e) (as redesignated by paragraph (4))—

(A) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) CRITERIA USED.—In carrying out the process described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

“(A) make public the criteria used in evaluating applications; and

“(B) in the case of an application submitted by a lead eligible partner that identifies a local conservation district as another eligible partner for the project, evaluate the engagement of the lead eligible partner with the local conservation district to ensure local input.”;

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking the paragraph designation and heading and all that follows through “description of—” and inserting the following:

“(3) CONTENTS.—The Secretary shall develop a simplified application process that requires each application submitted under this subsection to include a description of—”;

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “, including the covered programs to be used”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (D), by inserting “or in-kind” after “financial”;

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “may” and inserting “shall”;

(ii) in subparagraphs (A) and (B), by inserting “eligible” before “producers” each place it appears;

(iii) by striking subparagraph (D);

(iv) by redesignating subparagraphs (E) and (F) as subparagraphs (G) and (H), respectively; and

(v) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) build new partnerships at the local, State, and corporate levels or include a diversity of stakeholders in the project;

“(E) deliver a high percentage of applied conservation—

“(i) to address the identified natural resource concerns; or

“(ii) in the case of a project in a critical conservation area under section 1271F, to address the critical conservation condition for that critical conservation area;

“(F)(i) develop and implement new watershed or habitat plans to address 1 or more natural resource concerns; or

“(ii) implement the project consistent with existing watershed restoration plans;”;

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) REVIEW.—To the extent practicable, after receipt of an application under this subsection, the Secretary shall provide to each applicant information and feedback (including written information and feedback, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate) throughout the annual program application process for any improvements that could be made to the application.”.

(d) ASSISTANCE TO ELIGIBLE PRODUCERS.—Section 1271C of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3871c) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by inserting “ELIGIBLE” before “PRODUCERS”;

(2) by striking subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—An eligible producer may receive financial or technical assistance to conduct eligible activities on eligible land through a program contract entered into with the Secretary.

“(b) PROGRAM CONTRACTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a program contract to be entered into with an eligible producer to conduct eligible activities on eligible land, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may establish.

“(2) APPLICATION BUNDLES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible partner may submit to the Secretary, on behalf of eligible producers, a bundle of applications for assistance under the program through program contracts to address a substantial portion of a natural resource concern defined in the partnership agreement.

“(B) PRIORITY.—The Secretary shall give priority to applications described in subparagraph (A).”;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “In accordance with statutory requirements of the covered programs involved, the Secretary may make payments to a producer” and inserting “Subject to section 1271D, the Secretary may make payments to an eligible producer”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “eligible” before “producers” each place it appears; and

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking “participating” and inserting “eligible”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS THROUGH GRANT AGREEMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A partnership agreement may be a grant agreement entered into with an eligible partner in accordance with this subsection.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Under a grant agreement under paragraph (1)—

“(A) using amounts made available to carry out this subtitle, the Secretary shall provide to the eligible partner a grant;

“(B) the eligible partner shall carry out eligible activities on eligible land (including by contracting with 1 or more producers, if the eligible partner determines the contracting to be appropriate), on the condition that the eligible activities directly or indirectly benefit agricultural producers (including forestry producers), to address natural resource concerns on a regional or watershed scale, such as—

“(i) infrastructure investments relating to agricultural or nonindustrial private forest production that would benefit multiple producers, such as a multiproducer irrigation water delivery system, including investments to address drought;

“(ii) projects addressing water quality or quantity concerns (including drought) in coordination with producers, including the development and implementation of watershed plans;

“(iii) projects that use innovative approaches to leveraging the Federal investment in conservation with private financial mechanisms, in conjunction with agricultural production or forest resource management, such as—

“(I) the provision of performance-based payments to eligible producers; and

“(II) support for an environmental market;

“(iv) projects that facilitate pilot testing of new conservation practices, technologies, or activities;

“(v) projects that promote the long-term viability and sustainability of agricultural land through innovative agricultural land and water protection strategies and mechanisms, including projects that support the transfer of land to beginning farmers and ranchers, veteran farmers and ranchers, socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers, and limited resource farmers and ranchers; and

“(vi) other projects for which the Secretary determines that the goals and objectives of the program would be easier to achieve through the grant agreement; and

“(C) the Secretary may provide technical and administrative assistance, as mutually agreed by the parties.

“(3) NONAPPLICABILITY OF ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME LIMITATION.—The adjusted gross income limitation described in section 1001D(b)(1) shall not apply to the receipt by an eligible partner of a grant under this subsection.

“(4) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may not use more than 30 percent of funding made available to carry out the program for grant agreements.

“(5) REPORTS.—An eligible partner that enters into a grant agreement under this subsection shall submit to the Secretary—

“(A) any information that the Secretary requires to prepare the report under section 1271E(b); and

“(B) an annual report that describes the status of the project carried out by the eligible partner, including a description of—

“(i) the use of the grant funds;

“(ii) any subcontracts awarded using grant funds;

“(iii) the eligible producers receiving funding using the grant funds;

“(iv)(I) the progress made by the project in addressing each natural resource concern defined in the grant agreement, including in a quantified form; and

“(II) as appropriate, other environmental, economic, or social outcomes of the project; and

“(v) any other reporting data the Secretary determines are necessary to ensure compliance with the program rules.”.

(e) FUNDING.—Section 1271D of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3871d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “\$100,000,000” and inserting “\$200,000,000”; and

(B) by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2019 through 2023”;

(2) in subsection (c), by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To ensure that additional resources are available to carry out the program, in addition to the funds made available under subsection (a), for each fiscal year the Secretary shall transfer 7 percent of the funds and acres made available for the following programs:

“(A) The conservation stewardship program established under subchapter B of chapter 2 of subtitle D.

“(B) The environmental quality incentives program established under chapter 4 of subtitle D.

“(C) The agricultural conservation easement program established under subtitle H.

“(2) DURATION OF AVAILABILITY.—Any funds or acres transferred under paragraph (1) shall remain available for obligation only for the purposes of carrying out the program until expended.

“(3) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—To the maximum extent practicable, of projects receiving funds or acres transferred under paragraph (1) from a program described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of that paragraph, the percentage of projects that shall have purposes similar to the purposes of the applicable program from which funds or acres were transferred shall be approximately equal to the percentage of funds or acres transferred from the applicable program.”;

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “25 percent of the funds and acres to projects based on a State competitive process administered by the State Conservationist, with the advice of the State technical committee” and inserting the following: “40 percent of the funds and acres to projects based on a State or multistate competitive process administered by the Secretary at the local level with the advice of the applicable State technical committees”;

(B) by striking paragraph (2);

(C) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2); and

(D) in paragraph (2) (as so redesignated), by striking “35 percent” and inserting “60 percent”;

(4) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking “None of the funds” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), none of the funds”;

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND OUTREACH.—Under a partnership agreement, the Secretary may advance reasonable amounts of funding for technical assistance to eligible partners to conduct project development and outreach activities in a project area, including—

“(A) providing outreach and education to eligible producers for potential participation in the project;

“(B) developing a watershed or habitat plan;

“(C) establishing baseline metrics to support the development of the assessment required under section 1271B(c)(1)(E); or

“(D) providing technical assistance to eligible producers.

“(3) REIMBURSEMENT.—The Secretary may reimburse reasonable amounts of funding for activities conducted during the period beginning on the date on which the Secretary announces the approval of an application under section 1271B(e) and ending on the day before the effective date of the partnership agreement.”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—At the time of project selection, the Secretary shall identify and make publically available the amount that the Secretary shall use to provide technical assistance under the terms of the partnership agreement.

“(2) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall limit costs of the Secretary for technical assistance to costs specific and necessary to carry out the objectives of the program.

“(3) THIRD-PARTY PROVIDERS.—The Secretary shall develop and implement strategies to encourage third-party technical service providers to provide technical assistance to eligible partners pursuant to a partnership agreement.”.

(f) ADMINISTRATION.—Section 1271E of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3871e) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2018”;

(B) in paragraphs (1) and (2), by inserting “eligible” before “producers” each place it appears;

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (4) as paragraphs (2) through (5), respectively; and

(D) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(1) a summary of—

“(A) the progress made towards addressing the 1 or more natural resource concerns defined for the projects; and

“(B) any other related environmental, social, or economic outcomes of the projects.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) COMPLIANCE WITH CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary may not provide assistance under the program to an eligible producer unless the eligible producer agrees, during the program year for which the assistance is provided—

“(1) to comply with applicable conservation requirements under subtitle B; and

“(2) to comply with applicable wetland protection requirements under subtitle C.

“(d) HISTORICALLY UNDERSERVED PRODUCERS.—To the maximum extent practicable, in carrying out the program, the Secretary shall work with eligible partners to maintain eligible benefits available through the covered programs for beginning farmers and ranchers, veteran farmers and ranchers, socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers, and limited resource farmers and ranchers.

“(e) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall issue regulations to carry out the program.”.

(g) CRITICAL CONSERVATION AREAS.—Section 1271F of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3871f) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (a), (b), and (c) as subsections (b), (c), and (e), respectively;

(2) by inserting before subsection (b) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) CRITICAL CONSERVATION AREA.—The term ‘critical conservation area’ means a geographical area that contains a critical

conservation condition that can be addressed through the program.

“(2) CRITICAL CONSERVATION CONDITION.—The term ‘critical conservation condition’ means—

“(A) a condition of land that would benefit from water quality improvement, including through reducing erosion, promoting sediment control, and addressing nutrient management activities affecting large bodies of water of regional, national, or international significance; and

“(B) a condition of land that would benefit from water quantity improvement, including improvement relating to—

“(i) drought;

“(ii) groundwater, surface water, aquifer, or other water sources; or

“(iii) water retention and flood prevention.”;

(3) in subsection (b) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking “producer” and inserting “program”; and

(B) by inserting “that address each critical conservation condition for which the critical conservation area is designated” before the period at the end;

(4) in subsection (c) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (3) as paragraphs (2) through (4), respectively;

(B) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall identify 1 or more critical conservation conditions that apply to each critical conservation area designated under this section after the date of enactment of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-79; 128 Stat. 649), including the conservation goals and outcomes sufficient to demonstrate that progress is being made to address the critical conservation conditions.”;

(C) in paragraph (2) (as so redesignated)—

(i) by striking subparagraphs (C) and (D) and inserting the following:

“(C) contains a critical conservation condition; or”;

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (D); and

(iii) in subparagraph (D) (as so redesignated), by inserting “eligible” before “producers”; and

(D) by striking paragraph (3) (as so redesignated) and inserting the following:

“(3) REVIEW AND WITHDRAWAL.—The Secretary may—

“(A) review designations of critical conservation areas under this section not more frequently than once every 5 years; and

“(B) withdraw designation of a critical conservation area only if the Secretary determines that the area is no longer a critical conservation area.”;

(5) by inserting after subsection (c) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(d) OUTREACH TO ELIGIBLE PARTNERS AND ELIGIBLE PRODUCERS.—The Secretary shall provide outreach and education to eligible partners and eligible producers in critical conservation areas designated under this section to encourage the development of projects to address each critical conservation condition identified by the Secretary for that critical conservation area.”;

(6) in subsection (e) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “producer” and inserting “program”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (3); and

(7) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) REPORTS.—Not later than December 31, 2018, and each year thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report describing the status of each critical conservation

condition for each critical conservation area designated under this section, including—

“(1) the conditions for which each critical conservation area is designated;

“(2) conservation goals and outcomes sufficient to demonstrate that progress is being made to address the critical conservation conditions;

“(3) the partnership agreements selected to address each conservation goal and outcome; and

“(4) the extent to which each conservation goal and outcome is being addressed by the partnership agreements.”.

(h) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1271E of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3871e) (as amended by subsection (f)) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “1271B(d)” each place it appears and inserting “1271B(e)”; and

(B) in subsection (b)(5), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “1271C(b)(2)” and inserting “1271C(d)”.

(2) Section 1271F of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3871f) is amended in subsection (b) (as redesignated by subsection (g)(1)) by striking “1271D(d)(3)” and inserting “1271D(d)(2)”.

SEC. 2412. WETLAND CONVERSION.

Section 1221(d) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3821(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Except as” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) DUTY OF THE SECRETARY.—No person shall become ineligible under paragraph (1) if the Secretary determines that an exemption under section 1222(b) applies to that person.”.

SEC. 2413. DELINEATION OF WETLANDS.

(a) IDENTIFICATION OF MINIMAL EFFECT EXEMPTIONS.—Section 1222(d) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3822(d)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “For purposes” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes”; and

(2) in paragraph (1) (as so designated)—

(A) in the first sentence, by inserting “not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, in accordance with paragraph (2),” before “the Secretary”; and

(B) in the second sentence, by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall carry out paragraph (1)—

“(A) in compliance with applicable Federal environmental laws, including the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

“(B) in accordance with subsections (d) and (e) of section 12.31 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018); and

“(C) in consultation with—

“(i) State technical committees established under section 1261(a);

“(ii) State wildlife and water resource agencies;

“(iii) the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service;

“(iv) State Committees of the Farm Service Agency; and

“(v) agricultural commodity organizations.

“(3) TRAINING OF EMPLOYEES.—The Secretary”.

(b) MITIGATION BANKING.—Section 1222(k)(1) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3822(k)(1)) is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the

Secretary to carry out this paragraph \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”.

SEC. 2414. EMERGENCY CONSERVATION PROGRAM.

(a) WATERSHED PROTECTION PROGRAM.—Section 403 of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2203) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “MEASURES” and inserting “WATERSHED PROTECTION PROGRAM”; and

(2) in subsection (a), by inserting “watershed protection” after “emergency”.

(b) PAYMENT LIMITATIONS.—Title IV of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978 is amended by inserting after section 403 (16 U.S.C. 2203) the following:

“SEC. 403A. PAYMENT LIMITATION.

“The maximum payment made under the emergency conservation program to an agricultural producer under this title may not exceed \$500,000.”.

(c) FUNDING AND ADMINISTRATION.—Section 404 of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2204) is amended—

(1) in the fourth sentence, by striking “The Corporation” and inserting the following:

“(d) LIMITATION.—The Commodity Credit Corporation”; and

(2) in the third sentence, by striking “In implementing the provisions of” and inserting the following:

“(c) USE OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION.—In implementing”;

(3) by striking the second sentence;

(4) by striking the section designation and all that follows through “There are authorized” in the first sentence and inserting the following:

“SEC. 404. FUNDING AND ADMINISTRATION.

“(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized”;

(5) in subsection (a) (as so designated), by inserting “, to remain available until expended” before the period at the end; and

(6) by inserting after subsection (a) (as so designated) the following:

“(b) SET-ASIDE FOR FENCING.—Of the amounts made available under subsection (a) for a fiscal year, 25 percent shall be set aside until April 1 of that fiscal year for the repair or replacement of fencing.”.

SEC. 2415. WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION.

Section 10 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1007) is amended by striking the section designation and all that follows through “No appropriation” in the second sentence and inserting the following:

“SEC. 10. FUNDING.

“(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act \$200,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.

“(b) LIMITATIONS.—No appropriation”.

SEC. 2416. SMALL WATERSHED REHABILITATION PROGRAM.

Section 14(h)(2) of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1012(h)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) \$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”.

SEC. 2417. REPEAL OF CONSERVATION CORRIDOR DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle G of title II of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (16 U.S.C. 3801 note; Public Law 107-171) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 5059 of the Water Resources Development Act of

2007 (16 U.S.C. 3801 note; Public Law 110-114) is repealed.

SEC. 2418. REPEAL OF CRANBERRY ACREAGE RESERVE PROGRAM.

Section 10608 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (16 U.S.C. 3801 note; Public Law 107-171) is repealed.

SEC. 2419. REPEAL OF NATIONAL NATURAL RESOURCES FOUNDATION.

Subtitle F of title III of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (16 U.S.C. 5801 et seq.) is repealed.

SEC. 2420. REPEAL OF FLOOD RISK REDUCTION.

Section 385 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7334) is repealed.

SEC. 2421. REPEAL OF STUDY OF LAND USE FOR EXPIRING CONTRACTS AND EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.

Section 1437 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 3831 note; Public Law 101-624) is repealed.

SEC. 2422. REPEAL OF INTEGRATED FARM MANAGEMENT PROGRAM OPTION.

Section 1451 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5822) is repealed.

SEC. 2423. REPEAL OF CLARIFICATION OF DEFINITION OF AGRICULTURAL LANDS.

Section 325 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-127; 110 Stat. 992) is repealed.

SEC. 2424. RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

Section 1537 of the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3460) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 1537. TERMINATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.

“The authority provided by this subtitle terminates effective October 1, 2023.”.

SEC. 2425. WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary and the Secretary of the Interior shall continue to carry out the Working Lands for Wildlife model of conservation on working landscapes, as implemented on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, in accordance with—

(1) the document entitled “Partnership Agreement Between the United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service and the United States Department of the Interior Fish and Wildlife Service”, numbered A-3A75-16-937, and formalized by the Chief of the Natural Resources Conservation Service on September 15, 2016, and by the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service on August 4, 2016, as in effect on September 15, 2016; and

(2) United States Fish and Wildlife Service Director’s Order No. 217, dated August 9, 2016, as in effect on August 9, 2016.

(b) EXPANSION OF MODEL.—The Secretary and the Secretary of the Interior may expand the conservation model described in subsection (a) through a new partnership agreement between the Farm Service Agency and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for the purpose of carrying out conservation activities for species conservation.

(c) EXTENSION OF PERIOD OF REGULATORY PREDICTABILITY.—

(1) DEFINITION OF PERIOD OF REGULATORY PREDICTABILITY.—In this subsection, the term “period of regulatory predictability” means the period of regulatory predictability under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) initially determined in accordance with the document and order described in paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively, of subsection (a).

(2) EXTENSION.—After the period of regulatory predictability, on request of the Secretary, the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, may provide additional consultation under section 7(a)(2) of

the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536(a)(2)), or additional conference under section 7(a)(4) of that Act (16 U.S.C. 1536(a)(4)), as applicable, with the Chief of the Natural Resources Conservation Service or the Administrator of the Farm Service Agency, as applicable, to extend the period of regulatory predictability.

(d) REGULATORY CERTAINTY.—Section 1244 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3844) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(n) REGULATORY CERTAINTY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to technical and programmatic information that the Secretary is otherwise authorized to provide, on request of a Federal agency, a State, an Indian tribe, or a unit of local government, the Secretary may provide technical and programmatic information—

“(A) subject to paragraph (2), to the Federal agency, State, Indian tribe, or unit of local government to support specifically the development of mechanisms that would provide regulatory certainty, regulatory predictability, safe harbor protection, or other similar regulatory assurances to a farmer, rancher, or private nonindustrial forest landowner under a regulatory requirement—

“(i) that relates to soil, water, or wildlife; and

“(ii) over which that Federal agency, State, Indian tribe, or unit of local government has authority; and

“(B) relating to conservation practices or activities that could be implemented by a farmer, rancher, or private nonindustrial forest landowner to address a targeted soil, water, or wildlife resource concern that is the direct subject of a regulatory requirement enforced by that Federal agency, State, Indian tribe, or unit of local government, as applicable.

“(2) MECHANISMS.—The Secretary shall only provide additional technical and programmatic information under paragraph (1) if the mechanisms to be developed by the Federal agency, State, Indian tribe, or unit of local government, as applicable, under paragraph (1)(A) are anticipated to include, at a minimum—

“(A) the implementation of 1 or more conservation practices or activities that effectively addresses the soil, water, or wildlife resource concern identified under paragraph (1);

“(B) the on-site confirmation that the applicable conservation practices or activities identified under subparagraph (A) have been implemented;

“(C) a plan for a periodic audit, as appropriate, of the continued implementation or maintenance of each of the conservation practices or activities identified under subparagraph (A); and

“(D) notification to a farmer, rancher, or private nonindustrial forest landowner of, and an opportunity to correct, any non-compliance with a requirement to obtain regulatory certainty, regulatory predictability, safe harbor protection, or other similar regulatory assurance.

“(3) CONTINUING CURRENT COLLABORATION ON SOIL, WATER, OR WILDLIFE CONSERVATION PRACTICES.—The Secretary shall—

“(A) continue collaboration with Federal agencies, States, Indian tribes, or local units of government on existing regulatory certainty, regulatory predictability, safe harbor protection, or other similar regulatory assurances in accordance with paragraph (2); and

“(B) continue collaboration with the Secretary of the Interior on consultation under section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536(a)(2)) or conference under section 7(a)(4) of that Act (16 U.S.C. 1536(a)(4)), as applicable, for wildlife con-

servations efforts, including the Working Lands for Wildlife model of conservation on working landscapes, as implemented on the day before the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, in accordance with—

“(i) the document entitled ‘Partnership Agreement Between the United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service and the United States Department of the Interior Fish and Wildlife Service’, numbered A-3A75-16-937, and formalized by the Chief of the Natural Resources Conservation Service on September 15, 2016, and by the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service on August 4, 2016, as in effect on September 15, 2016; and

“(ii) United States Fish and Wildlife Service Director’s Order No. 217, dated August 9, 2016, as in effect on August 9, 2016.

“(4) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this subsection—

“(A) preempts, displaces, or supplants any authority or right of a Federal agency, a State, an Indian tribe, or a unit of local government;

“(B) modifies or otherwise affects, preempts, or displaces—

“(i) any cause of action; or

“(ii) a provision of Federal or State law establishing a remedy for a civil or criminal cause of action; or

“(C) applies to a case in which the Department of Agriculture is the originating agency requesting a consultation or other technical and programmatic information or assistance from another Federal agency in assisting farmers, ranchers, or nonindustrial private forest landowners participating in a conservation program administered by the Secretary.”.

SEC. 2426. HEALTHY FORESTS RESERVE PROGRAM.

(a) PURPOSES.—Section 501(a) of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6571(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) to conserve forest land that provides habitat for species described in section 502(b)(2).”.

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—Section 502 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6572) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “private land” and all that follows through “which will” and inserting “private land, including private forest land or land being restored to forest, the enrollment of which will maintain,”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “private land” and all that follows through “which will” and inserting “private land, including private forest land or land being restored to forest, the enrollment of which will maintain,”;

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B)(i) are candidates for such listing, State-listed species, or special concern species; or

“(ii) are deemed a species of greatest conservation need under a State wildlife action plan.”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) conserve forest land that provides habitat for species described in section 502(b)(2).”.

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking paragraph (2);

(B) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2); and

(C) in paragraph (2)(B) (as redesignated by subparagraph (A))—

(i) in clause (ii), by striking “or” at the end; and

(ii) by striking clause (iii) and inserting the following:

“(iii) a permanent easement; or

“(iv) any combination of the options described in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii).”;

(4) in subsection (f)(1)(B), by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

“(ii)(I) are candidates for such listing, State-listed species, or special concern species; or

“(II) are deemed a species of greatest conservation need under a State wildlife action plan.”.

(c) RESTORATION PLANS.—Section 503(b) of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6573(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(2) by striking the subsection designation and all that follows through “restoration practices” and inserting the following:

“(b) PRACTICES AND MEASURES.—

“(1) DEFINITION OF PRACTICES AND MEASURES.—In this subsection, the term ‘practices and measures’ includes land management practices, vegetative treatments, structural practices and measures, practices to improve biological diversity, practices to increase carbon sequestration, and other appropriate activities, as determined by the Secretary.

“(2) RESTORATION PLANS.—The restoration plan may require such restoration practices and measures”;

(3) in subparagraph (A) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)), by striking “and” at the end; and

(4) in subparagraph (B) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)), by striking the period at the end and inserting “, or a species deemed a species of greatest conservation need under a State wildlife action plan.”.

SEC. 2427. WATERSHED PROTECTION.

(a) WATERSHED AREAS.—Section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1002) is amended in the undesignated matter following paragraph (3) by inserting “(except in cases in which the Secretary determines that the undertaking is necessary in a larger watershed or subwatershed in order to address regional drought concerns)” after “fifty thousand acres”.

(b) AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY.—Section 3 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1003) is amended—

(1) by striking the section designation and all that follows through “In order to assist” and inserting the following:

“SEC. 3. ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to assist”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive the watershed plan for works of improvement if the Secretary determines the watershed plan is unnecessary or duplicative.”.

SEC. 2428. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO INCREASED WATERSHED-BASED COLLABORATION.

It is the sense of Congress that the Federal Government should recognize and encourage partnerships at the watershed level between nonpoint sources and regulated point sources to advance the goals of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) and provide benefits to farmers, landowners, and the public.

SEC. 2429. MODIFICATIONS TO CONSERVATION EASEMENT PROGRAM.

Title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3801 et seq.) is amended by inserting after subtitle E the following:

“Subtitle F—Other Conservation Provisions**“SEC. 1251. MODIFICATIONS TO CONSERVATION EASEMENT PROGRAM.**

“(a) DEFINITION OF COVERED PROGRAM.—In this section, the term ‘covered program’ means wetland reserve easements under section 1265C.

“(b) MODIFICATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law applicable to the covered program, subject to subsection (c), if requested by the landowner, the Secretary shall—

“(1) allow land enrolled in the covered program to be—

“(A) modified for water management, general maintenance, vegetative cover control, wildlife habitat management, or any other purpose, subject to the condition that the modification shall be approved jointly by—

“(i) the State department of natural resources (or equivalent State agency); and

“(ii) the technical committee established under section 1261(a) of the State; or

“(B) exchanged for land that has equal or greater conservation, wildlife, ecological, and economic values, as determined by the Secretary; and

“(2) provide for the modification of an easement under the covered program if the Secretary determines that the modification—

“(A) would facilitate the practical administration and management of the land covered by the easement; and

“(B) would not adversely affect the functions and values for which the easement was established.

“(c) REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) NO EFFECT ON ENROLLED ACREAGE, ECOLOGICAL FUNCTIONS AND VALUES.—A modification or exchange under subsection (b) shall not—

“(A) result in a net loss of acreage enrolled in the covered program; or

“(B) adversely affect any ecological or conservation function or value for which the applicable easement was established.

“(2) EXCHANGED ACRES.—Any land for which an exchange is made under subsection (b) shall satisfy all requirements for enrollment in the covered program.

“(3) RESTRICTION ON PAYMENTS.—In modifying any easement under the covered program, the Secretary shall not increase any payment to any party to the easement.

“(d) COSTS.—A party to an easement under the covered program that requests a modification or exchange under subsection (b) shall be responsible for all costs of the modification or exchange, including—

“(1) an appraisal to determine whether the economic value of the land for which an exchange is made under subsection (b) is equal to or greater than the value of the land removed from the covered program;

“(2) the repayment of the costs paid by the Secretary for any restoration of land removed from the covered program;

“(3) if applicable, a survey of property boundaries, including review and approval by the applicable agency;

“(4) preparation and recording in accordance with standard real estate practices of any exchange, including requirements for title approval by the Secretary, subordination of liens, and amended warranty easement deed recording; and

“(5) any applicable recording and legal fees.”.

Subtitle E—Funding and Administration**SEC. 2501. FUNDING.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1241(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841(a)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “2018 (and fiscal year 2019 in the case of the program specified in paragraph (5))” and inserting “2023”;

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “\$10,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” and inserting “\$11,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2019 through 2023”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “\$33,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” and inserting “\$50,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, including not more than \$5,000,000 to provide outreach and technical assistance.”; and

(ii) by striking “retired or retiring owners and operators” and inserting “contract holders”;

(3) in paragraph (2), by striking subparagraphs (A) through (E) and inserting the following:

“(A) \$400,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2021;

“(B) \$425,000,000 for fiscal year 2022; and

“(C) \$450,000,000 for fiscal year 2023.”; and

(4) in paragraph (5), by striking subparagraphs (A) through (E) and inserting the following:

“(A) \$1,473,000,000 for fiscal year 2019;

“(B) \$1,478,000,000 for fiscal year 2020;

“(C) \$1,541,000,000 for fiscal year 2021;

“(D) \$1,571,000,000 for fiscal year 2022; and

“(E) \$1,595,000,000 for fiscal year 2023.”.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Section 1241(b) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841(b)) is amended by striking “2018 (and fiscal year 2019 in the case of the program specified in subsection (a)(5))” and inserting “2023”.

(c) ALLOCATIONS REVIEW AND UPDATE.—Section 1241(g) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841(g)) is amended by striking “REVIEW AND UPDATE” in the subsection heading and all that follows through “The Secretary” in paragraph (2) and inserting “UPDATE.—The Secretary”.

(d) ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN FARMERS OR RANCHERS FOR CONSERVATION ACCESS.—Section 1241(h)(1) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841(h)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”; and

(2) by striking “5 percent” each place it appears and inserting “15 percent”.

(e) CONSERVATION STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS.—Section 1241 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j) CONSERVATION STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the requirements of this title, the Natural Resources Conservation Service shall serve as the lead agency in developing and establishing technical standards and requirements for conservation programs carried out under this title, including—

“(A) standards for conservation practices under this title;

“(B) technical guidelines for implementing conservation practices under this title, including the location of the conservation practices;

“(C) standards for conservation plans; and

“(D) payment rates for conservation practices and activities under programs carried out under this title.

“(2) CONSISTENCY OF FARM SERVICE AGENCY STANDARDS.—The Administrator of the Farm

Service Agency shall ensure that the standards and requirements of programs administered by the Farm Service Agency incorporated and are consistent with the standards and requirements established by the Natural Resources Conservation Service under paragraph (1).

“(3) LOCAL FLEXIBILITY.—The Secretary shall establish a procedure to allow, on request of a State committee of the Farm Service Agency or a State technical committee established under section 1261(a) to modify any standard or requirement established under paragraph (1), that modification if the modification—

“(A) addresses a specific and local natural resource concern;

“(B) is based on science; and

“(C) maintains the conservation benefits of the standards and requirements established under paragraph (1).”.

SEC. 2502. DELIVERY OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

Section 1242 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3842) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking the subsection designation and heading and all that follows through “the term” and inserting the following:

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANT.—The term”;

and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) THIRD-PARTY PROVIDER.—The term ‘third-party provider’ means a commercial entity (including a farmer cooperative, agriculture retailer, or other commercial entity, as determined by the Secretary), a nonprofit entity, a State, a unit of local government (including a conservation district), or a Federal agency, that has expertise in the technical aspect of conservation planning, including nutrient management planning, watershed planning, or environmental engineering.”;

(2) in subsection (e), by adding at the end the following:

“(4) CERTIFICATION PROCESS.—The Secretary shall certify a third-party provider through—

“(A) a certification process administered by the Secretary, acting through the Chief of the Natural Resources Conservation Service; or

“(B) a non-Federal entity approved by the Secretary to perform the certification.

“(5) STREAMLINED CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall provide a streamlined certification process for a third-party provider that has an appropriate specialty certification, including a sustainability specialty certification and a 4R nutrient management specialty certification from the American Society of Agronomy.”; and

(3) in subsection (h)—

(A) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) EXPEDITED REVISION OF STANDARDS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, the Secretary shall develop an administrative process for—

“(A) expediting the establishment and revision of conservation practice standards; and

“(B) considering conservation innovations with respect to any establishment or revision under subparagraph (A).

“(4) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on—

“(A) the administrative process developed under paragraph (3);

“(B) conservation practice standards that were established or revised under that process; and

“(C) conservation innovations that were considered under that process.”.

SEC. 2503. ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS FOR CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.

(a) INCENTIVES FOR ACEQUIAS.—Section 1244(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3844(a)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “RANCHERS AND INDIAN TRIBES” and inserting “RANCHERS, INDIAN TRIBES, AND ACEQUIAS”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following:

“(F) Acequias.”.

(b) ACREAGE LIMITATIONS.—Section 1244(f) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3844(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “10” and inserting “15”; and

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking “the Agricultural Act of 2014” and inserting “the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018”.

(c) FUNDING FOR INDIAN TRIBES.—Section 1244(l) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3844(l)) is amended by striking “may” and inserting “shall”.

(d) EXEMPTION FROM CERTAIN REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 1244(m) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3844(m)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “or commodity” after “conservation”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting “or the Farm Service Agency” before the period at the end.

(e) SOURCE WATER PROTECTION.—Section 1244 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3844) (as amended by section 2425(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(o) SOURCE WATER PROTECTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the conservation stewardship program under subchapter B of chapter 2 of subtitle D and the environmental quality incentives program under chapter 4 of subtitle D, the Secretary shall encourage water quality and water quantity practices that—

“(A) protect sources of potable water, including protecting against public health threats; and

“(B) mutually benefit agricultural producers.

“(2) COLLABORATION AND PAYMENTS.—In encouraging practices under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

“(A) work collaboratively with drinking water utilities, community water systems, and State technical committees established under section 1261 to identify local priority areas for the protection of source waters for drinking water; and

“(B) subject to limitations under the programs described in paragraph (1), provide payment rates to producers for water quality practices or enhancements that primarily result in off-farm benefit at a rate sufficient to encourage greater adoption of those practices or enhancements by producers.”.

(f) PAYMENTS MADE TO ACEQUIAS.—Section 1244 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3844) (as amended by subsection (e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(p) PAYMENTS MADE TO ACEQUIAS.—

“(1) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may waive the applicability of the limitations in section 1001D(b) or section 1240G for a payment made under a contract under this title entered into with an acequia if the Secretary determines that the waiver is necessary to fulfill the objectives of the project under the contract.

“(2) CONTRACT LIMITATIONS.—If the Secretary grants a waiver under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall impose a separate payment limitation, as determined by the Secretary, for the contract to which the waiver applies.”.

SEC. 2504. DEFINITION OF ACEQUIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1201(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3801(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (27) as paragraphs (2) through (28), respectively;

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(1) ACEQUIA.—The term ‘acequia’ means an entity that—

“(A) is a political subdivision of a State;

“(B) is organized for the purpose of managing the operation of an irrigation ditch; and

“(C) does not have the authority to impose taxes or levies.”; and

(3) in paragraph (19)(B) (as so redesignated), by inserting “acequia,” before “or other”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 363 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2006e) is amended—

(1) by striking “section 1201(a)(16)” and inserting “section 1201(a)”; and

(2) by striking “(16 U.S.C. 3801(a)(16))” and inserting “(16 U.S.C. 3801(a))”.

SEC. 2505. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR WATER BANK PROGRAM.

Section 11 of the Water Bank Act (16 U.S.C. 1310) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “without fiscal year” and all that follows through “necessary” and inserting “\$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, to remain available until expended.”; and

(2) by striking the second sentence.

SEC. 2506. REPORT ON LAND ACCESS, TENURE, AND TRANSITION.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with the Chief Economist, shall submit to Congress and make publicly available a report identifying—

(1) the barriers that prevent or hinder the ability of beginning farmers and ranchers and historically underserved producers to acquire or access farmland;

(2) the extent to which Federal programs, including agricultural conservation easement programs, land transition programs, and financing programs, are improving—

(A) farmland access and tenure for beginning farmers and ranchers and historically underserved producers; and

(B) farmland transition and succession; and

(3) the regulatory, operational, or statutory changes that are necessary to improve—

(A) the ability of beginning farmers and ranchers and historically underserved producers to acquire or access farmland;

(B) farmland tenure for beginning farmers and ranchers and historically underserved producers; and

(C) farmland transition and succession.

SEC. 2507. REPORT ON SMALL WETLANDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Chief of the Natural Resources Conservation Service shall submit to Congress a report describing the number of wetlands with an area not more than 1 acre that have been delineated in each of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, and Iowa.

(b) REQUIREMENT.—In the report under subsection (a), the Chief of the Natural Resources Conservation Service shall list the number of wetlands acres in each State described in the report by tenths of an acre, and ensure the report is based on based available science.

SEC. 2508. STATE TECHNICAL COMMITTEES.

Section 1262(c) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3862(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) RECOMMENDATIONS TO SECRETARY.—Each State technical committee shall regu-

larly review new and innovative technologies and practices, including processes to conserve water and improve water quality and quantity, and make recommendations to the Secretary for further consideration of and possible development of conservation practice standards that incorporate those technologies and practices.”.

Subtitle F—Technical Corrections

SEC. 2601. FARMABLE WETLAND PROGRAM.

Section 1231B(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831b(b)(2)(A)(i)) is amended by adding a semicolon at the end.

SEC. 2602. REPORT ON PROGRAM ENROLLMENTS AND ASSISTANCE.

Section 1241(i) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841(i)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (2) and (4); and

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (3), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), respectively.

SEC. 2603. DELIVERY OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

Section 1242 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3842) is amended in subsections (e)(3)(B) and (f)(4) by striking “third party” each place it appears and inserting “third-party”.

SEC. 2604. STATE TECHNICAL COMMITTEES.

Section 1261(b)(2) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3861(b)(2)) is amended by striking “under section 1262(b)”.

Title III—TRADE

Subtitle A—Food for Peace Act

SEC. 3101. FOOD AID QUALITY.

Section 202(h)(3) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1722(h)(3)) is amended by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2019 through 2023”.

SEC. 3102. GENERATION AND USE OF CURRENCIES BY PRIVATE VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS AND COOPERATIVES.

Section 203 of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1723) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) LOCAL SALES.—In carrying out agreements of the type referred to in subsection (a), the Administrator may permit private voluntary organizations and cooperatives to sell, in 1 or more recipient countries, or in 1 or more countries in the same region, commodities distributed under nonemergency programs under this title for each fiscal year to generate proceeds to be used as provided in this section.”.

SEC. 3103. MINIMUM LEVELS OF ASSISTANCE.

Section 204(a) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1724(a)) is amended in paragraphs (1) and (2) by striking “2018” each place it appears and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 3104. FOOD AID CONSULTATIVE GROUP.

Section 205 of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1725) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(1), in the first sentence, by striking “45” and inserting “30”; and

(2) in subsection (f), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 3105. OVERSIGHT, MONITORING, AND EVALUATION.

Section 207(f)(4) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1726a(f)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking “\$17,000,000” and inserting “1.5 percent, but not less than \$17,000,000.”; and

(B) by striking “2018” each place it appears and inserting “2023”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 3106. ASSISTANCE FOR STOCKPILING AND RAPID TRANSPORTATION, DELIVERY, AND DISTRIBUTION OF SHELF-STABLE PREPACKAGED FOODS.

Section 208(f) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1726b(f)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 3107. ALLOWANCE OF DISTRIBUTION COSTS.

Section 406(b)(6) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1736(b)(6)) is amended by striking “distribution costs” and inserting “distribution costs, including the types of activities for which costs were paid under this subsection prior to fiscal year 2017”.

SEC. 3108. PREPOSITIONING OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES.

Section 407(c)(4)(A) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1736a(c)(4)(A)) is amended by striking “2018” each place it appears and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 3109. ANNUAL REPORT REGARDING FOOD AID PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.

Section 407(f)(1)(A) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1736a(f)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “or each separately” after “jointly”; and

(2) by inserting “by the Administrator, the Secretary, or both, as applicable,” after “Act”.

SEC. 3110. DEADLINE FOR AGREEMENTS TO FINANCE SALES OR TO PROVIDE OTHER ASSISTANCE.

Section 408 of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1736b) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 3111. NONEMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE.

Section 412(e) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1736f(e)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “MINIMUM LEVEL OF”;

(2) in paragraph (1), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”;

(3) in paragraph (2), by striking “\$350,000,000” and inserting “\$365,000,000”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) FARMER-TO-FARMER PROGRAM.—In determining the amount expended for a fiscal year for nonemergency food assistance programs under paragraphs (1) and (2), amounts expended for that year to carry out programs under section 501 may be considered amounts expended for those nonemergency food assistance programs.

“(4) COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUNDS.—In determining the amount expended for a fiscal year for nonemergency food assistance programs under paragraphs (1) and (2), amounts expended for that year from funds appropriated to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) may be considered amounts expended for those nonemergency food assistance programs if the funds are made available through grants or cooperative agreements that—

“(A) strengthen food security in developing countries; and

“(B) are consistent with the goals of title II.”

SEC. 3112. MICRONUTRIENT FORTIFICATION PROGRAMS.

Section 415(c) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1736g-2(c)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 3113. JOHN OGWONSKI AND DOUG BEREUTER FARMER-TO-FARMER PROGRAM.

Section 501 of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1737) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “section 1342 of title 31, United States Code, or” after “Notwithstanding”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “employees or staff of a State cooperative institution (as defined in subparagraphs (A) through (D) of section 1404(18) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103(18))” after “private corporations.”;

(2) in subsection (d), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”; and

(3) in subsection (e)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

Subtitle B—Agricultural Trade Act of 1978**SEC. 3201. PRIORITY TRADE PROMOTION, DEVELOPMENT, AND ASSISTANCE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5621 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“Subtitle C—Priority Trade Promotion, Development, and Assistance**“SEC. 221. ESTABLISHMENT.**

“The Secretary shall carry out activities under this subtitle—

“(1) to access, develop, maintain, and expand markets for United States agricultural commodities; and

“(2) to promote cooperation and the exchange of information.

“SEC. 222. MARKET ACCESS PROGRAM.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commodity Credit Corporation shall establish and carry out a program to encourage the development, maintenance, and expansion of commercial export markets for agricultural commodities (including commodities that are organically produced (as defined in section 2103 of the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6502))) through cost-share assistance to eligible trade organizations that implement a foreign market development program.

“(b) TYPE OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance under this section may be provided in the form of funds of, or commodities owned by, the Commodity Credit Corporation, as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

“(c) REQUIREMENTS FOR PARTICIPATION.—To be eligible for cost-share assistance under this section, an organization shall—

“(1) be an eligible trade organization;

“(2) prepare and submit a marketing plan to the Secretary that meets the guidelines governing such plans established by the Secretary; and

“(3) meet any other requirements established by the Secretary.

“(d) ELIGIBLE TRADE ORGANIZATIONS.—An eligible trade organization shall be—

“(1) a United States agricultural trade organization or regional State-related organization that—

“(A) promotes the export and sale of agricultural commodities; and

“(B) does not stand to profit directly from specific sales of agricultural commodities;

“(2) a cooperative organization or State agency that promotes the sale of agricultural commodities; or

“(3) a private organization that promotes the export and sale of agricultural commodities if the Secretary determines that such organization would significantly contribute to United States export market development.

“(e) APPROVED MARKETING PLAN.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A marketing plan submitted by an eligible trade organization under this section shall describe the advertising or other market oriented export promotion activities to be carried out by the eligible trade organization with respect to which assistance under this section is being requested.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—To be approved by the Secretary, a marketing plan submitted under this subsection shall—

“(A) specifically describe the manner in which assistance received by the eligible trade organization in conjunction with funds and services provided by the eligible trade organization will be expended in implementing the marketing plan;

“(B) establish specific market goals to be achieved as a result of the market access program; and

“(C) contain any additional requirements that the Secretary determines to be necessary.

“(3) AMENDMENTS.—A marketing plan may be amended by the eligible trade organization at any time, with the approval of the Secretary.

“(4) BRANDED PROMOTION.—An agreement entered into under this section may provide for the use of branded advertising to promote the sale of agricultural commodities in a foreign country under such terms and conditions as may be established by the Secretary.

“(f) OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

“(1) MULTIYEAR BASIS.—The Secretary may provide assistance under this section on a multiyear basis, subject to annual review by the Secretary for compliance with the approved marketing plan.

“(2) TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may terminate any assistance made, or to be made, available under this section if the Secretary determines that—

“(A) the eligible trade organization is not adhering to the terms and conditions of the program established under this section;

“(B) the eligible trade organization is not implementing the approved marketing plan or is not adequately meeting the established goals of the market access program;

“(C) the eligible trade organization is not adequately contributing its own resources to the market access program; or

“(D) the Secretary determines that termination of assistance in a particular instance is in the best interests of the program.

“(3) MONITORING AND EVALUATIONS.—

“(A) MONITORING.—The Secretary shall monitor the expenditure of funds received under this section by recipients of those funds.

“(B) EVALUATIONS.—The Secretary shall make evaluations of the expenditure of funds received under this section, including—

“(i) an evaluation of the effectiveness of the program in developing or maintaining markets for United States agricultural commodities;

“(ii) an evaluation of whether assistance provided under this section is necessary to maintain markets for United States agricultural commodities; and

“(iii) a thorough accounting of the expenditure of those funds by the recipient.

“(C) INITIAL EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall make an initial evaluation of expenditures of a recipient under this paragraph not later than 15 months after the initial provision of funds to the recipient.

“(4) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds made available to carry out this section—

“(A) shall not be used to provide direct assistance to any foreign for-profit corporation for the use of the corporation in promoting foreign-produced products;

“(B) shall not be used to provide direct assistance to any for-profit corporation that is not recognized as a small-business concern described in section 3(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(a)), excluding—

“(i) a cooperative;

“(ii) an association described in the first section of the Act entitled ‘An Act to authorize association of producers of agricultural products’, approved February 18, 1922 (7 U.S.C. 291); and

“(iii) a nonprofit trade association; and

“(C) may be used by a United States trade association, cooperative, or small business for individual branded promotional activity related to a United States branded product, if the beneficiaries of the activity have provided funds for the activity in an amount that is at least equivalent to the amount of assistance provided under this section.

“(g) LEVEL OF MARKETING ASSISTANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall justify in writing the level of assistance provided to an eligible trade organization under the program under this section and the level of cost-sharing required of the organization.

“(2) LIMITATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), assistance provided under this section for activities described in subsection (e)(4) shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost of implementing the marketing plan.

“(B) ACTION BY UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may determine not to apply the limitation described in subparagraph (A) in the case of agricultural commodities with respect to which there has been a favorable decision by the United States Trade Representative under section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2411).

“(ii) REQUIREMENT.—Criteria for determining that the limitation shall not apply under clause (i) shall be consistent and documented.

“SEC. 223. FOREIGN MARKET DEVELOPMENT COOPERATOR PROGRAM.

“(a) DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE TRADE ORGANIZATION.—In this section, the term ‘eligible trade organization’ means a United States trade organization that—

“(1) promotes the export of 1 or more United States agricultural commodities; and

“(2) does not have a business interest in or receive remuneration from specific sales of agricultural commodities.

“(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish and, in cooperation with eligible trade organizations, carry out a foreign market development cooperator program to maintain and develop foreign markets for United States agricultural commodities, with a continued significant emphasis on the importance of the export of value-added United States agricultural commodities into emerging markets.

“(c) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds made available to carry out this section shall be used only to provide—

“(1) cost-share assistance to an eligible trade organization under a contract or agreement with the eligible trade organization; and

“(2) assistance for other costs that are appropriate to carry out the foreign market development cooperator program, including contingent liabilities that are not otherwise funded.

“SEC. 224. E (KIKI) DE LA GARZA AGRICULTURAL FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.

“(a) DEFINITION OF EMERGING MARKET.—In this section, the term ‘emerging market’ means any country, foreign territory, customs union, or other economic market that the Secretary determines—

“(1) is taking steps toward a market-oriented economy through the food, agriculture, or rural business sectors of the economy of that country, territory, customs union, or other economic market, as applicable; and

“(2) has the potential to provide a viable and significant market for United States agricultural commodities.

“(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a program, to be known as the ‘E (Kiki) de la Garza Agricultural Fellowship Program’—

“(1) to develop agricultural markets in emerging markets; and

“(2) to promote cooperation and exchange of information between agricultural institutions and agribusinesses in the United States and emerging markets.

“(c) DEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURAL SYSTEMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—To develop, maintain, or expand markets for exports of United States agricultural commodities, the Secretary shall make available to emerging markets the expertise of the United States—

“(i) to make assessments of food and rural business systems needs;

“(ii) to make recommendations on measures necessary to enhance the effectiveness of the food and rural business systems described in clause (i), including potential reductions in trade barriers; and

“(iii) to identify and carry out specific opportunities and projects to enhance the effectiveness of the food and rural business systems described in clause (i).

“(B) EXTENT OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall implement this paragraph with respect to at least 3 emerging markets in each fiscal year.

“(2) EXPERTS FROM THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary may implement paragraph (1) by providing—

“(A) assistance to teams (consisting primarily of agricultural consultants, agricultural producers, other persons from the private sector, and government officials expert in assessing the food and rural business systems of other countries) to enable those teams to conduct the assessments, make the recommendations, and identify the opportunities and projects described in paragraph (1)(A) in emerging markets;

“(B) necessary subsistence expenses in the United States and necessary transportation expenses by individuals designated by emerging markets to enable those individuals to consult with food and rural business system experts in the United States to enhance those systems of those emerging markets;

“(C) necessary subsistence expenses in emerging markets and necessary transportation expenses of United States food and rural business system experts, agricultural producers, and other individuals knowledgeable in agricultural and agribusiness matters to assist in transferring knowledge and expertise to entities in emerging markets; and

“(D) necessary subsistence expenses and necessary transportation expenses of United States food and rural business system experts, including United States agricultural producers and other United States individuals knowledgeable in agriculture and agribusiness matters, and of individuals designated by emerging markets, to enable those designated individuals to consult with those United States experts—

“(i) to enhance food and rural business systems of emerging markets; and

“(ii) to transfer knowledge and expertise to emerging markets.

“(3) COST-SHARING.—The Secretary shall encourage the nongovernmental experts described in paragraph (2) to share the costs of, and otherwise assist in, the participation of those experts in the program under this subsection.

“(4) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary is authorized to provide, or pay the necessary costs for, technical assistance (including the establishment of extension services) to enable individuals or other entities to carry out recommendations, projects, and opportunities in emerging markets, including recommendations, projects, and opportunities described in clauses (ii) and (iii) of paragraph (1)(A).

“(5) REPORTS TO SECRETARY.—A team that receives assistance under paragraph (2)(A) shall prepare and submit to the Secretary such reports as the Secretary may require.

“(6) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—To provide the Secretary with information that may be useful to the Secretary in carrying out this subsection, the Secretary may establish an advisory

committee composed of representatives of the various sectors of the food and rural business systems of the United States.

“(7) EFFECT.—The authority provided under this subsection shall be in addition to and not in place of any other authority of the Secretary or the Commodity Credit Corporation.

“SEC. 225. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR SPECIALTY CROPS.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall establish an export assistance program (referred to in this section as the ‘program’) to address existing or potential unique barriers that prohibit or threaten the export of United States specialty crops.

“(b) PURPOSE.—The program shall provide direct assistance through public and private sector projects and technical assistance, including through the program under section 2(e) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 3157(e)), to remove, resolve, or mitigate existing or potential sanitary and phytosanitary and technical barriers to trade.

“(c) PRIORITY.—The program shall address time sensitive and strategic market access projects based on—

“(1) trade effect on market retention, market access, and market expansion; and

“(2) trade impact.

“(d) MULTIYEAR PROJECTS.—The Secretary may provide assistance under the program to a project for longer than a 5-year period if the Secretary determines that further assistance would effectively support the purpose of the program described in subsection (b).

“(e) ANNUAL REPORT.—Each year, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that contains, for the period covered by the report, a description of—

“(1) each factor that affects the export of specialty crops, including each factor relating to any—

“(A) significant sanitary or phytosanitary issue;

“(B) trade barrier; or

“(C) emerging sanitary or phytosanitary issue or trade barrier; and

“(2)(A) any funds provided under section 226(c)(4) that were not obligated in a fiscal year; and

“(B) a description of why the funds described in subparagraph (A) were not obligated.

“SEC. 226. FUNDING AND ADMINISTRATION.

“(a) COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION.—The Secretary shall use the funds, facilities, and authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out this subtitle.

“(b) FUNDING AMOUNT.—For each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, of the funds of, or an equal value of commodities owned by, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary shall use to carry out this subtitle \$259,500,000, to remain available until expended.

“(c) ALLOCATION.—For each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, the Secretary shall allocate funds to carry out this subtitle in accordance with the following:

“(1) MARKET ACCESS PROGRAM.—For market access activities authorized under section 222, of the funds of, or an equal value of commodities owned by, the Commodity Credit Corporation, not less than \$200,000,000 for each fiscal year.

“(2) FOREIGN MARKET DEVELOPMENT COOPERATOR PROGRAM.—To carry out section 223, of the funds of, or an equal value of commodities owned by, the Commodity Credit Corporation, not less than \$34,500,000 for each fiscal year.

“(3) E (KIKI) DE LA GARZA AGRICULTURAL FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.—To provide assistance under section 224, of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, not more than \$10,000,000 for each fiscal year.

“(4) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR SPECIALTY CROPS.—To carry out section 225, of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, not less than \$9,000,000 for each fiscal year, to remain available until expended.

“(5) PRIORITY TRADE FUND.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the amounts allocated under paragraphs (1) through (4), and notwithstanding any limitations in those paragraphs, as determined by the Secretary, for 1 or more programs under this subtitle for authorized activities to access, develop, maintain, and expand markets for United States agricultural commodities, \$6,000,000 for each fiscal year.

“(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—In allocating funds made available under subparagraph (A), the Secretary may consider providing a greater allocation to 1 or more programs under this subtitle for which the amounts requested under applications exceed available funding for the 1 or more programs.

“(d) CUBA.—Notwithstanding section 908 of the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7207) or any other provision of law, funds made available under this section may be used to carry out the programs authorized under sections 222 and 223 in Cuba.

“(e) AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to any other amounts provided under this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the programs and authorities under subsection (c)(5) and sections 222 through 225.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) MARKET ACCESS PROGRAM.—

(A) Section 203 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5623) is repealed.

(B) Section 211 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5641) is amended by striking subsection (c).

(C) Section 402(a)(1) of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5662(a)(1)) is amended by striking “203” and inserting “222”.

(D) Section 282(f)(2)(C) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1638a(f)(2)(C)) is amended by striking “section 203 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5623)” and inserting “section 222 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978”.

(E) Section 718 of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (7 U.S.C. 5623 note; Public Law 105-277) is amended by striking “section 203 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5623)” and inserting “section 222 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978”.

(F) Section 1302(b) of the Agricultural Reconciliation Act of 1993 (7 U.S.C. 5623 note; Public Law 103-66) is amended—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “section 203 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5623)” and inserting “section 222 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “section 203 of such Act” and inserting “section 222 of that Act”.

(2) FOREIGN MARKET DEVELOPMENT COOPERATOR PROGRAM.—Title VII of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5721 et seq.) is repealed.

(3) E (KIKI) DE LA GARZA AGRICULTURAL FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.—

(A) Section 1542 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5622 note; Public Law 101-624) is amended—

(i) by striking subsection (d);

(ii) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively; and

(iii) in subsection (e) (as so redesignated)—

(I) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “country” and inserting “coun-

try, foreign territory, customs union, or economic market”; and

(II) in paragraph (1), by striking “the country” and inserting “that country, foreign territory, customs union, or economic market, as applicable”.

(B) Section 1543(b)(5) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 3293(b)(5)) is amended by striking “section 1542(f)” and inserting “section 1542(e)”.

(C) Section 1543A(c)(2) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5679(c)(2)) is amended by inserting “and section 224 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978” after “section 1542”.

(4) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR SPECIALTY CROPS.—Section 3205 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 5680) is repealed.

Subtitle C—Other Agricultural Trade Laws SEC. 3301. FOOD FOR PROGRESS ACT OF 1985.

The Food for Progress Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1736o) is amended—

(1) by striking “President” each place it appears and inserting “Secretary”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (5)—

(i) in subparagraph (E), by striking “and”;

(ii) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) a land-grant college or university (as defined in section 1404 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103)).”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(10) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Agriculture.”;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “food”;

(B) by striking “entities to furnish” and inserting the following: “entities—

“(1) to furnish”;

(C) in paragraph (1) (as so designated), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) to provide financial assistance under subsection (1)(5) to eligible entities.”;

(4) in subsection (f)(3), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”;

(5) in subsection (g), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”;

(6) in subsection (k), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”;

(7) in subsection (1)—

(A) by striking the subsection designation and heading and all that follows through “(1) To enhance” and inserting the following:

“(1) SUPPORT FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To enhance”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”;

(C) in paragraph (4)(B), by inserting “internal” before “transportation”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) FLEXIBILITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, as necessary to carry out this section, the following funds shall be used to pay for the costs described in paragraph (4):

“(A) Of the funds of the Corporation described in subsection (f)(3), 30 percent.

“(B) Of the funds for administrative expenses under paragraph (1), 30 percent.

“(C) Of the funds of the Corporation, \$26,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”;

(8) in subsection (m), in the subsection heading, by striking “PRESIDENTIAL” and inserting “SECRETARIAL”;

(9) in subsection (n)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “and assistance” after “commodities”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “and assistance made available under this section” after “commodities”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, the Secretary shall issue regulations and revisions to agency guidance and procedures necessary to implement the amendments made to this section by that Act.

“(B) CONSULTATIONS.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, the Secretary shall consult with the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate relating to regulations issued and agency guidance and procedures revised under subparagraph (A).”; and

(10) in subsection (o), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “(acting through the Secretary)”.

SEC. 3302. BILL EMERSON HUMANITARIAN TRUST ACT.

Section 302 of the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust Act (7 U.S.C. 1736f-1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)(B)(i), by striking “2018” each place it appears and inserting “2023”; and

(2) in subsection (h), by striking “2018” each place it appears and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 3303. PROMOTION OF AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS TO EMERGING MARKETS.

Section 1542(a) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5622 note; Public Law 101-624) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 3304. COCHRAN EMERGING MARKET FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.

Section 1543 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 3293) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “(which may include agricultural extension services)” after “systems”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “enhance trade” and inserting the following: “enhance—

“(A) trade”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A) (as so designated) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) linkages between agricultural interests in the United States and regulatory systems governing sanitary and phytosanitary standards for agricultural products that—

“(i) may enter the United States; and

“(ii) may pose risks to human, animal, or plant life or health.”; and

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “\$3,000,000” and inserting “\$4,000,000”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “\$2,000,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”; and

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking “\$5,000,000” and inserting “\$6,000,000”.

SEC. 3305. BORLAUG INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.

Section 1473G of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3319j) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “shall support” and inserting “support”;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) the development of agricultural extension services in eligible countries.”; and

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) LEVERAGING ALUMNI ENGAGEMENT.—In carrying out the purposes and programs under this section, the Secretary shall encourage ongoing engagement with fellowship recipients who have completed training under the program to provide advice regarding, and participate in, new or ongoing agricultural development projects, with a priority for capacity-building projects, that are sponsored by—

“(A) Federal agencies; and

“(B) institutions of higher education in the eligible country of the fellowship recipient.”.

SEC. 3306. INTERNATIONAL FOOD SECURITY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

The Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 is amended by inserting after section 1543A (7 U.S.C. 5679) the following:

“SEC. 1543B. INTERNATIONAL FOOD SECURITY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

“(a) DEFINITION OF INTERNATIONAL FOOD SECURITY.—In this section, the term ‘international food security’ means access by any person at any time to food and nutrition that is sufficient for a healthy and productive life.

“(b) COLLECTION OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary of Agriculture (referred to in this section as the ‘Secretary’) shall compile information from appropriate mission areas of the Department of Agriculture (including the Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services mission area) relating to the improvement of international food security.

“(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—To benefit programs for the improvement of international food security, the Secretary shall organize the information described in subsection (b) and make the information available in a format suitable for—

“(1) public education; and

“(2) use by—

“(A) a Federal, State, or local agency;

“(B) an agency or instrumentality of the government of a foreign country;

“(C) a domestic or international organization, including a domestic or international nongovernmental organization; and

“(D) an intergovernmental organization.

“(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—On request by an entity described in subsection (c)(2), the Secretary may provide technical assistance to the entity to implement a program for the improvement of international food security.

“(e) PROGRAM PRIORITY.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall give priority to programs relating to the development of food and nutrition safety net systems with a focus on food insecure countries.

“(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”.

SEC. 3307. MCGOVERN-DOLE INTERNATIONAL FOOD FOR EDUCATION AND CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAM.

Section 3107 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 1736o-1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “that is” and inserting the following: “that—

“(1) is”;

(B) in paragraph (1) (as so designated), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(2)(A) is produced in and procured from—

“(i) a developing country that is a recipient country; or

“(ii) a developing country in the same region as a recipient country; and

“(B) at a minimum, meets each nutritional, quality, and labeling standard of the recipient country, as determined by the Secretary.”;

(2) in subsection (c)(2)(A)—

(A) in clause (v)(IV), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) by redesignating clause (vi) as clause (vii); and

(C) by inserting after clause (v) the following:

“(vi) the costs associated with transporting the commodities described in subsection (a)(2) from a developing country described in subparagraph (A)(ii) of that subsection to any designated point of entry within the recipient country; and”;

(3) in subsection (f)(1)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (E) and (F) as subparagraphs (F) and (G), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:

“(E) ensure to the maximum extent practicable that assistance—

“(i) is provided under this section in a timely manner; and

“(ii) is available when needed throughout the applicable school year;”;

(4) in subsection (1)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) PURCHASE OF COMMODITIES.—Of the funds made available to carry out this section, not more than 10 percent shall be used to purchase agricultural commodities described in subsection (a)(2).”.

SEC. 3308. GLOBAL CROP DIVERSITY TRUST.

Section 3202(c) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (22 U.S.C. 2220a note; Public Law 110-246) is amended by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2019 through 2023”.

SEC. 3309. LOCAL AND REGIONAL FOOD AID PROCUREMENT PROJECTS.

Section 3206(e)(1) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 1726c(e)(1)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “to the Secretary” after “appropriated”; and

(2) by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2019 through 2023”.

SEC. 3310. FOREIGN TRADE MISSIONS.

(a) TRIBAL REPRESENTATION ON TRADE MISSIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Tribal Advisory Committee established under subsection (b)(2) of section 309 of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6921) (as added by section 12304(2)) (referred to in this section as the “Advisory Committee”), shall seek—

(A) to support the greater inclusion of Tribal agricultural and food products in Federal trade-related activities; and

(B) to increase the collaboration between Federal trade promotion efforts and other Federal trade-related activities in support of the greater inclusion sought under subparagraph (A).

(2) INTERDEPARTMENTAL COORDINATION.—In carrying out activities to increase the collaboration described in paragraph (1)(B), the Secretary shall coordinate with—

(A) the Secretary of Commerce;

(B) the Secretary of State;

(C) the Secretary of the Interior; and

(D) the heads of any other relevant Federal agencies.

(b) REPORT; GOALS.—

(1) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report describing the efforts of the Department of Agriculture and other Federal agencies under this section to—

(A) the Advisory Committee;

(B) the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives;

(C) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives;

(D) the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate;

(E) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate; and

(F) the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate.

(2) GOALS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish goals for measuring, in an objective and quantifiable format, the extent to which Indian Tribes and Tribal agricultural and food products are included in the trade-related activities of the Department of Agriculture.

TITLE IV—NUTRITION

Subtitle A—Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program

SEC. 4101. DEFINITION OF CERTIFICATION PERIOD.

Section 3 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012) is amended by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following:

“(f) CERTIFICATION PERIOD.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘certification period’ means the period for which a household shall be eligible to receive benefits.

“(2) TIME LIMITS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), the certification period shall not exceed 12 months.

“(B) CONTACT.—A State agency shall have at least 1 contact with each certified household every 12 months.

“(C) ELDERLY OR DISABLED HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS.—The certification period may be for a duration of—

“(i) not more than 24 months if each adult household member is elderly or disabled; or

“(ii) not more than 36 months if—

“(I) each adult household member is elderly or disabled; and

“(II) the household of the adult household member has no earned income at the time of certification.

“(D) EXTENSION OF LIMIT.—The limits under this paragraph may be extended until the end of any transitional benefit period established under section 11(s).”.

SEC. 4102. FOOD DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4(b) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2013(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

“(4) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall pay not less than 80 percent of administrative costs and distribution costs on Indian reservations as the Secretary determines necessary for effective administration of such distribution by a State agency or tribal organization.

“(B) WAIVER.—The Secretary shall waive up to 100 percent of the non-Federal share of the costs described in subparagraph (A) if the Secretary determines that—

“(i) the tribal organization is financially unable to provide a greater non-Federal share of the costs; or

“(ii) providing a greater non-Federal share of the costs would be a substantial burden for the tribal organization.

“(C) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may not reduce any benefits or services under the

food distribution program on Indian reservations under this subsection to any tribal organization that is granted a waiver under subparagraph (B).

“(D) TRIBAL CONTRIBUTION.—The Secretary may allow a tribal organization to use funds provided to the tribal organization through a Federal agency or other Federal benefit to satisfy all or part of the non-Federal share of the costs described in subparagraph (A) if that use is otherwise consistent with the purpose of the funds.”;

(2) in paragraph (6)(F), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Funds made available for a fiscal year to carry out this subsection shall remain available for obligation for a period of 2 fiscal years.

“(B) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Funds made available for a fiscal year to carry out paragraph (4) shall remain available for obligation by the State agency or tribal organization for a period of 2 fiscal years.”.

(b) DEMONSTRATION PROJECT FOR TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—The term “demonstration project” means the demonstration project established under paragraph (2).

(B) FOOD DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM.—The term “food distribution program” means the food distribution program on Indian reservations carried out under section 4(b) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2013(b)).

(C) INDIAN RESERVATION.—The term “Indian reservation” has the meaning given the term “reservation” in section 3 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012).

(D) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term “Indian tribe” has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

(E) SELF-DETERMINATION CONTRACT.—The term “self-determination contract” has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

(F) TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.—The term “tribal organization” has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012).

(2) ESTABLISHMENT.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary shall establish a demonstration project under which 1 or more tribal organizations may enter into self-determination contracts to purchase agricultural commodities under the food distribution program for the Indian reservation of that tribal organization.

(3) ELIGIBILITY.—

(A) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of the Interior and Indian tribes to determine the process and criteria under which a tribal organization may participate in the demonstration project.

(B) CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall select for participation in the demonstration project tribal organizations that—

(i) are successfully administering the food distribution program of the tribal organization under section 4(b)(2)(B) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2013(b)(2)(B));

(ii) have the capacity to purchase agricultural commodities in accordance with paragraph (4) for the food distribution program of the tribal organization; and

(iii) meet any other criteria determined by the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and Indian tribes.

(4) PROCUREMENT OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES.—Any agricultural commodities purchased by a tribal organization under the demonstration project shall—

(A) be domestically produced;

(B) supplant, not supplement, the type of agricultural commodities in existing food packages for that tribal organization;

(C) be of similar or higher nutritional value as the type of agricultural commodities that would be supplanted in the existing food package for that tribal organization; and

(D) meet any other criteria determined by the Secretary.

(5) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report describing the activities carried out under the demonstration project during the preceding year.

(6) FUNDING.—

(A) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this subsection \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended.

(B) APPROPRIATIONS IN ADVANCE.—Only funds appropriated under subparagraph (A) in advance specifically to carry out this subsection shall be available to carry out this subsection.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3(v) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012(v)) is amended by striking “the Indian Self-Determination Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(b))” and inserting “section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304)”.

SEC. 4103. WORK REQUIREMENTS FOR SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) WORK REQUIREMENTS FOR ABLE-BODIED ADULTS WITHOUT DEPENDENTS.—Section 6 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking the second sentence;

(ii) by striking “, as amended” each place it appears;

(iii) by striking “(F) a person” and inserting the following:

“(vi) a person”;

(iv) by striking “(E) employed” and inserting the following:

“(v) employed”;

(v) by striking “(D) a regular” and inserting the following:

“(iv) a regular”;

(vi) by striking “(C) a bona fide student” and inserting the following:

“(iii) a bona fide student”;

(vii) by striking “(B) a parent” and inserting the following:

“(ii) a parent”;

(viii) by striking “(A) currently” and inserting the following:

“(i) currently”; and

(ix) by striking “(2) A person who” and all that follows through “if he or she is” inserting the following:

“(E) EXEMPTIONS.—A person who otherwise would be required to comply with the requirements of subparagraphs (A) through (D) shall be exempt from such requirements if the person is—”; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (1) (as amended by subparagraph (A)) the following:

“(2) ADDITIONAL WORK REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) DEFINITION OF WORK PROGRAM.—In this paragraph, the term ‘work program’ means—

“(i) a program under title I of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act;

“(ii) a program under section 236 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2296);

“(iii) a program of employment and training operated or supervised by a State or political subdivision of a State that meets

standards approved by the Governor of the State, including a program under paragraph (4), other than a job search program or a job search training program; and

“(iv) a workforce partnership under paragraph (4)(N).

“(B) WORK REQUIREMENT.—Subject to the other provisions of this paragraph, no individual shall be eligible to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program as a member of any household if, during the preceding 36-month period, the individual received supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits for not less than 3 months (consecutive or otherwise) during which the individual did not—

“(i) work 20 hours or more per week, averaged monthly;

“(ii) participate in and comply with the requirements of a work program for 20 hours or more per week, as determined by the State agency;

“(iii) participate in and comply with the requirements of a program under section 20 or a comparable program established by a State or political subdivision of a State; or

“(iv) receive benefits pursuant to subparagraph (C), (D), (E), or (F).

“(C) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (B) shall not apply to an individual if the individual is—

“(i) under 18 or over 50 years of age;

“(ii) medically certified as physically or mentally unfit for employment;

“(iii) a parent or other member of a household with responsibility for a dependent child;

“(iv) otherwise exempt under paragraph (1)(E); or

“(v) a pregnant woman.

“(D) WAIVER.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—On the request of a State agency, the Secretary may waive the applicability of subparagraph (B) to any group of individuals in the State if the Secretary makes a determination that the area in which the individuals reside—

“(I) has an unemployment rate of over 10 percent; or

“(II) does not have a sufficient number of jobs to provide employment for the individuals.

“(ii) REPORT.—The Secretary shall report the basis for a waiver under clause (i) to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

“(E) SUBSEQUENT ELIGIBILITY.—

“(i) REGAINING ELIGIBILITY.—An individual denied eligibility under subparagraph (B) shall regain eligibility to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program if, during a 30-day period, the individual—

“(I) works 80 or more hours;

“(II) participates in and complies with the requirements of a work program for 80 or more hours, as determined by a State agency; or

“(III) participates in and complies with the requirements of a program under section 20 or a comparable program established by a State or political subdivision of a State.

“(ii) MAINTAINING ELIGIBILITY.—An individual who regains eligibility under clause (i) shall remain eligible as long as the individual meets the requirements of clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of subparagraph (B).

“(iii) LOSS OF EMPLOYMENT.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—An individual who regained eligibility under clause (i) and who no longer meets the requirements of clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of subparagraph (B) shall remain eligible for a consecutive 3-month period, beginning on the date the individual first notifies the State agency that the individual no longer meets the requirements of clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of subparagraph (B).

“(II) LIMITATION.—An individual shall not receive any benefits pursuant to subclause (I) for more than a single 3-month period in any 36-month period.

“(F) 15-PERCENT EXEMPTION.—

“(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this subparagraph:

“(I) CASELOAD.—The term ‘caseload’ means the average monthly number of individuals receiving supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits during the 12-month period ending the preceding June 30.

“(II) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—The term ‘covered individual’ means a member of a household that receives supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits, or an individual denied eligibility for supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits solely due to subparagraph (B), who—

“(aa) is not eligible for an exception under subparagraph (C);

“(bb) does not reside in an area covered by a waiver granted under subparagraph (D);

“(cc) is not complying with clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of subparagraph (B);

“(dd) is not receiving supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits during the 3 months of eligibility provided under subparagraph (B); and

“(ee) is not receiving supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits under subparagraph (E).

“(ii) GENERAL RULE.—Subject to clauses (iii) through (vii), a State agency may provide an exemption from the requirements of subparagraph (B) for covered individuals.

“(iii) FISCAL YEAR 1998.—Subject to clauses (v) and (vii), for fiscal year 1998, a State agency may provide a number of exemptions such that the average monthly number of the exemptions in effect during the fiscal year does not exceed 15 percent of the number of covered individuals in the State in fiscal year 1998, as estimated by the Secretary, based on the survey conducted to carry out section 16(c) for fiscal year 1996 and such other factors as the Secretary considers appropriate due to the timing and limitations of the survey.

“(iv) SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS.—Subject to clauses (v) through (vii), for fiscal year 1999 and each subsequent fiscal year, a State agency may provide a number of exemptions such that the average monthly number of the exemptions in effect during the fiscal year does not exceed 15 percent of the number of covered individuals in the State, as estimated by the Secretary under clause (iii), adjusted by the Secretary to reflect changes in the State’s caseload and the Secretary’s estimate of changes in the proportion of members of households that receive supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits covered by waivers granted under subparagraph (D).

“(v) CASELOAD ADJUSTMENTS.—The Secretary shall adjust the number of individuals estimated for a State under clause (iii) or (iv) during a fiscal year if the number of members of households that receive supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits in the State varies from the State’s caseload by more than 10 percent, as determined by the Secretary.

“(vi) EXEMPTION ADJUSTMENTS.—During fiscal year 1999 and each subsequent fiscal year, the Secretary shall increase or decrease the number of individuals who may be granted an exemption by a State agency under this subparagraph to the extent that the average monthly number of exemptions in effect in the State for the preceding fiscal year under this subparagraph is lesser or greater than the average monthly number of exemptions estimated for the State agency for such preceding fiscal year under this subparagraph.

“(vii) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—A State agency shall submit such reports to the Secretary as the Secretary determines are nec-

essary to ensure compliance with this subparagraph.

“(G) OTHER PROGRAM RULES.—Nothing in this paragraph shall make an individual eligible for benefits under this Act if the individual is not otherwise eligible for benefits under the other provisions of this Act.”; and (2) by striking subsection (o).

(b) EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS THAT MEET STATE AND LOCAL WORKFORCE NEEDS.—Section 6(d)(4) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(d)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) in clause (i)—

(i) by inserting “, in consultation with the State workforce development board, or, if the State demonstrates that consultation with private employers or employer organizations would be more effective or efficient, in consultation with private employers or employer organizations,” after “designed by the State agency”; and

(ii) by striking “that will increase their ability to obtain regular employment,” and inserting the following: “that will—

“(I) increase the ability of the household members to obtain regular employment; and

“(II) meet State or local workforce needs.”; and

(B) in clause (ii), by inserting “and implemented to meet the purposes of clause (i)” after “under this paragraph”;

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in clause (iv), by redesignating subclauses (I) and (II) as items (aa) and (bb), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(B) by redesignating clauses (i) through (vii) and clause (viii) as subclauses (I) through (VII) and subclause (IX), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(C) by inserting after subclause (VII) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(VIII) Programs or activities described in subclauses (I) through (XII) of clause (iv) of section 16(h)(1)(F) that the Secretary determines, based on the results of the applicable independent evaluations conducted under clause (vii)(I) of that section, are effective at increasing employment or earnings for households participating in a pilot project under that section.”;

(D) in the matter preceding subclause (I) (as so redesignated)—

(i) by striking “this subparagraph” and inserting “this clause”;

(ii) by inserting “and a program containing a component under subclause (I) shall contain at least 1 additional component” before the colon; and

(iii) by striking “(B) For purposes of this Act, an” and inserting the following:

“(B) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

“(i) EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM.—The term”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) WORKFORCE PARTNERSHIP.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘workforce partnership’ means a program that—

“(aa) is operated by a private employer, an organization representing private employers, or a nonprofit organization providing services relating to workforce development;

“(bb) the Secretary or the State agency certifies—

“(AA) subject to subparagraph (N)(ii), would assist participants who are members of households participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program in gaining high-quality, work-relevant skills, training, work, or experience that will increase the ability of the participants to obtain regular employment;

“(BB) subject to subparagraph (N)(ii), would provide participants with not fewer than 20 hours per week of training, work, or experience under subitem (AA);

“(CC) would not use any funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act;

“(DD) would provide sufficient information, on request by the State agency, for the State agency to determine that participants who are members of households participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program are fulfilling any applicable work requirement under this subsection;

“(EE) would be willing to serve as a reference for participants who are members of households participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program for future employment or work-related programs; and

“(FF) meets any other criteria established by the Secretary, on the condition that the Secretary shall not establish any additional criteria that would impose significant paperwork burdens on the workforce partnership; and

“(cc) is in compliance with the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.), if applicable.

“(II) INCLUSION.—The term ‘workforce partnership’ includes a multistate program.”;

(3) in subparagraph (E)—

(A) in the second sentence, by striking “Such requirements” and inserting the following:

“(ii) VARIATION.—The requirements under clause (i)”;

(B) by striking “(E) Each State” and inserting the following:

“(E) REQUIREMENTS FOR PARTICIPATION FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Each State”; and

(C) adding at the end the following:

“(iii) APPLICATION TO WORKFORCE PARTNERSHIPS.—To the extent that a State agency requires an individual to participate in an employment and training program, the State agency shall consider an individual participating in a workforce partnership to be in compliance with the employment and training requirements.”;

(4) in subparagraph (H), by striking “(B)(v)” and inserting “(B)(i)(V)”;

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(N) WORKFORCE PARTNERSHIPS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A work registrant may participate in a workforce partnership to comply with the requirements of paragraph (1)(A)(ii) and paragraph (2).

“(ii) CERTIFICATION.—In certifying that a program meets the requirements of subitems (AA) and (BB) of subparagraph (B)(ii)(I)(bb) to be certified as a workforce partnership, the Secretary or the State agency shall require that the program submit to the Secretary or State agency sufficient information that describes—

“(I) the services and activities of the program that would provide participants with not fewer than 20 hours per week of training, work, or experience under those subitems; and

“(II) how the program would provide services and activities described in subclause (I) that would directly enhance the employability or job readiness of the participant.

“(iii) SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT.—A State agency may use a workforce partnership to supplement, not to supplant, the employment and training program of the State agency.

“(iv) PARTICIPATION.—A State agency may provide information on workforce partnerships, if available, to any member of a household participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program, but may not require any member of a household to participate in a workforce partnership.

“(v) EFFECT.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—A workforce partnership shall not replace the employment or training

of an individual not participating in the workforce partnership.

“(II) SELECTION.—Nothing in this subsection affects the criteria or screening process for selecting participants by a workforce partnership.

“(vi) LIMITATION ON REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out this subparagraph, the Secretary and each applicable State agency shall limit the reporting requirements of a workforce partnership to—

“(I) on notification that an individual is receiving supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits, notifying the applicable State agency that the individual is participating in the workforce partnership;

“(II) identifying participants who have completed or are no longer participating in the workforce partnership;

“(III) identifying changes to the workforce partnership that result in the workforce partnership no longer meeting the certification requirements of the Secretary or the State agency under subparagraph (B)(ii)(I)(bb); and

“(IV) providing sufficient information, on request by the State agency, for the State agency to verify that a participant is fulfilling any applicable work requirements under this subsection.

“(O) REFERRAL OF CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with such regulations as may be issued by the Secretary, with respect to any individual who is not eligible for an exemption under paragraph (1)(E) and who is determined by an employment and training program component to be ill-suited to participate in the employment and training program component, the State agency shall—

“(I) refer the individual to an appropriate employment and training program component;

“(II) refer the individual to an appropriate workforce partnership, if available;

“(III) reassess the physical and mental fitness of the individual under paragraph (1)(A); or

“(IV) to the maximum extent practicable, coordinate with other Federal, State, or local workforce or assistance programs to identify work opportunities or assistance for the individual.

“(ii) PROCESS.—In carrying out clause (i), the State agency shall ensure that an individual undergoing and complying with the process established under that clause shall not be found to have refused without good cause to participate in an employment and training program.”

(c) UPDATING WORK-RELATED PILOT PROJECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 16(h) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(h)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking “6(o)” and inserting “6(d)(2)”;

(ii) in subparagraph (E)—

(I) in clause (i)—

(aa) in subclause (I), by striking “6(o)(3)” and inserting “6(d)(2)(C)”;

(bb) in subclause (II), by striking “subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 6(o)(2)” and inserting “clause (ii) or (iii) of section 6(d)(2)(B)”;

(II) in clause (ii)—

(aa) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking “subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 6(o)(2)” and inserting “clause (ii) or (iii) of section 6(d)(2)(B)”;

(bb) in subclause (I), by striking “6(o)(2)” and inserting “6(d)(2)(B)”;

(cc) in subclause (II), by striking “6(o)(3)” and inserting “6(d)(2)(C)”;

(dd) in subclause (III), by striking “6(o)(4)” and inserting “6(d)(2)(D)”;

(ee) in subclause (IV), by striking “6(o)(6)” and inserting “6(d)(2)(F)”;

(iii) in subparagraph (F)—

(I) in clause (ii)(III)(ee)(AA), by striking “6(o)” and inserting “6(d)(2)”;

(II) in clause (viii)—

(aa) in subclause (III), by striking “September 30, 2018” and inserting the following: “September 30, 2023, for—

“(aa) the continuation of pilot projects being carried out under this subparagraph as of the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, if the pilot projects meet the limitations described in subclause (II); and

“(bb) additional pilot projects authorized under clause (x).”;

(bb) by adding at the end the following:

“(IV) FUNDS FOR ADDITIONAL PILOT PROJECTS.—From amounts made available under section 18(a)(1), the Secretary shall use to carry out clause (x) \$92,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 and 2020, to remain available until expended.”;

(III) by adding at the end the following:

“(x) AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT ADDITIONAL PILOT PROJECTS.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the availability of funds under clause (viii), the Secretary may carry out 8 or more additional pilot projects using a competitive grant process.

“(II) REQUIREMENTS.—Except as otherwise provided in this clause, a pilot project under this clause shall meet the criteria described in clauses (i), (ii)(II)(bb), and (iii) through (vi) and items (aa) through (dd) of clause (ii)(III).

“(III) EVALUATION AND REPORTING.—

“(aa) OPTIONAL EVALUATION.—

“(AA) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall have the option to conduct an independent longitudinal evaluation of pilot projects carried out under this clause, in accordance with clause (vii)(I).

“(BB) QUALIFYING CRITERIA.—If the Secretary determines to conduct an independent longitudinal evaluation under subitem (AA), to be eligible to participate in a pilot project under this clause, a State agency shall agree to participate in the evaluation described in clause (vii), including providing evidence that the State has a robust data collection system for program administration and is cooperating to make available State data on the employment activities and post-participation employment, earnings, and public benefit receipt of participants to ensure proper and timely evaluation.

“(bb) REPORTING.—If the Secretary determines not to conduct an independent longitudinal evaluation under item (aa), subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate and not less frequently than annually, each State agency participating in a pilot project carried out under this clause shall submit to the Secretary a report that describes the results of the pilot project.

“(IV) VOLUNTARY ACTIVITIES.—Except as provided in subclause (VIII), employment and training activities under a pilot project carried out under this clause shall be voluntary for work registrants.

“(V) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to participate in a pilot project carried out under this clause, a State agency shall commit to maintain at least the amount of State funding for employment and training programs and services under paragraphs (2) and (3) and under section 20 as the State expended for fiscal year 2018.

“(VI) LIMITATION.—In carrying out pilot projects under this clause, the Secretary shall not be subject to the limitation described in clause (viii)(II)(aa).

“(VII) PRIORITY.—In selecting pilot projects under this clause, the Secretary may give priority to pilot projects that—

“(aa) are targeted to—

“(AA) individuals 50 years of age or older;

“(BB) formerly incarcerated individuals;

“(CC) individuals participating in a substance abuse treatment program.

“(DD) homeless individuals;

“(EE) people with disabilities seeking to enter the workforce; or

1 “(FF) other individuals with substantial barriers to employment; or

“(bb) support employment and workforce participation through an integrated and family-focused approach in providing supportive services.

“(VIII) PILOT PROJECTS FOR MANDATORY PARTICIPATION IN EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES.—A State agency may be eligible to participate in a pilot project under this clause to test programs that assign work registrants to mandatory participation in employment and training activities, on the conditions that—

“(aa) the pilot project provides individualized case management designed to help remove barriers to employment for participants; and

“(bb) a work registrant is not assigned to employment and training activities primarily consisting of job search, job search training, or workforce activities.”;

(B) in paragraph (5)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “section 6(d)(4)” and inserting “this paragraph”;

(II) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subclauses (I) and (II), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in clause (ii), by redesignating subclauses (I) and (II) as items (aa) and (bb), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(II) in clause (iv)—

(aa) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking “clause (iii)” and inserting “subclause (III)”;

(bb) in subclause (IV)—

(AA) in item (cc), by striking “section 6(b)” and inserting “subsection (b)”;

(BB) by redesignating items (aa) through (cc) as subitems (AA) through (CC), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(cc) by redesignating subclauses (I) through (V) as items (aa) through (ee), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(III) by redesignating clauses (i) through (iv) as subclauses (I) through (IV), respectively, and indenting appropriately; and

(IV) by adding at the end the following:

“(V) STATE OPTION.—The State agency may report relevant data from a workforce partnership carried out under subparagraph (N) to demonstrate the number of program participants served by the workforce partnership.”;

(iii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) in clause (iii), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(II) in clause (iv)—

(aa) in the matter preceding subclause (I)—

(AA) by striking “paragraph (1)(E)” and inserting “subparagraph (E) of section 16(h)(1)”;

(BB) by striking “paragraph (1)” and inserting “that section”;

(bb) in subclause (I)—

(AA) by striking “paragraph (1)(E)(ii)” and inserting “section 16(h)(1)(E)(ii)”;

(BB) by striking “subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 6(o)(2)” and inserting “clause (ii) or (iii) of paragraph (2)(B)”;

(cc) in subclause (II), by striking “paragraph (1)(E)” and inserting “section 16(h)(1)(E)”;

(dd) by redesignating subclauses (I) through (III) as items (aa) through (cc), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(III) by redesignating clauses (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv) as subclauses (I), (II), (IV), and (VI), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(IV) by inserting after subclause (II) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(III) that the State agency has consulted with the State workforce board or, if appropriate, private employers or employer organizations, in the design of the employment and training program;” and

(V) by inserting after subclause (IV) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(V) that the employment and training program components of the State agency are responsive to State or local workforce needs; and”;

(iv) in subparagraph (D), by striking “subparagraph (B)” and inserting “clause (ii)”;

(v) in subparagraph (E), by inserting “or that the employment and training program is not adequately meeting State or local workforce needs” after “is inadequate”;

(vi) in subparagraph (F)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “October 1, 2016” and inserting “October 1, 2020”;

(II) in clause (i), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(III) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(IV) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subclauses (I) and (II), respectively, and indenting appropriately; and

(V) by adding at the end the following:

“(III) are meeting State or local workforce needs.”;

(vii) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (F) (as so amended) as clauses (i) through (vi), respectively, and indenting appropriately; and

(viii) by redesignating the paragraph as subparagraph (P), indenting the subparagraph appropriately, and moving the subparagraph so as to appear after subparagraph (O) of section 6(d)(4) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(d)(4)) (as added by subsection (b)(5)).

(2) RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATION, AND EVALUATIONS.—Section 17 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3);

(ii) by striking “(b)(1)(A) The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(b) DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS; PILOT PROJECTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”;

(iii) in paragraph (1) (as so designated)—

(I) in subparagraph (D)—

(aa) in clause (i), in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking “subparagraph (A)” and inserting “paragraph (1)”;

(bb) in clause (ii), by striking “clause (i)” and inserting “subparagraph (A)”;

(cc) in clause (iii), by striking “clause (i)(III)” and inserting “subparagraph (A)(iii)”;

(II) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as paragraph (4), and indenting appropriately;

(III) in subparagraph (C), by striking “(C)(i) No waiver” and inserting the following:

“(3) RESTRICTIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—No waiver”;

(IV) in subparagraph (B)—

(aa) in clause (i), in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking “subparagraph (A)” and inserting “paragraph (1)”;

(bb) in clause (ii)—

(AA) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking “subparagraph (A)” and inserting “paragraph (1)”;

(BB) in subclause (IV), by striking “this paragraph” and inserting “this subsection”;

(cc) in clause (iii), in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking “subparagraph (A)” and inserting “paragraph (1)”;

(dd) in clause (iv)—

(AA) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking “subparagraph (A)” and inserting “paragraph (1)”;

(BB) in subclause (I), by striking “the date of enactment of this subparagraph” and inserting “August 22, 1996”;

(CC) in subclause (III)(aa), by striking “3(n)” and inserting “3(q)”;

(DD) in subclause (III)(dd), by striking “(2)(B)” and inserting “(1)(E)(ii)”;

(EE) in subclause (III)(ii), by striking “this paragraph” and inserting “this subsection”;

(FF) in subclause (IV)(bb), by striking “this subclause” and inserting “this clause”;

(ee) in clause (vi), by striking “this paragraph” and inserting “this subsection”;

(v) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as paragraph (2) and indenting appropriately;

(iv) in paragraph (2) (as so redesignated)—

(I) by redesignating clauses (i) through (vi) as subparagraphs (A) through (F), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(II) in subparagraph (A) (as so redesignated), by redesignating subclauses (I) and (II) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(III) in subparagraph (B) (as so redesignated), by redesignating subclauses (I) through (IV) as clauses (i) through (iv), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(IV) in subparagraph (C) (as so redesignated), by redesignating subclauses (I) and (II) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and indenting appropriately; and

(V) in subparagraph (D) (as so redesignated)—

(aa) by redesignating subclauses (I) through (VII) as clauses (i) through (vii), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(bb) in clause (iii) (as so redesignated), by redesignating items (aa) through (jj) as subclauses (I) through (X), respectively, and indenting appropriately; and

(cc) in clause (iv) (as so redesignated), by redesignating items (aa) and (bb) as subclauses (I) and (II), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(v) in paragraph (3) (as so redesignated)—

(I) in subparagraph (A) (as so redesignated)—

(aa) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking “the date of enactment of this subparagraph” and inserting “November 28, 1990”;

(bb) in clause (ii), by striking “(ii) Clause (i)” and inserting the following:

“(B) APPLICATION.—Subparagraph (A)”;

(II) in subparagraph (A) (as so redesignated), by redesignating subclauses (I) and (II) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and indenting appropriately; and

(vi) in paragraph (4) (as so redesignated)—

(I) by redesignating clauses (i) through (iii) as subparagraphs (A) through (C), respectively, and indenting appropriately; and

(II) in subparagraph (A) (as so redesignated), by redesignating subclauses (I) through (IV) as clauses (i) through (iv), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(B) by striking subsection (d);

(C) by redesignating subsections (e) through (l) as subsections (d) through (k), respectively; and

(D) in subsection (e) (as so redesignated), in the first sentence, by striking “subsection (b)(1)” and inserting “subsection (b)”.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 18 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2027) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) RESTRICTION.—No funds authorized to be appropriated under this Act shall be used to operate a workforce partnership under section 6(d)(4)(N).”.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 5(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014(a)) is amended in the second sentence by striking “(d)(2)” and inserting “(d)(1)(E)”.

(2) Section 6(i)(3) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(i)(3)) is amended by striking “(d)” and inserting “(d)(1)”.

(3) Section 7(h)(6) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(h)(6)) is amended by striking “17(f)” and inserting “17(e)”.

(4) Section 7(i)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(i)(1)) is amended by striking “6(o)(2)” and inserting “6(d)(2)(B)”.

(5) Section 7(j)(1)(G) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(j)(1)(G)) is amended by striking “17(f)” and inserting “17(e)”.

(6) Section 11(n) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020(n)) is amended by striking “17(b)(1)” and inserting “17(b)”.

(7) Section 16(b)(4) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(b)(4)) is amended by striking “section 6(d)” and inserting “section 6(d)(1)”.

(8) Section 20(b)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2029(b)(1)) is amended by striking “clause (B), (C), (D), (E), or (F) of section 6(d)(2)” and inserting “clause (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), or (vi) of section 6(d)(1)(E)”.

(9) Section 103(a)(2)(D) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3113(a)(2)(D)) is amended by striking “section 6(o) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(o))” and inserting “paragraph (2) of section 6(d) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(d))”.

(10) Section 121(b)(2)(B)(iv) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3151(b)(2)(B)(iv)) is amended by striking “section 6(o) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(o))” and inserting “paragraph (2) of section 6(d) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(d))”.

(11) Section 23(b)(7)(D)(ii) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1769d(b)(7)(D)(ii)) is amended by striking “section 17(b)(1)(B) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026(b)(1)(B))” and inserting “paragraph (2) of section 17(b) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026(b))”.

(12) Section 24(g)(3)(C) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1769e(g)(3)(C)) is amended by striking “section 17(b)(1)(B) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026(b)(1)(B))” and inserting “paragraph (2) of section 17(b) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026(b))”.

SEC. 4104. IMPROVEMENTS TO ELECTRONIC BENEFIT TRANSFER SYSTEM.

(a) PROHIBITED FEES.—Section 7 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016) is amended—

(1) in subsection (f)(2)(C), in the subparagraph heading, by striking “INTERCHANGE” and inserting “PROHIBITED”; and

(2) in subsection (h), by striking paragraph (13) and inserting the following:

“(13) PROHIBITED FEES.—

“(A) DEFINITION OF SWITCHING.—In this paragraph, the term ‘switching’ means the routing of an intrastate or interstate transaction that consists of transmitting the details of a transaction electronically recorded through the use of an EBT card in 1 State to the issuer of the card in—

“(i) the same State; or

“(ii) another State.

“(B) PROHIBITION.—

“(i) INTERCHANGE FEES.—No interchange fee shall apply to an electronic benefit transfer transaction under this subsection.

“(ii) OTHER FEES.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—No fee charged by a benefit issuer (including any affiliate of a benefit issuer), or by any agent or contractor when acting on behalf of such benefit issuer, to a third party relating to the switching or routing of benefits to the same benefit issuer (including any affiliate of the benefit issuer) shall apply to an electronic benefit transfer transaction under this subsection.

“(II) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The prohibition under subclause (I) shall be effective through fiscal year 2022.”

(b) EBT PORTABILITY.—Section 7(f)(5) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(f)(5)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) OPERATION OF INDIVIDUAL POINT OF SALE DEVICE BY FARMERS’ MARKETS AND DIRECT MARKETING FARMERS.—A farmers’ market or direct marketing farmer that is exempt under paragraph (2)(B)(i) shall be allowed to operate an individual electronic benefit transfer point of sale device at more than 1 location under the same supplemental nutrition assistance program authorization, if—

“(i) the farmers’ market or direct marketing farmer provides to the Secretary information on location and hours of operation at each location; and

“(ii)(I) the point of sale device used by the farmers’ market or direct marketing farmer is capable of providing location information of the device through the electronic benefit transfer system; or

“(II) if the Secretary determines that the technology is not available for a point of sale device to meet the requirement under subclause (I), the farmers’ market or direct marketing farmer provides to the Secretary any other information, as determined by the Secretary, necessary to ensure the integrity of transactions processed using the point of sale device.”

(c) EVALUATION OF STATE ELECTRONIC BENEFIT TRANSFER SYSTEMS.—Section 7(h) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(h)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(15) GAO EVALUATION AND STUDY OF STATE ELECTRONIC BENEFIT TRANSFER SYSTEMS.—

“(A) EVALUATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Comptroller General of the United States (referred to in this paragraph as the ‘Comptroller General’) shall evaluate for each electronic benefit transfer system of a State agency selected in accordance with clause (ii)—

“(I) any type of fee charged—

“(aa) by the benefit issuer (or an affiliate, agent, or contractor of the benefit issuer) of the State agency for electronic benefit transfer-related services, including electronic benefit transfer-related services that did not exist before February 7, 2014; and

“(bb) to any retail food stores, including retail food stores that are exempt under subsection (f)(2)(B)(i) for electronic benefit transfer-related services;

“(II) in consultation with the Secretary and the retail food stores within the State, any electronic benefit transfer system outages affecting the EBT cards of the State agency;

“(III) in consultation with the Secretary, any type of entity that—

“(aa) provides electronic benefit transfer equipment and related services to the State agency, any benefit issuers of the State agency, or any retail food stores within the State;

“(bb) routes or switches transactions through the electronic benefit transfer system of the State agency; or

“(cc) has access to transaction information in the electronic benefit transfer system of the State agency; and

“(IV) in consultation with the Secretary, any emerging entities, services, or technologies in use with respect to the electronic benefit transfer system of the State agency.

“(i) SELECTION CRITERIA.—The Comptroller General shall select for evaluation under clause (i)—

“(I) with respect to each benefit issuer that provides electronic benefit transfer-related services to 1 or more State agencies, not fewer than 1 electronic benefit transfer system provided by that benefit issuer; and

“(II) any electronic benefit transfer system of a State agency that has experienced significant or frequent outages during the 2-year period preceding the date of enactment of this paragraph.

“(B) STUDY.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report based on the evaluation carried out under subparagraph (A) that includes—

“(i) a description of the types of entities that—

“(I) provide electronic benefit transfer equipment and related services to State agencies, benefit issuers, and retail food stores;

“(II) route or switch transactions through electronic benefit transfer systems of State agencies; or

“(III) have access to transaction information in electronic benefit transfer systems of State agencies;

“(i) a description of emerging entities, services, and technologies in use with respect to electronic benefit transfer systems of State agencies; and

“(iii) a summary of—

“(I) the types of fees charged—

“(aa) by benefit issuers (or affiliates, agents, or contractors of benefit issuers) of State agencies for electronic benefit transfer-related services, including whether the types of fees existed before February 7, 2014; and

“(bb) to any retail food stores, including retail food stores that are exempt under subsection (f)(2)(B)(i) for electronic benefit transfer-related services;

“(II)(aa) the causes of any electronic benefit transfer system outages affecting EBT cards; and

“(bb) potential solutions to minimize the disruption of outages to participating households.

“(16) REVIEW OF EBT SYSTEMS REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) REVIEW.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall review for each electronic benefit transfer system of a State agency selected under clause (ii)—

“(I) any contracts or other agreements between the State agency and the benefit issuer of the State agency to determine—

“(aa) the customer service requirements of the benefit issuer, including call center requirements; and

“(bb) the consistency and compatibility of data provided by the benefit issuer to the Secretary for appropriate oversight of possible fraudulent transactions; and

“(II) the use of third-party applications that access the electronic benefit transfer system to provide electronic benefit transfer account information to participating households.

“(ii) SELECTION CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall select for the review under clause (i)

not fewer than 5 electronic benefit transfer systems of State agencies, of which—

“(I) with respect to each benefit issuer that provides electronic benefit transfer-related services to 1 or more State agencies, not fewer than 1 shall be provided by that benefit issuer; and

“(II) not more than 4 shall have experienced significant or frequent outages during the 2-year period preceding the date of enactment of this paragraph.

“(B) REGULATIONS AND GUIDANCE.—Based on the study conducted by the Comptroller General of the United States under paragraph (15)(B) and the review conducted by the Secretary under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall promulgate such regulations or issue such guidance as the Secretary determines appropriate—

“(i) to prohibit the imposition of any fee that is inconsistent with paragraph (13);

“(ii) to minimize electronic benefit system outages;

“(iii) to update procedures to handle electronic benefit transfer system outages that minimize disruption to participating households and retail food stores while protecting against fraud and abuse;

“(iv) to develop cost-effective customer service standards for benefit issuers, including benefit issuer call centers or other customer service options equivalent to call centers, that would ensure adequate customer service for participating households;

“(v) to address the use of third-party applications that access electronic benefit transfer systems to provide electronic benefit transfer account information to participating households, including by establishing safeguards consistent with sections 9(c) and 11(e)(8) to protect the privacy of data relating to participating households and approved retail food stores; and

“(vi) to improve the reliability of electronic benefit transfer systems.

“(C) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that includes a description of the effects, if any, on an electronic benefit transfer system of a State agency from the use of third-party applications that access the electronic benefit transfer system to provide electronic benefit transfer account information to participating households.”

(d) APPROVAL OF RETAIL FOOD STORES.—Section 9 of the Food and Nutrition Act (7 U.S.C. 2018) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in the fourth sentence, by striking “No retail food store” and inserting the following:

“(D) VISIT REQUIRED.—No retail food store”;

(B) in the third sentence, by striking “Approval” and inserting the following:

“(C) CERTIFICATE.—Approval”;

(C) in the second sentence—

(i) by striking “food; and (D) the” and inserting the following: “food;

“(iv) any information, if available, about the ability of the anticipated or existing electronic benefit transfer equipment and service provider of the applicant to provide sufficient information through the electronic benefit transfer system to minimize the risk of fraudulent transactions; and

“(v) the”;

(ii) by striking “concern; (C) whether” and inserting the following: “concern;

“(iii) whether”;

(iii) by striking “applicant; (B) the” and inserting the following: “applicant;

“(ii) the”;

(iv) by striking “following: (A) the nature” and inserting the following: “following:

“(i) the nature”; and

(v) in the matter preceding clause (i) (as so designated), by striking “in determining” and inserting the following:

“(B) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—In determining”; and

(D) in the first sentence, by striking “(a)(1) Regulations” and inserting the following:

“(a) AUTHORIZATION TO ACCEPT AND REDEEM BENEFITS.—

“(1) APPLICATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Regulations”;

(2) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

“(4) ELECTRONIC BENEFIT TRANSFER EQUIPMENT AND SERVICE PROVIDERS.—Before implementing clause (iv) of paragraph (1)(B), the Secretary shall issue guidance for retail food stores on how to select electronic benefit transfer equipment and service providers that are able to meet the requirements of that clause.”; and

(3) in subsection (c), in the first sentence, by inserting “records relating to electronic benefit transfer equipment and related services, transaction and redemption data provided through the electronic benefit transfer system,” after “purchase invoices.”.

SEC. 4105. RETAIL INCENTIVES.

Section 9 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2018) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) INCENTIVES.—

“(1) DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE INCENTIVE FOOD.—In this subsection, the term ‘eligible incentive food’ means food that is—

“(A) identified for increased consumption by the most recent Dietary Guidelines for Americans published under section 301 of the National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5341); and

“(B) a fruit, a vegetable, low-fat dairy, or a whole grain.

“(2) REGULATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations to clarify the process by which an approved retail food store may seek a waiver to offer an incentive that may be used only for the purchase of eligible incentive food at the point of purchase to a household purchasing food with benefits issued under this Act.

“(B) REGULATIONS.—The regulations under subparagraph (A) shall establish a process under which an approved retail food store, prior to carrying out an incentive program under this subsection, shall provide to the Secretary information describing the incentive program, including—

“(i) the types of incentives that will be offered;

“(ii) the types of foods that will be incentivized for purchase; and

“(iii) an explanation of how the incentive program intends to support meeting dietary intake goals.

“(3) NO LIMITATION ON BENEFITS.—A waiver granted under this subsection shall not be used to carry out any activity that limits the use of benefits under this Act or any other Federal nutrition law.

“(4) EFFECT.—Regulations promulgated under this subsection shall not affect any requirements under section 4405 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 7517) or section 4304 of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, including the eligibility of a retail food store to participate in a project funded under those sections.

“(5) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate an annual report describing the types of incentives approved under this subsection.”.

SEC. 4106. REQUIRED ACTION ON DATA MATCH INFORMATION.

Section 11(e) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (24), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (25), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(26) that for a household participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program, the State agency shall pursue clarification and verification, if applicable, of information relating to the circumstances of the household received from data matches for the purpose of ensuring an accurate eligibility and benefit determination, only if the information—

“(A) appears to present significantly conflicting information from the information that was used by the State agency at the time of certification of the household;

“(B) is obtained from data matches carried out under subsection (q), (r), or (w); or

“(C)(i) is fewer than 60 days old relative to the current month of participation of the household; and

“(ii) if accurate, would have been required to be reported by the household based on the reporting requirements assigned to the household by the State agency under section 6(c).”.

SEC. 4107. INCOME VERIFICATION.

Section 17 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026) (as amended by section 4103(c)(2)(C)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(1) PILOT PROJECTS FOR IMPROVING EARNED INCOME VERIFICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Under such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers to be appropriate, the Secretary shall establish a pilot program (referred to in this subsection as the ‘pilot program’) under which not more than 8 States may carry out pilot projects to test strategies to improve the accuracy or efficiency of the process for verification of earned income at certification and recertification of applicant households for the supplemental nutrition assistance program.

“(2) CONTRACT OPTIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the pilot program, prior to soliciting applications for pilot projects from State agencies, the Secretary shall—

“(i) assess the availability of up-to-date earned income information from different commercial data service providers; and

“(ii) make a determination regarding the overall cost-effectiveness to the Department of Agriculture and the State agencies administering the supplemental nutrition assistance program of—

“(I) the Secretary entering into a contract with a commercial data service provider to provide to State agencies carrying out pilot projects up-to-date earned income information for verification of the earned income at certification and recertification of applicant households for the supplemental nutrition assistance program;

“(II) the Secretary entering into an agreement with the Secretary of Health and Human Services to allow State agencies carrying out pilot projects to verify earned income information at certification and recertification of applicant households for the supplemental nutrition assistance program in the State using up-to-date earned income information from a commercial data service provider under the electronic interface developed by the State and used by the State Medicaid agency to verify income eligibility for the State Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.); or

“(III) a State agency carrying out a pilot project entering into a contract with a com-

mercial data service provider to obtain up-to-date earned income information to verify the earned income at certification and recertification of applicant households for the supplemental nutrition assistance program in the State.

“(B) AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO CONTRACTS.—If determined appropriate by the Secretary, the Secretary may, based on the cost-effectiveness determination described in subparagraph (A)(ii)—

“(i) enter into a contract described in subclause (I) of that subparagraph;

“(ii) enter into an agreement described in subclause (II) of that subparagraph; or

“(iii) allow each State agency carrying out a pilot project to enter into a contract described in subclause (III) of that subparagraph, on the condition that the Federal share of the cost of the contract shall not exceed 75 percent of the total cost of the contract.

“(C) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the results of the assessment and determination under subparagraph (A).

“(3) PILOT PROJECTS.—

“(A) APPLICATION.—A State agency seeking to carry out a pilot project under the pilot program shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, including—

“(i) an identification of the 1 or more proposed changes to the process for verifying earned income used by the State agency;

“(ii) a description of how the proposed changes under clause (i) would meet the purpose described in paragraph (1); and

“(iii) a plan to evaluate how the proposed changes under clause (i) would improve the accuracy or efficiency of the verification of earned income at certification and recertification of applicant households for the supplemental nutrition assistance program in the State.

“(B) SELECTION CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall select to carry out pilot projects State agencies that, as determined by the Secretary—

“(i) do not have access to up-to-date earned income information for the verification of earned income at certification and recertification of applicant households for the supplemental nutrition assistance program in the State;

“(ii) would be able to access and use, for the verification of earned income at certification and recertification of applicant households for the supplemental nutrition assistance program in the State, up-to-date earned income information used to determine eligibility for another Federal assistance program; or

“(iii) have cost-effective, innovative approaches to verifying earned income that would improve the accuracy or efficiency of the verification of earned income at certification and recertification of applicant households for the supplemental nutrition assistance program in the State.

“(4) GRANTS.—The Secretary may make grants to a State agency to carry out a pilot project.

“(5) EFFECT ON OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—A pilot project carried out under this subsection shall not alter the eligibility requirements under section 5 or the reporting requirements under section 6(c).

“(6) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the pilot program terminates under paragraph (8), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and

the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the results of the pilot projects carried out under the pilot program.

“(7) FUNDING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Out of funds made available under section 18(a)(1), on October 1, 2018, the Secretary shall make available \$10,000,000 to carry out this subsection, to remain available until expended.

“(B) COSTS.—The Secretary shall allocate not more than 10 percent of the amounts made available under subparagraph (A) to carry out subparagraphs (A) and (C) of paragraph (2) and paragraph (6).

“(8) TERMINATION.—The pilot program shall terminate not later than September 30, 2022.”.

SEC. 4108. PILOT PROJECTS TO IMPROVE HEALTHY DIETARY PATTERNS RELATED TO FLUID MILK IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 17 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026) (as amended by section 4107) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(m) PILOT PROJECTS TO IMPROVE HEALTHY DIETARY PATTERNS RELATED TO FLUID MILK CONSUMPTION AMONG PARTICIPANTS OR HOUSEHOLDS IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM THAT UNDER-CONSUME FLUID MILK.—

“(1) DEFINITION OF FLUID MILK.—In this subsection, the term ‘fluid milk’ means cow milk, without flavoring or sweeteners, consistent with the most recent Dietary Guidelines for Americans published under section 301 of the National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5341), that is packaged in liquid form.

“(2) PILOT PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall carry out, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers to be appropriate, pilot projects to develop and test methods that would increase the purchase of fluid milk, in a manner consistent with the most recent Dietary Guidelines for Americans published under section 301 of the National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5341), by individuals or households participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program that under-consume fluid milk by providing an incentive for the purchase of fluid milk at the point of purchase to a household purchasing food with supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits.

“(3) GRANTS OR COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary may enter into competitively awarded cooperative agreements with, or provide grants to, a government agency or nonprofit organization for use in accordance with projects that meet the strategic goals of this subsection, including allowing the government agency or nonprofit organization to award subgrants to retail food stores authorized under this Act.

“(B) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to receive a cooperative agreement or grant under this paragraph, a government agency or nonprofit organization shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

“(C) SELECTION CRITERIA.—Pilot projects shall be evaluated against publicly disseminated criteria that shall include—

“(i) incorporation of a scientifically based strategy that is designed to improve diet quality through the increased purchase of fluid milk for participants or households in the supplemental nutrition assistance program that under-consume fluid milk;

“(ii) a commitment to a pilot project that allows for a rigorous outcome evaluation, including data collection; and

“(iii) other criteria, as determined by the Secretary.

“(D) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds provided under this paragraph shall not be used for any project that limits the use of benefits under this Act.

“(E) DURATION.—Each pilot project carried out under this subsection shall be in effect for not more than 24 months.

“(4) PROJECTS.—Pilot projects carried out under paragraph (2) shall include projects to determine whether incentives for the purchase of fluid milk by individuals or households participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program that under-consume fluid milk result in—

“(A) improved nutritional outcomes for participating individuals or households;

“(B) changes in purchasing and consumption of fluid milk among participating individuals or households; or

“(C) diets more closely aligned with healthy eating patterns consistent with the most recent Dietary Guidelines for Americans published under section 301 of the National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5341).

“(5) EVALUATION AND REPORTING.—

“(A) EVALUATION.—

“(i) INDEPENDENT EVALUATION.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide for an independent evaluation of projects selected under this subsection that measures the impact of the pilot program on health and nutrition as described in paragraphs (2) through (4).

“(II) REQUIREMENT.—The independent evaluation under subclause (I) shall use rigorous methodologies, particularly random assignment or other methods that are capable of producing scientifically valid information regarding which activities are effective.

“(ii) COSTS.—The Secretary may use funds provided to carry out this subsection to pay costs associated with monitoring and evaluating each pilot project.

“(B) REPORTING.—Not later than 90 days after the last day of fiscal year 2019 and each fiscal year thereafter until the completion of the last evaluation under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that includes a description of—

“(i) the status of each pilot project;

“(ii) the results of the evaluation completed during the previous fiscal year; and

“(iii) to the maximum extent practicable—

“(I) the impact of the pilot project on appropriate health, nutrition, and associated behavioral outcomes among households participating in the pilot project;

“(II) baseline information relevant to the stated goals and desired outcomes of the pilot project; and

“(III) equivalent information about similar or identical measures among control or comparison groups that did not participate in the pilot project.

“(C) PUBLIC DISSEMINATION.—In addition to the reporting requirements under subparagraph (B), evaluation results shall be shared broadly to inform policy makers, service providers, other partners, and the public to promote wide use of successful strategies.

“(6) FUNDING.—

“(A) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection \$20,000,000, to remain available until expended.

“(B) APPROPRIATIONS IN ADVANCE.—Only funds appropriated under subparagraph (A) in advance specifically to carry out this sub-

section shall be available to carry out this subsection.”.

SEC. 4109. INTERSTATE DATA MATCHING TO PREVENT MULTIPLE ISSUANCES.

Section 11 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(w) NATIONAL ACCURACY CLEARINGHOUSE.—

“(1) DEFINITION OF INDICATION OF MULTIPLE ISSUANCE.—In this subsection, the term ‘indication of multiple issuance’ means an indication, based on a computer match, that benefits are being issued to an individual under the supplemental nutrition assistance program from more than 1 State simultaneously.

“(2) ESTABLISHMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish an interstate data system, to be known as the ‘National Accuracy Clearinghouse’, to prevent the simultaneous issuance of benefits to an individual by more than 1 State under the supplemental nutrition assistance program.

“(B) DATA MATCHING.—The Secretary shall require that States make available to the National Accuracy Clearinghouse only such information as is necessary for the purpose described in subparagraph (A).

“(C) DATA PROTECTION.—The information made available by States under subparagraph (B)—

“(i) shall be used only for the purpose described in subparagraph (A); and

“(ii) shall not be retained for longer than is necessary to accomplish that purpose.

“(3) ISSUANCE OF INTERIM FINAL REGULATIONS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations (which shall include interim final regulations) to carry out this subsection that—

“(A) incorporate best practices and lessons learned from the pilot program under section 4032(c) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 2036c(c));

“(B) require a State to take appropriate action, as determined by the Secretary, with respect to each indication of multiple issuance or indication that an individual receiving benefits in 1 State has applied to receive benefits in another State, while ensuring timely and fair service to applicants for, and participants in, the supplemental nutrition assistance program;

“(C) limit the information submitted through or retained by the National Accuracy Clearinghouse to information necessary to accomplish the purpose described in paragraph (2)(A);

“(D) establish safeguards to protect—

“(i) the information submitted through or retained by the National Accuracy Clearinghouse, including by limiting the period of time that information is retained to the period necessary to accomplish the purpose described in paragraph (2)(A); and

“(ii) the privacy of information that is submitted through or retained by the National Accuracy Clearinghouse, which shall include—

“(I) prohibiting any contractor who has access to information that is submitted through or retained by the National Accuracy Clearinghouse from using that information for purposes not directly related to the purpose described in paragraph (2)(A); and

“(II) other safeguards, consistent with subsection (e)(8);

“(E) establish a process by which a State shall—

“(i) not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, conduct a computer match using the National Accuracy Clearinghouse;

“(ii) after the first computer match under clause (i), conduct computer matches on an

ongoing basis, as determined by the Secretary;

“(iii) identify and take appropriate action, as determined by the Secretary, with respect to each indication of multiple issuance or indication that an individual receiving benefits in 1 State has applied to receive benefits in another State; and

“(iv) protect the identity and location of a vulnerable individual (including a victim of domestic violence) that is an applicant to or participant of the supplemental nutrition assistance program; and

“(F) include other rules and standards, as determined by the Secretary.”

SEC. 4110. QUALITY CONTROL.

(A) RECORDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 11(a)(3)(B) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020(a)(3)(B)) is amended in the matter preceding clause (i) by inserting “and systems containing those records” after “subparagraph (A)”.

(2) COST SHARING FOR COMPUTERIZATION.—Section 16(g)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(g)(1)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (E), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (F)(ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) would be accessible by the Secretary for inspection and audit under section 11(a)(3)(B); and”.

(b) QUALITY CONTROL SYSTEM.—Section 16(c)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(c)(1)) is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) QUALITY CONTROL SYSTEM INTEGRITY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, the Secretary shall issue interim final regulations that—

“(I) ensure that the quality control system established under this subsection produces valid statistical results;

“(II) provide for oversight of contracts entered into by a State agency for the purpose of improving payment accuracy;

“(III) ensure the accuracy of data collected under the quality control system established under this subsection; and

“(IV) to the maximum extent practicable, for each fiscal year, evaluate the integrity of the quality control process of not fewer than 2 State agencies, selected in accordance with criteria determined by the Secretary.

“(ii) DEBARMENT.—In accordance with the nonprocurement debarment procedures under part 417 of title 2, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), the Secretary shall bar any person that, in carrying out the quality control system established under this subsection, knowingly submits, or causes to be submitted, false information to the Secretary.”

(c) ELIMINATION OF STATE BONUSES FOR ERROR RATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 16(d) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(d)) is amended—

(A) by striking the subsection heading and inserting “STATE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AND BONUSES.—”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “subparagraph (B)(ii)” and inserting “clauses (i) and (iii) of subparagraph (B)”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “With respect” and all that follows through the end of clause (i) and inserting the following:

“(i) PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT.—With respect to fiscal year 2005 and each fiscal year

thereafter, the Secretary shall measure the performance of each State agency with respect to the criteria established under subparagraph (A)(i).”;

(II) in clause (ii), by striking “(ii) subject to paragraph (3),” and inserting the following:

“(ii) PERFORMANCE BONUSES FOR FISCAL YEARS 2005 THROUGH 2017.—With respect to each of fiscal years 2005 through 2017, subject to paragraph (3), the Secretary shall”; and

(III) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) PERFORMANCE BONUSES FOR FISCAL YEARS 2018 AND THEREAFTER.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—With respect to fiscal year 2018 and each fiscal year thereafter, subject to subclause (II) and paragraph (3), the Secretary shall award performance bonus payments in the following fiscal year, in a total amount of \$6,000,000 for each fiscal year, to State agencies that meet standards for high or most improved performance established by the Secretary under subparagraph (A)(ii) for the measure of application processing timeliness.

“(II) PERFORMANCE BONUS PAYMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018 PERFORMANCE.—The Secretary shall award performance bonus payments in a total amount of \$6,000,000 to State agencies in fiscal year 2019 for fiscal year 2018 performance, in accordance with subclause (I).”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 16(i)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(i)(1)) is amended by striking “(as defined in subsection (d)(1))”.

SEC. 4111. REQUIREMENT OF LIVE-PRODUCTION ENVIRONMENTS FOR CERTAIN PILOT PROJECTS RELATING TO COST SHARING FOR COMPUTERIZATION.

Section 16(g)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(g)(1)) (as amended by section 4110(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (F), by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subclauses (I) and (II), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (G) as clauses (i) through (vii), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(3) in the matter preceding clause (i) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking “paragraphs (2) and (3)” and inserting “paragraph (2)”; and

(B) by striking “in the planning” and inserting the following: “in the—

“(A) planning”;

(4) in clause (v) (as so redesignated) of subparagraph (A) (as so designated), by striking “implementation, including through pilot projects in limited areas for major systems changes as determined under rules promulgated by the Secretary, data from which” and inserting the following: “implementation, including a requirement that—

“(I) such testing shall be accomplished through pilot projects in limited areas for major systems changes (as determined under rules promulgated by the Secretary);

“(II) each pilot project described in subclause (I) that is carried out before the implementation of a system shall be conducted in a live-production environment; and

“(III) the data resulting from each pilot project carried out under this clause”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) operation of 1 or more automatic data processing and information retrieval systems that the Secretary determines may continue to be operated in accordance with clauses (i) through (vii) of subparagraph (A).”

SEC. 4112. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 18(a)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2027(a)(1)) is amended in the first sentence by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 4113. ASSISTANCE FOR COMMUNITY FOOD PROJECTS.

Section 25(b)(2) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2034(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B) by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C) by striking “fiscal year 2015 and each fiscal year thereafter.” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2015 through 2018; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2019 and each fiscal year thereafter.”

SEC. 4114. NUTRITION EDUCATION STATE PLANS.

Section 28(c) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2036a(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “Except as provided in subparagraph (C), a” and inserting “A”;

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(iii) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (iv); and

(iv) by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

“(iii) describe how the State agency shall use an electronic reporting system that measures and evaluates the projects; and”; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (C);

(2) in paragraph (3)(B), in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “, the Director of the National Institute of Food and Agriculture,” before “and outside stakeholders”;

(3) in paragraph (5), by inserting “the expanded food and nutrition education program or” before “other health promotion”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) REPORT.—The State agency shall submit to the Secretary an annual evaluation report in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary.”

SEC. 4115. EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) STATE PLAN.—Section 202A(b) of the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 7503(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) at the option of the State agency, describe a plan of operation for 1 or more projects in partnership with 1 or more emergency feeding organizations located in the State to harvest, process, and package donated commodities received under section 203D(d); and

“(6) describe a plan, which may include the use of a State advisory board established under subsection (c), that provides emergency feeding organizations or eligible recipient agencies within the State an opportunity to provide input on the commodity preferences and needs of the emergency feeding organization or eligible recipient agency.”

(b) STATE AND LOCAL SUPPLEMENTATION OF COMMODITIES.—Section 203D of the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 7507) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) PROJECTS TO HARVEST, PROCESS, AND PACKAGE DONATED COMMODITIES.—

“(1) DEFINITION OF PROJECT.—In this subsection, the term ‘project’ means the harvesting, processing, or packaging of unharvested, unprocessed, or unpackaged commodities donated by agricultural producers, processors, or distributors for use by emergency feeding organizations under subsection (a).

“(2) FEDERAL FUNDING FOR PROJECTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C) and paragraph (3), using funds made available under paragraph (5), the Secretary may provide funding to States to pay for the costs of carrying out a project.

“(B) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of a project under subparagraph (A) shall not exceed 50 percent of the total cost of the project.

“(C) ALLOCATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Each fiscal year, the Secretary shall allocate to States that have submitted under section 202A(b)(5) a State plan describing a plan of operation for a project the funds made available under subparagraph (A) based on a formula determined by the Secretary.

“(ii) REALLOCATION.—If the Secretary determines that a State will not expend all of the funds allocated to the State for a fiscal year under clause (i), the Secretary shall reallocate the unexpended funds to other States that have submitted under section 202A(b)(5) a State plan describing a plan of operation for a project during that fiscal year or the subsequent fiscal year, as the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(iii) REPORTS.—Each State to which funds are allocated for a fiscal year under this subparagraph shall, on a regular basis, submit to the Secretary financial reports describing the use of the funds.

“(3) PROJECT PURPOSES.—A State may only use Federal funds received under paragraph (2) for a project the purposes of which are—

“(A) to reduce food waste at the agricultural production, processing, or distribution level through the donation of food;

“(B) to provide food to individuals in need; and

“(C) to build relationships between agricultural producers, processors, and distributors and emergency feeding organizations through the donation of food.

“(4) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may encourage a State agency that carries out a project using Federal funds received under paragraph (2) to enter into cooperative agreements with State agencies of other States under section 203B(d) to maximize the use of commodities donated under the project.

“(5) FUNDING.—Out of funds not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Secretary to carry out this subsection \$4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, to remain available until the end of the subsequent fiscal year.”.

(c) FOOD WASTE.—Section 203D of the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 7507) (as amended by subsection (b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) FOOD WASTE.—The Secretary shall issue guidance outlining best practices to minimize the food waste of the commodities donated under subsection (a).”.

(d) EMERGENCY FOOD PROGRAM INFRASTRUCTURE GRANTS.—Section 209(d) of the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 7511a(d)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

(e) AVAILABILITY OF COMMODITIES FOR THE EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—Section 27(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2036(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”;

(B) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”;

(ii) in clause (iii), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(iii) in clause (iv), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(v) for fiscal year 2019, \$23,000,000;

“(vi) for fiscal year 2020, \$35,000,000;

“(vii) for fiscal year 2021, \$35,000,000;

“(viii) for fiscal year 2022, \$35,000,000; and

“(ix) for fiscal year 2023, \$35,000,000; and”;

and

(C) in subparagraph (E)—

(i) by striking “2019” and inserting “2024”;

(ii) by striking “(D)(iv)” and inserting “(D)(ix)”;

(iii) by striking “June 30, 2017” and inserting “June 30, 2023”.

SEC. 4116. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) Section 3 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by striking “7(i)” and inserting “7(h)”;

(2) in subsection (i), by striking “7(i)” and inserting “7(h)”;

(3) in subsection (o)(1)(A), by striking “(r)(1)” and inserting “(q)(1)”.

(b) Section 5(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014(a)) is amended by striking “3(n)(4)” each place it appears and inserting “3(m)(4)”.

(c) Section 8 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2017) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e)(1), by striking “3(n)(5)” and inserting “3(m)(5)”;

(2) in subsection (f)(1)(A), by striking “3(n)(5)” and inserting “3(m)(5)”.

(d) Section 9(c) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2018(c)) is amended in the third sentence by striking “to any used by” and inserting “to, and used by,”.

(e) Section 10 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2019) is amended in the first sentence—

(1) by striking “or the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation” each place it appears; and

(2) by striking “3(p)(4)” and inserting “3(o)(4)”.

(f) Section 11 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020) is amended—

(1) by striking “3(t)(1)” each place it appears and inserting “3(s)(1)”;

(2) by striking “3(t)(2)” each place it appears and inserting “3(s)(2)”.

(g) Section 18(e) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2027(e)) is amended in the first sentence by striking “7(f)” and inserting “7(e)”.

(h) Section 25(a)(1)(B)(i)(I) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2034(a)(1)(B)(i)(I)) is amended by striking “service;” and inserting “service;”.

Subtitle B—Commodity Distribution Programs

SEC. 4201. COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM.

Section 4(a) of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c note; Public Law 93–86) is amended in the first sentence by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 4202. COMMODITY SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM.

Section 5 of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c note; Public Law 93–86) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(B), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”;

(2) in subsection (d)(2), in the first sentence, by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”; and

(3) in subsection (g)—

(A) by striking “Except” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) CERTIFICATION.—

“(A) DEFINITION OF CERTIFICATION PERIOD.—In this paragraph, the term ‘certification pe-

riod’ means the period during which a participant in the commodity supplemental food program in a State may continue to receive benefits under the commodity supplemental food program without a formal review of the eligibility of the participant.

“(B) MINIMUM CERTIFICATION PERIOD.—Subject to subparagraphs (C) and (D), a State shall establish for the commodity supplemental food program of the State a certification period of—

“(i) not less than 1 year; but

“(ii) not more than 3 years.

“(C) TEMPORARY CERTIFICATION.—An eligible individual in the commodity supplemental food program in a State may be provided with a temporary monthly certification to fill any caseload slot resulting from nonparticipation by other certified participants.

“(D) APPROVALS.—A certification period of more than 1 year established by a State under subparagraph (B) shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary, who shall approve such a certification period on the condition that, with respect to each participant receiving benefits under the commodity supplemental food program of the State, the local agency in the State administering the commodity supplemental food program, on an annual basis during the certification period applicable to the participant—

“(i) verifies the address and continued interest of the participant; and

“(ii) has sufficient reason to determine that the participant still meets the income eligibility standards under paragraph (1), which may include a determination that the participant has a fixed income.”.

SEC. 4203. DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUS COMMODITIES; SPECIAL NUTRITION PROJECTS.

Section 1114(a)(2)(A) of the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 (7 U.S.C. 1431e(a)(2)(A)) is amended in the first sentence by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

Subtitle C—Miscellaneous

SEC. 4301. PURCHASE OF SPECIALTY CROPS.

Section 10603(b) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 612c–4(b)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 4302. SENIORS FARMERS’ MARKET NUTRITION PROGRAM.

Section 4402(a) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 3007(a)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 4303. THE GUS SCHUMACHER FOOD INSECURITY NUTRITION INCENTIVE.

Section 4405 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 7517) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “FOOD” and inserting “THE GUS SCHUMACHER FOOD”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “means” and all that follows through the end of subparagraph (L) and inserting “means a governmental agency or nonprofit organization.”; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(ii) by striking “means the” and inserting the following: “means—

“(A) the”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) the programs for nutrition assistance under section 19 of that Act (7 U.S.C. 2028).”;

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively;

(ii) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) PARTNERS AND COLLABORATORS.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this subsection may partner with, or make subgrants to, public, private, nonprofit, or for-profit entities, including—

- “(i) an emergency feeding organization;
- “(ii) an agricultural cooperative;
- “(iii) a producer network or association;
- “(iv) a community health organization;
- “(v) a public benefit corporation;
- “(vi) an economic development corporation;
- “(vii) a farmers’ market;
- “(viii) a community-supported agriculture program;
- “(ix) a buying club;
- “(x) a retail food store participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program;
- “(xi) a State, local, or tribal agency;
- “(xii) another eligible entity that receives a grant; and
- “(xiii) any other entity the Secretary designates.”;

(iii) in subparagraph (C) (as so redesignated), by striking “The” and inserting “Except as provided in subparagraph (D)(iii), the”;

(iv) in subparagraph (D) (as so redesignated), by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) TRIBAL AGENCIES.—The Secretary may allow a tribal agency to use funds provided to the Indian Tribe of the tribal agency through a Federal agency (including the Indian Health Service) or other Federal benefit to satisfy all or part of the non-Federal share described in clause (i), if such use is otherwise consistent with the purpose of such funds.”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “For purposes of” and all that follows through “that” and inserting “To receive a grant under this subsection, an eligible entity shall”;

(II) in clause (i), by striking “meets” and inserting “meet”;

(III) in clause (ii)—

(aa) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking “proposes” and inserting “propose”;

(bb) by striking subclauses (II) and (III) and inserting the following:

“(II) would increase the purchase of fruits and vegetables by low-income consumers participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program by providing an incentive for the purchase of fruits and vegetables at the point of purchase to a household purchasing food with supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits;

“(III) except in the case of projects receiving \$100,000 or less over 1 year, would measure the purchase of fruits and vegetables by low-income consumers participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program”;

(cc) in subclause (IV), by striking “and” at the end; and

(dd) by striking subclause (V) and inserting the following:

“(V) has adequate plans to collect data for reporting and agrees to provide that information for the report described in paragraph (5); and

“(VI) would share information with the Training and Technical Assistance Centers and the Information and Evaluation Centers (as those terms are defined in paragraph (4)) for the purposes described in that paragraph.”;

(i) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking clause (v);

(II) by redesignating clause (vi) as clause (x); and

(III) by inserting after clause (iv) the following:

“(v) include a program design—

“(I) that provides incentives when fruits or vegetables are purchased using supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits; and

“(II) in which the incentives earned may be used only to purchase fruits or vegetables;

“(vi) have demonstrated the ability to provide services to underserved communities;

“(vii) include coordination with multiple stakeholders, such as farm organizations, nutrition education programs, cooperative extension services, public health departments, health providers, private and public health insurance agencies, cooperative grocers, grocery associations, and community-based and nongovernmental organizations;

“(viii) offer supplemental services in high-need communities, including online ordering, transportation between home and store, and delivery services;

“(ix) include food retailers that are open—

“(I) for extended hours; and

“(II) most or all days of the year; or”;

(C) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

“(4) TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTERS; INFORMATION AND EVALUATION CENTERS.—

“(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

“(i) INFORMATION AND EVALUATION CENTER.—The term ‘Information and Evaluation Center’ means any of the information and evaluation centers established under subparagraph (B)(i)(II).

“(ii) TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTER.—The term ‘Training and Technical Assistance Center’ means any of the training and technical assistance centers established under subparagraph (B)(i)(I).

“(B) ESTABLISHMENT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—To provide services to eligible entities applying for or receiving a grant under this subsection or to partners or collaborators applying for or receiving a subgrant under paragraph (1)(B), the Secretary shall establish, in accordance with clause (ii)—

“(I) 1 or more training and technical centers, each of which shall be known as a ‘Food Insecurity Nutrition Incentive Program Training and Technical Assistance Center’; and

“(II) 1 or more information and evaluation centers, each of which shall be known as a ‘Food Insecurity Nutrition Incentive Program Information and Evaluation Center’.

“(ii) CRITERIA.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish the Training and Technical Assistance Centers and the Information and Evaluation Centers under clause (i) by designating as a Training and Technical Assistance Center or an Information or Evaluation Center, as applicable, 1 or more entities that meet the criteria described in subclause (II) or (III), as applicable.

“(II) TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTERS.—To be eligible to be designated as a Training and Technical Assistance Center—

“(aa) an entity shall—

“(AA) have the capacity to effectively implement and track outreach, training, and coordination functions;

“(BB) be able to produce instructional materials that can easily be replicated and distributed through multiple formats;

“(CC) have working relationships with nonprofit and private organizations, State and local governments, and tribal organizations (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304));

“(DD) have the ability to work in underserved or rural communities; and

“(EE) have an organizational mission aligned with the needs of eligible entities receiving grants under this subsection; or

“(bb) for purposes of carrying out subclauses (VII) and (VIII) of subparagraph (C)(i), an entity shall—

“(AA) have experience developing or supporting the development of point of sale technology; and

“(BB) meet any other criteria, as determined by the Secretary, to effectively carry out subclauses (VII) and (VIII) of subparagraph (C)(i).

“(III) INFORMATION AND EVALUATION CENTERS.—To be eligible to be designated as an Information and Evaluation Center, an entity shall—

“(aa) have experience designing, creating, and maintaining an online, publicly searchable reporting and informational clearinghouse; and

“(bb) be able to conduct systematic analysis of the impacts and outcomes of projects using a grant under this subsection.

“(C) SERVICES.—

“(i) TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTERS.—The Training and Technical Assistance Centers shall provide services that include—

“(I) assisting eligible entities applying for a grant or partners or collaborators applying for a subgrant under this subsection in—

“(aa) assessing the food system in the geographical area of the eligible entity; and

“(bb) designing a proposed project;

“(II) collecting and providing to eligible entities applying for or receiving a grant or to partners or collaborators applying for or receiving a subgrant under this subsection information on best practices from existing projects, including best practices regarding communications, signage, record-keeping, incentive instruments, integration with point of sale systems, and reporting;

“(III) disseminating information and facilitating communication among eligible entities receiving a grant or partners or collaborators receiving a subgrant under this subsection;

“(IV)(aa) identifying common challenges faced by eligible entities receiving a grant or partners or collaborators receiving a subgrant under this subsection; and

“(bb) coordinating the work towards solutions to those challenges;

“(V) communicating with farms, direct to consumer markets, and grocery organizations to share information and partner on projects using a grant or subgrant under this subsection;

“(VI) assisting with collaboration among eligible entities receiving a grant or partners or collaborators receiving a subgrant under this subsection, State agencies, and the Food and Nutrition Service;

“(VII) identifying and providing to eligible entities applying for or receiving a grant or partners or collaborators applying for or receiving a subgrant under this subsection information on point of sale technology that could reduce cost and increase efficiency of supplemental nutrition assistance program and incentive transaction processing at participating authorized retailers;

“(VIII) supporting the development of the technology described in clause (VII); and

“(IX) other services identified by the Secretary.

“(ii) INFORMATION AND EVALUATION CENTERS.—The Information and Evaluation Centers shall provide services that include—

“(I) using standard metrics based on outcome measures used for existing projects, and in collaboration with the Director of the National Institute of Food and Agriculture and the Administrator of the Food and Nutrition Service, creating a system to collect

and compile core data sets from eligible entities receiving a grant and partners or collaborators receiving a subgrant, as appropriate, under this subsection;

“(II) beginning with fiscal year 2020, preparing an annual report with summary data and an evaluation of each project receiving a grant under this subsection during the fiscal year preceding the report, that includes the amount of grant funds used for the project and the measurement of the outcomes of the project, for submission to the Secretary; and

“(III) other services identified by the Secretary.

“(D) GRANTS AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—In carrying out this paragraph, the Secretary, on a competitive basis, shall make grants to, or enter into cooperative agreements with—

“(i) State cooperative extension services;

“(ii) nongovernmental organizations;

“(iii) Federal, State, or tribal agencies;

“(iv) 2-year and 4-year degree-granting institutions of higher education (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a))) and land-grant colleges and universities (as defined in section 1404 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103)); and

“(v) other appropriate partners, as determined by the Secretary.

“(5) ANNUAL EVALUATION AND REPORT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Annually beginning with fiscal year 2020, the Secretary shall conduct, and submit to Congress an evaluation of each project receiving a grant under this subsection, including—

“(i) the results of the project;

“(ii) the amount of grant funds used for the project; and

“(iii) a measurement of the outcomes of the project.

“(B) REQUIREMENT.—The evaluation conducted under subparagraph (A) shall be based on uniform data provided by eligible entities receiving a grant under this subsection.

“(C) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall make the evaluation conducted under subparagraph (A), including the data provided by eligible entities under subparagraph (B), publicly available online in an anonymized format that protects confidential, personal, or other sensitive data.

“(D) REPORTING MECHANISM.—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, include eligible entities receiving a grant under this subsection, grocers, farmers, health professionals, researchers, and employees of the Department of Agriculture with direct experience with implementation of the supplemental nutrition assistance program in the design of—

“(i) the instrument through which data will be collected from eligible entities under subparagraph (B); and

“(ii) the mechanism for reporting by eligible entities.”; and

(4) in subsection (c), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) MANDATORY FUNDING.—Of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary shall use to carry out subsection (b) \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2019 and each fiscal year thereafter.

“(3) COSTS.—Of the funds made available under paragraph (2) for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall allocate not more than 15 percent—

“(A) to carry out paragraphs (4) and (5) of subsection (b); and

“(B) to pay for the administrative costs of carrying out this section.”.

SEC. 4304. HARVESTING HEALTH PILOT PROJECTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term “eligible entity” means—

(A) a nonprofit organization; or

(B) a State or unit of local government.

(2) HEALTHCARE PARTNER.—The term “healthcare partner” means a healthcare provider, including—

(A) a hospital;

(B) a Federally-qualified health center (as defined in section 1905(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(1)));

(C) a hospital or clinic operated by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; or

(D) a health care provider group.

(3) MEMBER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “member” means, as determined by the applicable eligible entity or healthcare partner carrying out a pilot project in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary—

(i) an individual eligible for—

(I) benefits under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.); or

(II) medical assistance under a State plan or a waiver of such a plan under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) and enrolled under such plan or waiver; and

(ii) a member of a low-income household that suffers from, or is at risk of developing, a diet-related health condition.

(B) SCOPE OF ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATIONS.—A determination by an eligible entity or healthcare partner that an individual is a member for purposes of subparagraph (A) shall not—

(i) constitute a determination that the individual is eligible for benefits or assistance under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) or the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.), as applicable; or

(ii) be a factor in determining whether the individual is eligible for such benefits or assistance.

(4) PILOT PROJECT.—The term “pilot project” means a pilot project that is awarded a grant under subsection (b)(1).

(5) PRODUCE PRESCRIPTION PROGRAM.—The term “produce prescription program” means a program that—

(A) prescribes fresh fruits and vegetables to members;

(B) may provide—

(i) financial or non-financial incentives for members to purchase or procure fresh fruits and vegetables; and

(ii) educational resources on nutrition to members; and

(C) may establish additional accessible locations for members to procure fresh fruits and vegetables.

(b) GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a grant program under which the Secretary shall award grants to eligible entities to conduct pilot projects that demonstrate and evaluate the impact of a produce prescription program on—

(i) the improvement of dietary health through increased consumption of fruits and vegetables;

(ii) the reduction of individual and household food insecurity; and

(iii) the reduction in health care use and associated costs.

(B) HEALTHCARE PARTNERS.—In carrying out a pilot project using a grant received under subparagraph (A), an eligible entity shall partner with 1 or more healthcare partners.

(C) GRANT APPLICATIONS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant under subparagraph (A), an eligible entity shall submit to the Secretary an application containing such information as the Secretary may require, including the information described in clause (ii).

(ii) APPLICATION.—An application under clause (i) shall—

(I) identify the 1 or more healthcare partners with which the eligible entity is partnering under subparagraph (B); and

(II) include—

(aa) a description of the methods by which an eligible entity shall—

(AA) screen and verify eligibility for members for participation in a produce prescription program, in accordance with procedures established under subsection (a)(3)(A);

(BB) implement an effective produce prescription program, including the role of each healthcare partner in implementing the produce prescription program;

(CC) evaluate members participating in a produce prescription program with respect to the issues described in clauses (i) through (iii) of subparagraph (A);

(DD) provide educational opportunities relating to nutrition to members participating in a produce prescription program; and

(EE) inform members of the availability of the produce prescription pilot project;

(bb) a description of any additional nonprofit or emergency feeding organizations that shall be involved in the pilot project and the role of each additional nonprofit or emergency feeding organization in implementing and evaluating an effective produce prescription program;

(cc) documentation of a partnership agreement with a relevant State Medicaid agency or other appropriate entity, as determined by the Secretary, to evaluate the effectiveness of a produce prescription program in reducing health care use and associated costs; and

(dd) any other data necessary to analyze the impact of a produce prescription program, as determined by the Secretary.

(2) COORDINATION.—In carrying out the grant program established under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall coordinate with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies that carry out activities relating to healthcare partners.

(3) PARTNERSHIPS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the grant program under paragraph (1), the Secretary may enter into 1 or more memoranda of understanding with a Federal agency, a State, or a private partner to ensure the effective implementation and evaluation of each pilot project.

(B) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—A memorandum of understanding entered into under subparagraph (A) shall include—

(i) a description of a plan to provide educational opportunities relating to nutrition to members participating in the produce prescription program;

(ii) a description of the role of the Federal agency, State, or private partner, as applicable, in implementing and evaluating an effective produce prescription program;

(iii) documentation of a partnership agreement with a relevant State Medicaid agency or other appropriate entity, as determined by the Secretary, to evaluate the effectiveness of the produce prescription program in reducing health care use and associated costs; and

(iv) any other data necessary to analyze the impact of the produce prescription program, as determined by the Secretary.

(c) FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary shall use to carry out this section \$4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, to remain available until expended.

(2) COSTS.—The Secretary may use not greater than 10 percent of the amounts provided under paragraph (1) to pay for the

costs of administering, monitoring, and evaluating each pilot project.

TITLE V—CREDIT

Subtitle A—Farm Ownership Loans

SEC. 5101. MODIFICATION OF THE 3-YEAR EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENT FOR PURPOSES OF ELIGIBILITY FOR FARM OWNERSHIP LOANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 302(b) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1922(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking “(3)” and inserting “(5)”; and

(B) by inserting “(not exceeding 2 years)” after “period of time”;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) OTHER ACCEPTABLE EXPERIENCE.—In determining whether a farmer or rancher has other acceptable experience under paragraph (1), the Secretary may count any of—

“(A) not less than 16 hours of post-secondary education in a field related to agriculture;

“(B) successful completion of a farm management curriculum offered by a cooperative extension service, a community college, an adult vocational agriculture program, a non-profit organization, or a land-grant college or university;

“(C) an honorable discharge from the armed forces of the United States;

“(D) successful repayment of a youth loan made under section 311(b);

“(E) at least 1 year as hired farm labor with substantial management responsibilities;

“(F) successful completion of a farm mentorship, apprenticeship, or internship program with an emphasis on management requirements and day-to-day farm management decisions; and

“(G) an established relationship with an individual participating as a counselor who has experience in farming or ranching or is a retired farmer or rancher in a Service Corps of Retired Executives program authorized under section 8(b)(1)(B) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(b)(1)(B)), or with a local farm or ranch operator or organization, approved by the Secretary, that is committed to mentoring the farmer or rancher.

“(3) DEMING RULE.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a farmer or rancher is deemed to have participated in the business operations of a farm or ranch for not less than 3 years or have other acceptable experience for a period of time, as determined by the Secretary, if the farmer or rancher meets the requirements of subparagraphs (E) and (G) of paragraph (2).”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 310D(a)(2) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1934(a)(2)) is amended by striking “paragraphs (2) through (4) of section 302” and inserting “subparagraphs (A) through (D) of section 302(a)(1)”.

SEC. 5102. CONSERVATION LOAN AND LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM.

Section 304(h) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1924(h)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 5103. LIMITATIONS ON AMOUNT OF FARM OWNERSHIP LOANS.

Section 305 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1925) is amended in subsection (a), by striking “smaller of” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: “lesser of—

“(1) the value of the farm or other security; and

“(2) in the case of—

“(A) a loan other than a loan guaranteed by the Secretary, \$600,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023; or

“(B) a loan guaranteed by the Secretary, subject to subsection (c), \$1,750,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”

Subtitle B—Operating Loans

SEC. 5201. LIMITATIONS ON AMOUNT OF OPERATING LOANS.

Section 313 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1943) is amended in subsection (a)(1), by striking “to exceed” and all that follows through “Secretary;” and inserting the following: “to exceed, in the case of—

“(A) a loan other than a loan guaranteed by the Secretary, \$400,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023; or

“(B) a loan guaranteed by the Secretary, subject to subsection (c), \$1,750,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”

SEC. 5202. COOPERATIVE LENDING PILOT PROJECTS.

Section 313(c)(4)(A) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1943(c)(4)(A)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

Subtitle C—Administrative Provisions

SEC. 5301. BEGINNING FARMER AND RANCHER INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT ACCOUNTS PILOT PROGRAM.

Section 333B(h) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1983b(h)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 5302. LOAN AUTHORIZATION LEVELS.

Section 346(b)(1) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1994(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “\$4,226,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2018” and inserting “\$12,000,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023”; and

(2) by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting the following:

“(A) \$4,000,000,000 shall be for direct loans, of which—

“(i) \$2,000,000,000 shall be for farm ownership loans under subtitle A; and

“(ii) \$2,000,000,000 shall be for operating loans under subtitle B; and

“(B) \$8,000,000,000 shall be for guaranteed loans, of which—

“(i) \$4,000,000,000 shall be for farm ownership loans under subtitle A; and

“(ii) \$4,000,000,000 shall be for operating loans under subtitle B.”

SEC. 5303. LOAN FUND SET-ASIDES.

Section 346(b)(2)(A)(ii)(III) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1994(b)(2)(A)(ii)(III)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 5304. EQUITABLE RELIEF.

The Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act is amended by inserting after section 365 (7 U.S.C. 2008) the following:

“SEC. 366. EQUITABLE RELIEF.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary may provide a form of relief described in subsection (c) to any farmer or rancher who—

“(1) received a direct farm ownership, operating, or emergency loan under this title; and

“(2) the Secretary determines is not in compliance with the requirements of this title with respect to the loan.

“(b) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may only provide relief to a farmer or rancher under subsection (a) if the Secretary determines that the farmer or rancher—

“(1) acted in good faith; and

“(2) relied on an action of, or the advice of, the Secretary (including any authorized rep-

resentative of the Secretary) to the detriment of the farming or ranching operation of the farmer or rancher.

“(c) FORMS OF RELIEF.—The Secretary may provide to a farmer or rancher under subsection (a) any of the following forms of relief:

“(1) The farmer or rancher may retain loans or other benefits received in association with the loan with respect to which the farmer or rancher was determined to be non-compliant under subsection (a)(2).

“(2) The farmer or rancher may receive such other equitable relief as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

“(d) CONDITION.—As a condition of receiving relief under this section, the Secretary may require the farmer or rancher to take actions designed to remedy the noncompliance.

“(e) ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL; JUDICIAL REVIEW.—A determination or action of the Secretary under this section—

“(1) shall be final; and

“(2) shall not be subject to administrative appeal or judicial review under chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code.”

SEC. 5305. SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED FARMERS AND RANCHERS; QUALIFIED BEGINNING FARMERS AND RANCHERS.

The Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act is amended by inserting after section 366 (as added by section 5304) the following:

“SEC. 367. SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED FARMERS AND RANCHERS; QUALIFIED BEGINNING FARMERS AND RANCHERS.

“In the case of a loan guaranteed by the Secretary under subtitle A or B to a socially disadvantaged farmer or rancher (as defined in section 355(e)) or a qualified beginning farmer or rancher, the Secretary shall—

“(1) waive the guarantee fee of 1.5 percent; and

“(2) provide for a standard guarantee plan, which shall cover an amount equal to 95 percent of the outstanding principal of the loan.”

SEC. 5306. EMERGENCY LOAN ELIGIBILITY.

Section 373(b)(2)(B) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2008h(b)(2)(B)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subclauses (I) and (II), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(2) in the matter preceding subclause (I) (as so redesignated), by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) RESTRUCTURED LOANS.—For purposes of clause (i), a borrower who was restructured with a write-down or restructuring under section 353 shall not be considered to have received debt forgiveness on a loan made or guaranteed under this title.”

Subtitle D—Miscellaneous

SEC. 5401. STATE AGRICULTURAL MEDIATION PROGRAMS.

(a) ISSUES COVERED BY STATE MEDIATION PROGRAMS.—Section 501(c) of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987 (7 U.S.C. 5101(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture”; and

(ii) in clause (ii), by inserting “and the national organic program established under the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6501 et seq.)” before the period at the end; and

(iii) by striking clause (vii) and inserting the following:

“(vii) Lease issues, including land leases and equipment leases.

“(viii) Family farm transition.

“(ix) Farmer-neighbor disputes.

“(x) Such other issues as the Secretary or the head of the department of agriculture of each participating State considers appropriate for better serving the agricultural community and persons eligible for mediation.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) **MEDIATION SERVICES.**—Funding provided for the mediation program of a qualifying State may also be used to provide credit counseling to persons described in paragraph (2)—

“(i) prior to the initiation of any mediation involving the Department of Agriculture; or

“(ii) unrelated to any ongoing dispute or mediation in which the Department of Agriculture is a party.”;

(2) in paragraph (2)(A)—

(A) in clause (ii), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(B) in clause (iii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) any other persons involved in an issue described in any of clauses (i) through (x) of paragraph (1)(B).”; and

(3) in paragraph (3)(F), by striking “that persons” and inserting the following: “that—

“(i) the Department of Agriculture receives adequate notification of those issues; and

“(ii) persons”.

(b) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Section 505 of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987 (7 U.S.C. 5105) is amended to read as follows:

“**SEC. 505. REPORT.**

“Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing—

“(1) the effectiveness of the State mediation programs receiving matching grants under this subtitle;

“(2) recommendations for improving the delivery of mediation services to producers;

“(3) the steps being taken to ensure that State mediation programs receive timely funding under this subtitle; and

“(4) the savings to the States as a result of having a mediation program.”.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Section 506 of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987 (7 U.S.C. 5106) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 5402. SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED FARMERS AND RANCHERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 4.19 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2207) is amended—

(1) by striking the section designation and heading and inserting the following:

“**SEC. 4.19. YOUNG, BEGINNING, SMALL, AND SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED FARMERS AND RANCHERS.**”; and

(2) in subsection (a), in the first sentence, by striking “ranchers.” and inserting “ranchers and socially disadvantaged farmers or ranchers (as defined in section 2501(e) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(e)))”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 5.17(a)(3) of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2252(a)(3)) is amended, in the second sentence, by striking “ranchers.” and inserting “ranchers and socially disadvantaged farmers or ranchers (as defined in section 2501(e) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(e)))”.

SEC. 5403. SHARING OF PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.

Section 5.19 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2254) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) **SHARING OF PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.**—A System institution shall not be considered to have waived the confidentiality of a privileged communication with an attorney or an accountant if the System institution provides the content of the communication to the Farm Credit Administration pursuant to the supervisory or regulatory authorities of the Farm Credit Administration.”.

SEC. 5404. REMOVAL AND PROHIBITION AUTHORITY; INDUSTRY-WIDE PROHIBITION.

Part C of title V of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 is amended by inserting after section 5.29 (12 U.S.C. 2265) the following:

“**SEC. 5.29A. REMOVAL AND PROHIBITION AUTHORITY; INDUSTRY-WIDE PROHIBITION.**

“(a) **DEFINITION OF PERSON.**—In this section, the term ‘person’ means—

“(1) an individual; and

“(2) in the case of a specific determination by the Farm Credit Administration, a legal entity.

“(b) **INDUSTRY-WIDE PROHIBITION.**—Except as provided in subsection (c), any person who, pursuant to an order issued under section 5.28 or 5.29, has been removed or suspended from office at a System institution or prohibited from participating in the conduct of the affairs of a System institution shall not, during the period of effectiveness of the order, continue or commence to hold any office in, or participate in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of—

“(1) any insured depository institution subject to section 8(e)(7)(A)(i) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1818(e)(7)(A)(i));

“(2) any institution subject to section 8(e)(7)(A)(ii) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1818(e)(7)(A)(ii));

“(3) any insured credit union under the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.);

“(4) any Federal home loan bank;

“(5) any institution chartered under this Act;

“(6) any appropriate Federal financial institutions regulatory agency (as defined in section 8(e)(7)(D) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1818(e)(7)(D)));

“(7) the Federal Housing Finance Agency; or

“(8) the Farm Credit Administration.

“(c) **EXCEPTION FOR INSTITUTION-AFFILIATED PARTY THAT RECEIVES WRITTEN CONSENT.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—

“(A) **AFFILIATED PARTIES.**—If, on or after the date on which an order described in subsection (b) is issued that removes or suspends an institution-affiliated party from office at a System institution or prohibits an institution-affiliated party from participating in the conduct of the affairs of a System institution, that party receives written consent described in subparagraph (B), subsection (b) shall not apply to that party—

“(i) to the extent provided in the written consent received; and

“(ii) with respect to the institution described in each written consent.

“(B) **WRITTEN CONSENT DESCRIBED.**—The written consent referred to in subparagraph (A) is written consent received from—

“(i) the Farm Credit Administration; and

“(ii) each appropriate Federal financial institutions regulatory agency (as defined in section 8(e)(7)(D) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1818(e)(7)(D))) of the applicable institution described in any of paragraphs (1), (2), (3), or (4) of subsection (b) with respect to which the party proposes to be become an affiliated party.

“(2) **DISCLOSURE.**—Any agency described in clause (i) or (ii) of paragraph (1)(B) that provides a written consent under that paragraph shall—

“(A) report the action to the Farm Credit Administration; and

“(B) publicly disclose the action.

“(3) **CONSULTATION BETWEEN AGENCIES.**—The agencies described in clauses (i) and (ii) of paragraph (1)(B) shall consult with each other before providing any written consent under that paragraph.

“(d) **VIOLATIONS.**—A violation of subsection (b) by any person who is subject to an order described in that subsection shall be treated as violation of that order.”.

SEC. 5405. JURISDICTION OVER INSTITUTION-AFFILIATED PARTIES.

Part C of title V of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 is amended by inserting after section 5.31 (12 U.S.C. 2267) the following:

“**SEC. 5.31A. JURISDICTION OVER INSTITUTION-AFFILIATED PARTIES.**

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of sections 5.25, 5.26, and 5.32, the jurisdiction of the Farm Credit Administration over parties, and the authority of the Farm Credit Administration to initiate actions, shall include enforcement authority over institution-affiliated parties.

“(b) **EFFECT OF SEPARATION ON JURISDICTION AND AUTHORITY.**—Subject to subsection (c), the resignation, termination of employment or participation, or separation of an institution-affiliated party (including a separation caused by the merger, consolidation, conservatorship, or receivership of a Farm Credit System institution) shall not affect the jurisdiction and authority of the Farm Credit Administration to issue any notice or order and proceed under this part against that party.

“(c) **LIMITATION.**—To proceed against a party under subsection (b), the notice or order described in that subsection shall be served not later than 6 years after the date on which the party ceased to be an institution-affiliated party with respect to the applicable Farm Credit System institution.

“(d) **APPLICABILITY.**—The date on which a party ceases to be an institution-affiliated party described in subsection (c) may occur before, on, or after the date of enactment of this section.”.

SEC. 5406. DEFINITION OF INSTITUTION-AFFILIATED PARTY.

Section 5.35 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2271) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) the term ‘institution-affiliated party’ means—

“(A) a director, officer, employee, shareholder, or agent of a System institution;

“(B) an independent contractor (including an attorney, appraiser, or accountant) who knowingly or recklessly participates in—

“(i) a violation of law (including regulations) that is associated with the operations and activities of 1 or more System institutions;

“(ii) a breach of fiduciary duty; or

“(iii) an unsafe practice that causes or is likely to cause more than a minimum financial loss to, or a significant adverse effect on, a System institution; and

“(C) any other person, as determined by the Farm Credit Administration (by regulation or on a case-by-case basis) who participates in the conduct of the affairs of a System institution; and”.

SEC. 5407. REPEAL OF OBSOLETE PROVISIONS; TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(1) Section 1.1(c) of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2001(c)) is amended in the first sentence by striking “including any costs of defeasance under section 4.8(b).”.

(2) Section 1.2 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2002) is amended by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) COMPOSITION.—The Farm Credit System shall include the Farm Credit Banks, the bank for cooperatives, Agricultural Credit Banks, the Federal Land Bank Associations, the Federal Land Credit Associations, the Production Credit Associations, the agricultural credit associations, the Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corporation, the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation, service corporations established pursuant to section 4.25, and such other institutions as may be made a part of the Farm Credit System, all of which shall be chartered by and subject to regulation by the Farm Credit Administration.”

(3) Section 2.4 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2075) is amended by striking subsection (d).

(4) Section 3.0(a) of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2121(a)) is amended—

(A) in the third sentence, by striking “and a Central Bank for Cooperatives”; and

(B) by striking the fifth sentence.

(5) Section 3.2 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2123) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking “not merged into the United Bank for Cooperatives or the National Bank for Cooperatives”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2)(A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “(other than the National Bank for Cooperatives)”; and

(B) by striking subsection (b);

(C) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking “(a)(1) Each bank” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Each bank”; and

(ii) by striking “(2)(A) If approved” and inserting the following:

“(b) NOMINATION AND ELECTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If approved”;

(D) in subsection (b)(1) (as so designated)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking “(B) The total” and inserting the following:

“(2) NUMBER OF VOTES.—The total”; and

(ii) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and indenting appropriately; and

(E) in paragraph (2) (as so designated), by striking “paragraph” and inserting “subsection”.

(6) Section 3.5 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2126) is amended in the third sentence by striking “district”.

(7) Section 3.7(a) of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2128(a)) is amended by striking the second sentence.

(8) Section 3.8(b)(1)(A) of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2129(b)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting “(or any successor agency)” after “Rural Electrification Administration”.

(9) Section 3.9(a) of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2130(a)) is amended by striking the third sentence.

(10) Section 3.10 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2131) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c), by striking the second sentence; and

(B) in subsection (d)—

(i) by striking “district” each place it appears; and

(ii) by inserting “for cooperatives (or any successor bank)” before “on account”.

(11) Section 3.11 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2132) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), in the first sentence, by striking “subsections (b) and (c) of this section” and inserting “subsection (b)”; and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking “district”; and

(ii) in the second sentence, by striking “Except as provided in subsection (c) below, all” and inserting “All”;

(C) by striking subsection (c); and

(D) by redesignating subsections (d) through (f) as subsections (c) through (e), respectively.

(12) Part B of title III of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2141 et seq.) is amended in the part heading by striking “UNITED AND”.

(13) Section 3.20 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2141) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “or the United Bank for Cooperatives, as the case may be”; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “the district banks for cooperatives and the Central Bank for Cooperatives” and inserting “the constituent banks described in section 413(b) of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987 (12 U.S.C. 2121 note; Public Law 100-233)”.

(14) Section 3.21 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2142) is repealed.

(15) Section 3.28 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2149) is amended by striking “a district bank for cooperatives and the Central Bank for Cooperatives” and inserting “the constituent banks described in section 413(b) of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987 (12 U.S.C. 2121 note; Public Law 100-233)”.

(16) Section 3.29 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2149a) is repealed.

(17) Section 4.0 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2151) is repealed.

(18) Section 4.8 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2159) is amended—

(A) by striking the section designation and heading and all that follows through “Each bank” in subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“SEC. 4.8. PURCHASE AND SALE OF OBLIGATIONS.

“Each bank”; and

(B) by striking subsection (b).

(19) Section 4.9 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2160) is amended—

(A) in subsection (d)—

(i) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(3) REPRESENTATION OF BOARD.—The Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation shall not have representation on the board of directors of the Corporation.”;

(ii) in the undesignated matter following paragraph (1)(D), by striking “In selecting” and inserting the following:

“(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In selecting”; and

(iii) in paragraph (2) (as so designated), by inserting “of paragraph (1)” after “(A) and (B)”;

(B) by striking subsection (e); and

(C) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (e).

(20) Section 4.9A(c) of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2162(c)) is amended—

(A) by striking “institution, and—” in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and all that follows through the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting “institution.”;

(B) by striking “If an institution” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If an institution”;

(C) in paragraph (1) (as so designated), by striking “the receiver of the institution” and inserting “the Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, acting as receiver.”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) FUNDING.—The Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation shall use such funds from the Farm Credit Insurance Fund as are sufficient to carry out this section.”.

(21) Section 4.12A(a) of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2184(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A Farm Credit System bank or association shall provide to a stockholder of the bank or association a current list of stockholders of the bank or association not later than 7 calendar days after the date on which the bank or association receives a written request for the stockholder list from the stockholder.”.

(22) Section 4.14A of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2202a) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “and section 4.36” before the colon at the end; and

(ii) in paragraph (5)(B)(ii)(I), by striking “4.14C.”;

(B) by striking subsection (h);

(C) by redesignating subsections (i) through (l) as subsections (h) through (k), respectively; and

(D) in subsection (k) (as so redesignated), by striking “production credit”.

(23) Section 4.14C of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2202c) is repealed.

(24) Section 4.17 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2205) is amended in the third sentence by striking “Federal intermediate credit banks and”.

(25) Section 4.19(a) of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2207(a)) (as amended by section 5402(a)(2)) is amended—

(A) in the first sentence—

(i) by striking “district”; and

(ii) by striking “Federal land bank association and production credit”; and

(B) in the second sentence, by striking “units” and inserting “institutions”.

(26) Section 4.38 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2219c) is amended by striking “The Assistance Board established under section 6.0 and all” and inserting “All”.

(27) Section 4.39 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2219d) is amended by striking “8.0(7)” and inserting “8.0”.

(28) Section 5.16 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2251) is amended—

(A) by striking the section designation and heading and all that follows through “As an alternate” in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“SEC. 5.16. OFFICES, QUARTERS, AND FACILITIES FOR THE FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION.

“(a) OFFICES.—The Farm Credit Administration shall maintain—

“(1) the principal office of the Farm Credit Administration within the Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV Metropolitan Statistical Area, as defined by the Office of Management and Budget; and

“(2) such other offices in the United States as the Farm Credit Administration determines are necessary.

“(b) QUARTERS AND FACILITIES.—As an alternative”; and

(B) in the undesignated matter following paragraph (5) of subsection (b) (as so designated)—

(i) in the fifth sentence, by striking “In actions undertaken by the banks pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this section” and inserting the following:

“(5) AGENT FOR BANKS.—In actions undertaken by the banks pursuant to this section”;

(ii) in the fourth sentence, by striking “The plans” and inserting the following:

“(4) APPROVAL OF BOARD.—The plans”;

(iii) in the third sentence, by striking “The powers” and inserting the following:

“(3) POWERS OF BANKS.—The powers”;

(iv) in the second sentence, by striking “Such advances” and inserting the following:

“(2) ADVANCES.—The advances of funds described in paragraph (1)”; and

(v) in the first sentence, by striking “The Board” and inserting the following:

“(c) FINANCING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board”.

(29) Section 5.17(a)(2) of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2252(a)(2)) is amended by striking the second and third sentences.

(30) Section 5.18 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2253) is repealed.

(31) Section 5.19 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2254) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking “Except for Federal land bank associations, each” and inserting “Each”; and

(ii) by striking the second sentence; and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking “(b)(1) Each” and inserting “(b) Each”;

(ii) in the matter preceding paragraph (2) (as so designated)—

(I) in the second sentence, by striking “, except with respect to any actions taken by any banks of the System under section 4.8(b),”; and

(II) by striking the third sentence; and

(iii) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3).

(32) Section 5.31 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2267) is amended in the second sentence by striking “4.14A(i)” and inserting “4.14A(h)”.

(33) Section 5.32(h) of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2268(h)) is amended by striking “4.14A(i)” and inserting “4.14A(h)”.

(34) Section 5.35 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2271) is amended in paragraph (5) (as redesignated by section 5406(2))—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by adding “and” at the end;

(B) by striking subparagraph (B);

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B); and

(D) in subparagraph (B) (as so redesignated)—

(i) by striking “after December 31, 1992,”;

(ii) by striking “by the Farm Credit System Assistance Board under section 6.6 or”.

(35) Section 5.38 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2274) is amended by striking “a farm” and all that follows through “land bank” and inserting “a Farm Credit Bank board, officer, or employee shall not remove any director or officer of any”.

(36) Section 5.44 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2275) is repealed.

(37) Section 5.58(2) of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2277a-7(2)) is amended by striking the second sentence.

(38) Section 5.60 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2277a-9) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b), by striking the subsection designation and heading and all that follows through “The Corporation” in paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(b) AMOUNTS IN FUND.—The Corporation”;

and

(B) in subsection (c)(2), by striking “Insurance Fund to—” in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) and all that follows through “ensure” in subparagraph (B) and inserting “Insurance Fund to ensure”.

(39) Title VI of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2278a et seq.) is repealed.

(40) Section 7.9 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2279c-2) is amended by striking subsection (c).

(41) Section 7.10(a) of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2279d(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

“(4) the institution pays to the Farm Credit Insurance Fund the amount by which the total capital of the institution exceeds 6 percent of the assets;”.

(42) Section 8.0 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2279aa) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “means—” in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) and all that follows through the period at

the end of the undesignated matter following subparagraph (B) and inserting “means the board of directors established under section 8.2.”;

(B) by striking paragraphs (6) and (8);

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (7), (9), and (10) as paragraphs (6), (7), and (8), respectively; and

(D) in subparagraph (B)(i) of paragraph (7) (as so redesignated), by striking “(b) through (d)” and inserting “(b) and (c)”.

(43) Section 8.2 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2279aa-2) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (a);

(B) in subsection (b), by striking the subsection designation and heading and all that follows through the period at the end of paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Corporation shall be under the management of the board of directors.”;

(C) in subsection (a) (as so designated)—

(i) by striking “permanent board” each place it appears and inserting “Board”;

(ii) by striking paragraph (3);

(iii) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (10) as paragraphs (3) through (9), respectively; and

(iv) in paragraph (3)(A) (as so redesignated), by striking “(6)” and inserting “(5)”;

and

(D) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

(44) Section 8.4(a)(1) of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2279aa-4(a)(1)) is amended—

(A) in the sixth sentence—

(i) by striking “Class B” and inserting the following:

“(iii) CLASS B STOCK.—Class B”; and

(ii) by striking “8.2(b)(2)(B)” and inserting “8.2(a)(2)(B)”;

(B) in the fifth sentence—

(i) by striking “Class A” and inserting the following:

“(ii) CLASS A STOCK.—Class A”; and

(ii) by striking “8.2(b)(2)(A)” and inserting “8.2(a)(2)(A)”;

(C) in the fourth sentence, by striking “The stock” and inserting the following:

“(D) CLASSES OF STOCK.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The stock”;

(D) by striking the third sentence and inserting the following:

“(C) OFFERS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall offer the voting common stock to banks, other financial institutions, insurance companies, and System institutions under such terms and conditions as the Board may adopt.

“(ii) REQUIREMENTS.—The voting common stock shall be fairly and broadly offered to ensure that—

“(I) no institution or institutions acquire a disproportionate share of the total quantity of the voting common stock outstanding of a class of stock; and

“(II) capital contributions and issuances of voting common stock for the contributions are fairly distributed between entities eligible to hold class A stock and class B stock.”;

(E) in the second sentence, by striking “Each share” and inserting the following:

“(B) NUMBER OF VOTES.—Each share”; and

(F) in the first sentence, by striking “The Corporation” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation”.

(45) Section 8.6 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2279aa-6) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (d);

(B) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d); and

(C) in paragraph (2) of subsection (d) (as so redesignated), by striking “8.0(9)” and inserting “8.0”.

(46) Section 8.9 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2279aa-9) is amended by striking “4.14C,” each place it appears.

(47) Section 8.11(e) of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2279aa-11(e)) is amended by striking “8.0(7)” and inserting “8.0”.

(48) Section 8.32(a) of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2279bb-1(a)) is amended—

(A) in the first sentence of the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “Not sooner than the expiration of the 3-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Farm Credit System Reform Act of 1996, the” and inserting “The”; and

(B) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “8.0(9)(C)” and inserting “8.0(7)(C)”.

(49) Section 8.33(b)(2)(A) of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2279bb-2(b)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “8.6(e)” and inserting “8.6(d)”.

(50) Section 8.35 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2279bb-4) is amended by striking subsection (e).

(51) Section 8.38 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2279bb-7) is repealed.

(52) Section 4 of the Agricultural Marketing Act (12 U.S.C. 1141b) is repealed.

(53) Section 5 of the Agricultural Marketing Act (12 U.S.C. 1141c) is repealed.

(54) Section 6 of the Agricultural Marketing Act (12 U.S.C. 1141d) is repealed.

(55) Section 7 of the Agricultural Marketing Act (12 U.S.C. 1141e) is repealed.

(56) Section 8 of the Agricultural Marketing Act (12 U.S.C. 1141f) is repealed.

(57) Section 14 of the Agricultural Marketing Act (12 U.S.C. 1141i) is repealed.

(58) The Act of June 22, 1939 (53 Stat. 853, chapter 239; 12 U.S.C. 1141d-1), is repealed.

(59) Section 201(e) of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932 (12 U.S.C. 1148) is repealed.

(60) Section 2 of the Act of July 14, 1953 (67 Stat. 150, chapter 192; 12 U.S.C. 1148a-4), is repealed.

(61) Section 32 of the Farm Credit Act of 1937 (12 U.S.C. 1148b) is repealed.

(62) Section 33 of the Farm Credit Act of 1937 (12 U.S.C. 1148c) is repealed.

(63) Section 34 of the Farm Credit Act of 1937 (12 U.S.C. 1148d) is repealed.

(64) The Joint Resolution of March 3, 1932 (47 Stat. 60, chapter 70; 12 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.), is repealed.

SEC. 5408. CORPORATION AS CONSERVATOR OR RECEIVER; CERTAIN OTHER POWERS.

Part E of title V of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 is amended by inserting after section 5.61B (12 U.S.C. 2277a-10b) the following:

“SEC. 5.61C. CORPORATION AS CONSERVATOR OR RECEIVER; CERTAIN OTHER POWERS.

“(a) DEFINITION OF INSTITUTION.—In this section, the term ‘institution’ includes any System institution for which the Corporation has been appointed as conservator or receiver.

“(b) CERTAIN POWERS AND DUTIES OF CORPORATION AS CONSERVATOR OR RECEIVER.—In addition to the powers inherent in the express grant of corporate authority under section 5.58(9), and other powers exercised by the Corporation under this part, the Corporation shall have the following express powers to act as a conservator or receiver:

“(1) RULEMAKING AUTHORITY OF CORPORATION.—The Corporation may prescribe such regulations as the Corporation determines to be appropriate regarding the conduct of conservatorships or receiverships.

“(2) GENERAL POWERS.—

“(A) SUCCESSOR TO SYSTEM INSTITUTION.—The Corporation shall, as conservator or receiver, and by operation of law, succeed to—

“(i) all rights, titles, powers, and privileges of the System institution, and of any stockholder, member, officer, or director of such System institution with respect to the System institution and the assets of the System institution; and

“(ii) title to the books, records, and assets of any previous conservator or other legal custodian of such System institution.

“(B) OPERATE THE SYSTEM INSTITUTION.—The Corporation may, as conservator or receiver—

“(i) take over the assets of and operate the System institution with all the powers of the stockholders or members, the directors, and the officers of the System institution and conduct all business of the System institution;

“(ii) collect all obligations and money due the System institution;

“(iii) perform all functions of the System institution in the name of the System institution which are consistent with the appointment as conservator or receiver;

“(iv) preserve and conserve the assets and property of such System institution; and

“(v) provide by contract for assistance in fulfilling any function, activity, action, or duty of the Corporation as conservator or receiver.

“(C) FUNCTIONS OF SYSTEM INSTITUTION’S OFFICERS, DIRECTORS, MEMBERS, AND STOCKHOLDERS.—The Corporation may, by regulation or order, provide for the exercise of any function by any stockholder, member, director, or officer of any System institution for which the Corporation has been appointed conservator or receiver.

“(D) POWERS AS CONSERVATOR.—Subject to any Farm Credit Administration approvals required under this Act, the Corporation may, as conservator, take such action as may be—

“(i) necessary to put the System institution in a sound and solvent condition; and

“(ii) appropriate to carry on the business of the System institution and preserve and conserve the assets and property of the System institution.

“(E) ADDITIONAL POWERS AS RECEIVER.—The Corporation may, as receiver, liquidate the System institution and proceed to realize upon the assets of the System institution, in such manner as the Corporation determines to be appropriate.

“(F) ORGANIZATION OF NEW SYSTEM BANK.—The Corporation may, as receiver with respect to any System bank, organize a bridge System bank under subsection (h).

“(G) MERGER; TRANSFER OF ASSETS AND LIABILITIES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), the Corporation may, as conservator or receiver—

“(I) merge the System institution with another System institution; and

“(II) transfer or sell any asset or liability of the System institution in default without any approval, assignment, or consent with respect to such transfer.

“(ii) APPROVAL.—No merger or transfer under clause (i) may be made to another System institution (other than a bridge System bank under subsection (h)) without the approval of the Farm Credit Administration.

“(H) PAYMENT OF VALID OBLIGATIONS.—The Corporation, as conservator or receiver, shall, to the extent that proceeds are realized from the performance of contracts or the sale of the assets of a System institution, pay all valid obligations of the System institution in accordance with the prescriptions and limitations of this section.

“(I) INCIDENTAL POWERS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation may, as conservator or receiver—

“(I) exercise all powers and authorities specifically granted to conservators or receivers, respectively, under this section and such incidental powers as shall be necessary to carry out such powers; and

“(II) take any action authorized by this section, which the Corporation determines is in the best interests of—

“(aa) the System institution in receivership or conservatorship;

“(bb) System institutions;

“(cc) System institution stockholders or investors; or

“(dd) the Corporation.

“(ii) TERMINATION OF RIGHTS AND CLAIMS.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (II), notwithstanding any other provision of law, the appointment of the Corporation as receiver for a System institution and the succession of the Corporation, by operation of law, to the rights, titles, powers, and privileges described in subparagraph (A) shall terminate all rights and claims that the stockholders and creditors of the System institution may have, arising as a result of their status as stockholders or creditors, against the assets or charter of the System institution or the Corporation.

“(II) EXCEPTIONS.—Subclause (I) shall not terminate the right to payment, resolution, or other satisfaction of the claims of stockholders and creditors described in that subclause, as permitted under paragraphs (10) and (11) and subsection (d).

“(iii) CHARTER.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for purposes of this section, the charter of a System institution shall not be considered to be an asset of the System institution.

“(J) UTILIZATION OF PRIVATE SECTOR.—In carrying out its responsibilities in the management and disposition of assets from System institutions, as conservator, receiver, or in its corporate capacity, the Corporation may utilize the services of private persons, including real estate and loan portfolio asset management, property management, auction marketing, legal, and brokerage services, if the Corporation determines utilization of such services is practicable, efficient, and cost effective.

“(3) AUTHORITY OF RECEIVER TO DETERMINE CLAIMS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation may, as receiver, determine claims in accordance with the requirements of this subsection and regulations prescribed under paragraph (4).

“(B) NOTICE REQUIREMENTS.—The receiver, in any case involving the liquidation or winding up of the affairs of a closed System institution, shall—

“(i) promptly publish a notice to the System institution’s creditors to present their claims, together with proof, to the receiver by a date specified in the notice which shall be not less than 90 days after the publication of such notice; and

“(ii) republish such notice approximately 1 month and 2 months, respectively, after the publication under clause (i).

“(C) MAILING REQUIRED.—The receiver shall mail a notice similar to the notice published under subparagraph (B)(i) at the time of such publication to any creditor shown on the System institution’s books—

“(i) at the creditor’s last address appearing in such books; or

“(ii) upon discovery of the name and address of a claimant not appearing on the System institution’s books within 30 days after the discovery of such name and address.

“(4) RULEMAKING AUTHORITY RELATING TO DETERMINATION OF CLAIMS.—The Corporation may prescribe regulations regarding the allowance or disallowance of claims by the receiver and providing for administrative determination of claims and review of such determination.

“(5) PROCEDURES FOR DETERMINATION OF CLAIMS.—

“(A) DETERMINATION PERIOD.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Before the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date any claim against a System institution is filed with the Corporation as receiver, the Corporation shall determine whether to allow or disallow

the claim and shall notify the claimant of any determination with respect to such claim.

“(ii) EXTENSION OF TIME.—The period described in clause (i) may be extended by a written agreement between the claimant and the Corporation.

“(iii) MAILING OF NOTICE SUFFICIENT.—The requirements of clause (i) shall be deemed to be satisfied if the notice of any determination with respect to any claim is mailed to the last address of the claimant which appears—

“(I) on the System institution’s books;

“(II) in the claim filed by the claimant; or

“(III) in documents submitted in proof of the claim.

“(iv) CONTENTS OF NOTICE OF DISALLOWANCE.—If any claim filed under clause (i) is disallowed, the notice to the claimant shall contain—

“(I) a statement of each reason for the disallowance; and

“(II) the procedures available for obtaining agency review of the determination to disallow the claim or judicial determination of the claim.

“(B) ALLOWANCE OF PROVEN CLAIMS.—The receiver shall allow any claim received on or before the date specified in the notice published under paragraph (3)(B)(i) by the receiver from any claimant which is proved to the satisfaction of the receiver.

“(C) DISALLOWANCE OF CLAIMS FILED AFTER END OF FILING PERIOD.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), claims filed after the date specified in the notice published under paragraph (3)(B)(i) shall be disallowed and such disallowance shall be final.

“(ii) CERTAIN EXCEPTIONS.—Clause (i) shall not apply with respect to any claim filed by any claimant after the date specified in the notice published under paragraph (3)(B)(i) and such claim may be considered by the receiver if—

“(I) the claimant did not receive notice of the appointment of the receiver in time to file such claim before such date; and

“(II) such claim is filed in time to permit payment of such claim.

“(D) AUTHORITY TO DISALLOW CLAIMS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The receiver may disallow any portion of any claim by a creditor or claim of security, preference, or priority which is not proved to the satisfaction of the receiver.

“(ii) PAYMENTS TO LESS THAN FULLY SECURED CREDITORS.—In the case of a claim of a creditor against a System institution which is secured by any property or other asset of such System institution, any receiver appointed for any System institution—

“(I) may treat the portion of such claim which exceeds an amount equal to the fair market value of such property or other asset as an unsecured claim against the System institution; and

“(II) may not make any payment with respect to such unsecured portion of the claim other than in connection with the disposition of all claims of unsecured creditors of the System institution.

“(iii) EXCEPTIONS.—No provision of this paragraph shall apply with respect to—

“(I) any extension of credit from any Federal Reserve bank or the United States Treasury to any System institution; or

“(II) any security interest in the assets of the System institution securing any such extension of credit.

“(E) NO JUDICIAL REVIEW OF DETERMINATION PURSUANT TO SUBPARAGRAPH (D).—No court may review the Corporation’s determination pursuant to subparagraph (D) to disallow a claim.

“(F) LEGAL EFFECT OF FILING.—

“(i) STATUTE OF LIMITATION TOLLED.—For purposes of any applicable statute of limitations, the filing of a claim with the receiver shall constitute a commencement of an action.

“(ii) NO PREJUDICE TO OTHER ACTIONS.—Subject to paragraph (12) and the determination of claims by a receiver, the filing of a claim with the receiver shall not prejudice any right of the claimant to continue any action which was filed before the appointment of the receiver.

“(6) PROVISION FOR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION OF CLAIMS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Before the end of the 60-day period beginning on the earlier of—

“(i) the end of the period described in paragraph (5)(A)(i) with respect to any claim against a System institution for which the Corporation is receiver; or

“(ii) the date of any notice of disallowance of such claim pursuant to paragraph (5)(A)(i), the claimant may request administrative review of the claim in accordance with paragraph (7) or file suit on such claim (or continue an action commenced before the appointment of the receiver) in the district or territorial court of the United States for the district within which the System institution’s principal place of business is located or the United States District Court for the District of Columbia (and such court shall have jurisdiction to hear such claim).

“(B) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—If any claimant fails to file suit on such claim (or continue an action commenced before the appointment of the receiver), before the end of the 60-day period described in subparagraph (A), the claim shall be deemed to be disallowed (other than any portion of such claim which was allowed by the receiver) as of the end of such period, such disallowance shall be final, and the claimant shall have no further rights or remedies with respect to such claim.

“(7) REVIEW OF CLAIMS; ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING.—If any claimant requests review under this paragraph in lieu of filing or continuing any action under paragraph (6) and the Corporation agrees to such request, the Corporation shall consider the claim after opportunity for a hearing on the record. The final determination of the Corporation with respect to such claim shall be subject to judicial review under chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code.

“(8) EXPEDITED DETERMINATION OF CLAIMS.—

“(A) ESTABLISHMENT REQUIRED.—The Corporation shall establish a procedure for expedited relief outside of the routine claims process established under paragraph (5) for claimants who—

“(i) allege the existence of legally valid and enforceable or perfected security interests in assets of any System institution for which the Corporation has been appointed receiver; and

“(ii) allege that irreparable injury will occur if the routine claims procedure is followed.

“(B) DETERMINATION PERIOD.—Before the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date any claim is filed in accordance with the procedures established pursuant to subparagraph (A), the Corporation shall—

“(i) determine—

“(I) whether to allow or disallow such claim; or

“(II) whether such claim should be determined pursuant to the procedures established pursuant to paragraph (5); and

“(ii) notify the claimant of the determination, and if the claim is disallowed, provide a statement of each reason for the disallowance and the procedure for obtaining agency review or judicial determination.

“(C) PERIOD FOR FILING OR RENEWING SUIT.—Any claimant who files a request for expedited relief shall be permitted to file a suit, or to continue a suit filed before the appointment of the receiver, seeking a determination of the claimant’s rights with respect to such security interest after the earlier of—

“(i) the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the filing of a request for expedited relief; or

“(ii) the date the Corporation denies the claim.

“(D) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—If an action described in subparagraph (C) is not filed, or the motion to renew a previously filed suit is not made, before the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date on which such action or motion may be filed in accordance with subparagraph (B), the claim shall be deemed to be disallowed as of the end of such period (other than any portion of such claim which was allowed by the receiver), such disallowance shall be final, and the claimant shall have no further rights or remedies with respect to such claim.

“(E) LEGAL EFFECT OF FILING.—

“(i) STATUTE OF LIMITATION TOLLED.—For purposes of any applicable statute of limitations, the filing of a claim with the receiver shall constitute a commencement of an action.

“(ii) NO PREJUDICE TO OTHER ACTIONS.—Subject to paragraph (12), the filing of a claim with the receiver shall not prejudice any right of the claimant to continue any action which was filed before the appointment of the receiver.

“(9) AGREEMENT AS BASIS OF CLAIM.—

“(A) REQUIREMENTS.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), any agreement which does not meet the requirements set forth in section 5.61(d) shall not form the basis of, or substantially comprise, a claim against the receiver or the Corporation.

“(B) EXCEPTION TO CONTEMPORANEOUS EXECUTION REQUIREMENT.—Notwithstanding section 5.61(d), any agreement relating to an extension of credit between a Federal Reserve bank or the United States Treasury and any System institution which was executed before such extension of credit to such System institution shall be treated as having been executed contemporaneously with such extension of credit for purposes of subparagraph (A).

“(10) PAYMENT OF CLAIMS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The receiver may, in the receiver’s discretion and to the extent funds are available from the assets of the System institution, pay creditor claims which are allowed by the receiver, approved by the Corporation pursuant to a final determination pursuant to paragraph (7) or (8), or determined by the final judgment of any court of competent jurisdiction in such manner and amounts as are authorized under this Act.

“(B) LIQUIDATION PAYMENTS.—The receiver may, in the receiver’s sole discretion, pay from the assets of the System institution portions of proved claims at any time, and no liability shall attach to the Corporation (in such Corporation’s corporate capacity or as receiver), by reason of any such payment, for failure to make payments to a claimant whose claim is not proved at the time of any such payment.

“(C) RULEMAKING AUTHORITY OF CORPORATION.—The Corporation may prescribe such rules, including definitions of terms, as it deems appropriate to establish a single uniform interest rate for or to make payments of post insolvency interest to creditors holding proven claims against the receivership estates of System institutions following satisfaction by the receiver of the principal amount of all creditor claims.

“(11) PRIORITY OF EXPENSES AND CLAIMS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts realized from the liquidation or other resolution of any System institution by any receiver appointed for such System institution shall be distributed to pay claims (other than secured claims to the extent of any such security) in the following order of priority:

“(i) Administrative expenses of the receiver.

“(ii) If authorized by the Corporation, wages, salaries, or commissions, including vacation, severance, and sick leave pay earned by an individual—

“(I) in an amount that is not more than \$11,725 for each individual (as indexed for inflation, by regulation of the Corporation); and

“(II) that is earned 180 days or fewer before the date of appointment of the Corporation as receiver.

“(iii) In the case of the resolution of a System bank, all claims of holders of consolidated and System-wide bonds and all claims of the other System banks arising from the payments of the System banks pursuant to—

“(I) section 4.4 on consolidated and System-wide bonds issued under subsection (c) or (d) of section 4.2; or

“(II) an agreement, in writing and approved by the Farm Credit Administration, among the System banks to reallocate the payments.

“(iv) In the case of the resolution of a production credit association or other association making direct loans under section 7.6, all claims of a System bank based on the financing agreement between the association and the System bank—

“(I) including interest accrued before and after the appointment of the receiver; and

“(II) not including any setoff for stock or other equity of that System bank owned by the association, on that condition that, prior to making that setoff, that System bank shall obtain the approval of the Farm Credit Administration Board for the retirement of that stock or equity.

“(v) Any general or senior liability of the System institution (which is not a liability described in clause (vi) or (vii)).

“(vi) Any obligation subordinated to general creditors (which is not an obligation described in clause (vii)).

“(vii) Any obligation to stockholders or members arising as a result of their status as stockholders or members.

“(B) PAYMENT OF CLAIMS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—

“(I) PAYMENT.—All claims of each priority described in clauses (i) through (vii) of subparagraph (A) shall be paid in full, or provisions shall be made for that payment, prior to the payment of any claim of a lesser priority.

“(II) INSUFFICIENT FUNDS.—If there are insufficient funds to pay in full all claims in any priority described clauses (i) through (vii) of subparagraph (A), distribution on that priority of claims shall be made on a pro rata basis.

“(ii) DISTRIBUTION OF REMAINING ASSETS.—Following the payment of all claims in accordance with subparagraph (A), the receiver shall distribute the remainder of the assets of the System institution to the owners of stock, participation certificates, and other equities in accordance with the priorities for impairment under the bylaws of the System institution.

“(iii) ELIGIBLE BORROWER STOCK.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (C) or any other provision of this section, eligible borrower stock shall be retired in accordance with section 4.9A.

“(C) EFFECT OF STATE LAW.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The provisions of subparagraph (A) shall not supersede the law of any State except to the extent such law is

inconsistent with the provisions of such subparagraph, and then only to the extent of the inconsistency.

“(ii) PROCEDURE FOR DETERMINATION OF INCONSISTENCY.—Upon the Corporation’s own motion or upon the request of any person with a claim described in subparagraph (A) or any State which is submitted to the Corporation in accordance with procedures which the Corporation shall prescribe, the Corporation shall determine whether any provision of the law of any State is inconsistent with any provision of subparagraph (A) and the extent of any such inconsistency.

“(iii) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—The final determination of the Corporation under clause (ii) shall be subject to judicial review under chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code.

“(D) ACCOUNTING REPORT.—Any distribution by the Corporation in connection with any claim described in subparagraph (A)(vii) shall be accompanied by the accounting report required under paragraph (15)(B).

“(12) SUSPENSION OF LEGAL ACTIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—After the appointment of a conservator or receiver for a System institution, the conservator or receiver may request a stay for a period not to exceed—

“(i) 45 days, in the case of any conservator; and

“(ii) 90 days, in the case of any receiver, in any judicial action or proceeding to which such System institution is or becomes a party.

“(B) GRANT OF STAY BY ALL COURTS REQUIRED.—Upon receipt of a request by any conservator or receiver pursuant to subparagraph (A) for a stay of any judicial action or proceeding in any court with jurisdiction of such action or proceeding, the court shall grant such stay as to all parties.

“(13) ADDITIONAL RIGHTS AND DUTIES.—

“(A) PRIOR FINAL ADJUDICATION.—The Corporation shall abide by any final unappealable judgment of any court of competent jurisdiction which was rendered before the appointment of the Corporation as conservator or receiver.

“(B) RIGHTS AND REMEDIES OF CONSERVATOR OR RECEIVER.—In the event of any appealable judgment, the Corporation as conservator or receiver shall—

“(i) have all the rights and remedies available to the System institution (before the appointment of such conservator or receiver) and the Corporation in its corporate capacity, including removal to Federal court and all appellate rights; and

“(ii) not be required to post any bond in order to pursue such remedies.

“(C) NO ATTACHMENT OR EXECUTION.—No attachment or execution may issue by any court on—

“(i) assets in the possession of the receiver; or

“(ii) the charter of a System institution for which the Corporation has been appointed receiver.

“(D) LIMITATION ON JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, no court shall have jurisdiction over—

“(i) any claim or action for payment from, or any action seeking a determination of rights with respect to, the assets of any System institution for which the Corporation has been appointed receiver, including assets which the Corporation may acquire from itself as such receiver; or

“(ii) any claim relating to any act or omission of such System institution or the Corporation as receiver.

“(E) DISPOSITION OF ASSETS.—In exercising any right, power, privilege, or authority as receiver in connection with any sale or disposition of assets of any System institution for which the Corporation is acting as receiver, the Corporation shall, to the max-

imum extent practicable, conduct its operations in a manner which—

“(i) maximizes the net present value return from the sale or disposition of such assets;

“(ii) minimizes the amount of any loss realized in the resolution of cases;

“(iii) ensures adequate competition and fair and consistent treatment of offerors;

“(iv) prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, sex, or ethnic groups in the solicitation and consideration of offers; and

“(v) mitigates the potential for serious adverse effects to the rest of the System.

“(14) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS FOR ACTIONS BROUGHT BY CONSERVATOR OR RECEIVER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any provision of any contract, the applicable statute of limitations with regard to any action brought by the Corporation as conservator or receiver shall be—

“(i) in the case of any contract claim, the longer of—

“(I) the 6-year period beginning on the date the claim accrues; or

“(II) the period applicable under State law; and

“(ii) in the case of any tort claim, the longer of—

“(I) the 3-year period beginning on the date the claim accrues; or

“(II) the period applicable under State law.

“(B) DETERMINATION OF THE DATE ON WHICH A CLAIM ACCRUES.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the date on which the statute of limitations begins to run on any claim described in such subparagraph shall be the later of—

“(i) the date of the appointment of the Corporation as conservator or receiver; or

“(ii) the date on which the cause of action accrues.

“(C) REVIVAL OF EXPIRED STATE CAUSES OF ACTION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any tort claim described in clause (ii) for which the statute of limitation applicable under State law with respect to such claim has expired not more than 5 years before the appointment of the Corporation as conservator or receiver, the Corporation may bring an action as conservator or receiver on such claim without regard to the expiration of the statute of limitation applicable under State law.

“(ii) CLAIMS DESCRIBED.—A tort claim referred to in clause (i) is a claim arising from fraud, intentional misconduct resulting in unjust enrichment, or intentional misconduct resulting in substantial loss to the System institution.

“(15) ACCOUNTING AND RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation as conservator or receiver shall, consistent with the accounting and reporting practices and procedures established by the Corporation, maintain a full accounting of each conservatorship and receivership or other disposition of System institutions in default.

“(B) ANNUAL ACCOUNTING OR REPORT.—With respect to each conservatorship or receivership to which the Corporation was appointed, the Corporation shall make an annual accounting or report, as appropriate, available to the Farm Credit Administration Board.

“(C) AVAILABILITY OF REPORTS.—Any report prepared pursuant to subparagraph (B) shall be made available by the Corporation upon request to any stockholder of the System institution for which the Corporation was appointed conservator or receiver or any other member of the public.

“(D) RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), after the end of the 6-year period beginning on the date the Corporation is appointed as receiver of a System institution, the Corporation may destroy any records of

such System institution which the Corporation, in the Corporation’s discretion, determines to be unnecessary unless directed not to do so by a court of competent jurisdiction or governmental agency, or prohibited by law.

“(ii) OLD RECORDS.—Notwithstanding clause (i), the Corporation may destroy records of a System institution which are at least 10 years old as of the date on which the Corporation is appointed as the receiver of such System institution in accordance with clause (i) at any time after such appointment is final, without regard to the 6-year period of limitation contained in clause (i).

“(16) FRAUDULENT TRANSFERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation, as conservator or receiver for any System institution, may avoid a transfer of any interest of a System institution-affiliated party, or any person who the Corporation determines is a debtor of the System institution, in property, or any obligation incurred by such party or person, that was made within 5 years of the date on which the Corporation was appointed conservator or receiver if such party or person voluntarily or involuntarily made such transfer or incurred such liability with the intent to hinder, delay, or defraud the System institution, the Farm Credit Administration, or the Corporation.

“(B) RIGHT OF RECOVERY.—To the extent a transfer is avoided under subparagraph (A), the Corporation may recover, for the benefit of the System institution, the property transferred, or, if a court so orders, the value of such property (at the time of such transfer) from—

“(i) the initial transferee of such transfer or the System institution-affiliated party or person for whose benefit such transfer was made; or

“(ii) any immediate or mediate transferee of any such initial transferee.

“(C) RIGHTS OF TRANSFEREE OR OBLIGEE.—The Corporation may not recover under subparagraph (B) from—

“(i) any transferee that takes for value, including satisfaction or securing of a present or antecedent debt, in good faith; or

“(ii) any immediate or mediate good faith transferee of such transferee.

“(D) RIGHTS UNDER THIS PARAGRAPH.—The rights under this paragraph of the Corporation shall be superior to any rights of a trustee or any other party (other than any party which is a Federal agency) under title 11, United States Code.

“(17) ATTACHMENT OF ASSETS AND OTHER INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—Subject to paragraph (18), any court of competent jurisdiction may, at the request of the Corporation (in the Corporation’s capacity as conservator or receiver for any System institution or in the Corporation’s corporate capacity with respect to any asset acquired or liability assumed by the Corporation under section 5.61), issue an order in accordance with Rule 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, including an order placing the assets of any person designated by the Corporation under the control of the court and appointing a trustee to hold such assets.

“(18) STANDARDS.—

“(A) SHOWING.—Rule 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure shall apply with respect to any proceeding under paragraph (17) without regard to the requirement of such rule that the applicant show that the injury, loss, or damage is irreparable and immediate.

“(B) STATE PROCEEDING.—If, in the case of any proceeding in a State court, the court determines that rules of civil procedure available under the laws of such State provide substantially similar protections to such party’s right to due process as Rule 65 (as modified with respect to such proceeding

by subparagraph (A)), the relief sought by the Corporation pursuant to paragraph (17) may be requested under the laws of such State.

“(19) TREATMENT OF CLAIMS ARISING FROM BREACH OF CONTRACTS EXECUTED BY THE RECEIVER OR CONSERVATOR.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, any final and unappealable judgment for monetary damages entered against a receiver or conservator for a System institution for the breach of an agreement executed or approved by such receiver or conservator after the date of its appointment shall be paid as an administrative expense of the receiver or conservator. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to limit the power of a receiver or conservator to exercise any rights under contract or law, including terminating, breaching, canceling, or otherwise discontinuing such agreement.

“(C) PROVISIONS RELATING TO CONTRACTS ENTERED INTO BEFORE APPOINTMENT OF CONSERVATOR OR RECEIVER.—

“(1) AUTHORITY TO REPUDIATE CONTRACTS.—In addition to any other rights a conservator or receiver may have, the conservator or receiver for a System institution may disaffirm or repudiate any contract or lease—

“(A) to which such System institution is a party;

“(B) the performance of which the conservator or receiver, in the conservator’s or receiver’s discretion, determines to be burdensome; and

“(C) the disaffirmance or repudiation of which the conservator or receiver determines, in the conservator’s or receiver’s discretion, will promote the orderly administration of the System institution’s affairs.

“(2) TIMING OF REPUDIATION.—The Corporation as conservator or receiver for any System institution shall determine whether or not to exercise the rights of repudiation under this subsection within a reasonable period following such appointment.

“(3) CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES FOR REPUDIATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in subparagraph (C) and paragraphs (4), (5), and (6), the liability of the conservator or receiver for the disaffirmance or repudiation of any contract pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be—

“(i) limited to actual direct compensatory damages; and

“(ii) determined as of—

“(I) the date of the appointment of the conservator or receiver; or

“(II) in the case of any contract or agreement referred to in paragraph (8), the date of the disaffirmance or repudiation of such contract or agreement.

“(B) NO LIABILITY FOR OTHER DAMAGES.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ‘actual direct compensatory damages’ does not include—

“(i) punitive or exemplary damages;

“(ii) damages for lost profits or opportunity; or

“(iii) damages for pain and suffering.

“(C) MEASURE OF DAMAGES FOR REPUDIATION OF FINANCIAL CONTRACTS.—In the case of any qualified financial contract or agreement to which paragraph (8) applies, compensatory damages shall be—

“(i) deemed to include normal and reasonable costs of cover or other reasonable measures of damages utilized in the industries for such contract and agreement claims; and

“(ii) paid in accordance with this subsection and subsection (j), except as otherwise specifically provided in this section.

“(4) LEASES UNDER WHICH THE SYSTEM INSTITUTION IS THE LESSEE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the conservator or receiver disaffirms or repudiates a lease under which the System institution was the lessee,

the conservator or receiver shall not be liable for any damages (other than damages determined pursuant to subparagraph (B)) for the disaffirmance or repudiation of such lease.

“(B) PAYMENTS OF RENT.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), the lessor under a lease to which such subparagraph applies shall—

“(i) be entitled to the contractual rent accruing before the later of the date—

“(I) the notice of disaffirmance or repudiation is mailed; or

“(II) the disaffirmance or repudiation becomes effective, unless the lessor is in default or breach of the terms of the lease; and

“(ii) have no claim for damages under any acceleration clause or other penalty provision in the lease; and

“(iii) have a claim for any unpaid rent, subject to all appropriate offsets and defenses, due as of the date of the appointment, which shall be paid in accordance with this subsection and subsection (j).

“(5) LEASES UNDER WHICH THE SYSTEM INSTITUTION IS THE LESSOR.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the conservator or receiver repudiates an unexpired written lease of real property of the System institution under which the System institution is the lessor and the lessee is not, as of the date of such repudiation, in default, the lessee under such lease may either—

“(i) treat the lease as terminated by such repudiation; or

“(ii) remain in possession of the leasehold interest for the balance of the term of the lease, unless the lessee defaults under the terms of the lease after the date of such repudiation.

“(B) PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO LESSEE REMAINING IN POSSESSION.—If any lessee under a lease described in subparagraph (A) remains in possession of a leasehold interest pursuant to clause (ii) of such subparagraph—

“(i) the lessee—

“(I) shall continue to pay the contractual rent pursuant to the terms of the lease after the date of the repudiation of such lease; and

“(II) may offset against any rent payment which accrues after the date of the repudiation of the lease, any damages which accrue after such date due to the nonperformance of any obligation of the System institution under the lease after such date; and

“(ii) the conservator or receiver shall not be liable to the lessee for any damages arising after such date as a result of the repudiation, other than the amount of any offset allowed under clause (i)(II).

“(6) CONTRACTS FOR THE SALE OF REAL PROPERTY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the conservator or receiver repudiates any contract (which repudiates any contract that meets the requirements of paragraphs (1) through (4) of section 5.61(d) for the sale of real property, and the purchaser of such real property under such contract is in possession and is not, as of the date of such repudiation, in default, such purchaser may either—

“(i) treat the contract as terminated by such repudiation; or

“(ii) remain in possession of such real property.

“(B) PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO PURCHASER REMAINING IN POSSESSION.—If any purchaser of real property under any contract described in subparagraph (A) remains in possession of such property pursuant to clause (ii) of such subparagraph—

“(i) the purchaser—

“(I) shall continue to make all payments due under the contract after the date of the repudiation of the contract; and

“(II) may offset against any such payments any damages which accrue after such date due to the nonperformance (after such date)

of any obligation of the System institution under the contract; and

“(ii) the conservator or receiver shall—

“(I) not be liable to the purchaser for any damages arising after that date as a result of the repudiation, other than the amount of any offset allowed under clause (i)(II);

“(II) deliver title to the purchaser in accordance with the contract; and

“(III) have no obligation under the contract, other than the performance required under subclause (II).

“(C) ASSIGNMENT AND SALE ALLOWED.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—No provision of this paragraph shall be construed as limiting the right of the conservator or receiver to assign the contract described in subparagraph (A) and sell the property subject to the contract and this paragraph.

“(ii) NO LIABILITY AFTER ASSIGNMENT AND SALE.—If an assignment and sale described in clause (i) is consummated, the Corporation, acting as conservator or receiver, shall have no further liability under the applicable contract described in subparagraph (A) or with respect to the real property which was the subject of such contract.

“(7) PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO SERVICE CONTRACTS.—

“(A) SERVICES PERFORMED BEFORE APPOINTMENT.—In the case of any contract for services between any person and any System institution for which the Corporation has been appointed conservator or receiver, any claim of such person for services performed before the appointment of the conservator or the receiver shall be—

“(i) a claim to be paid in accordance with subsections (b) and (d); and

“(ii) deemed to have arisen as of the date the conservator or receiver was appointed.

“(B) SERVICES PERFORMED AFTER APPOINTMENT AND PRIOR TO REPUDIATION.—If, in the case of any contract for services described in subparagraph (A), the conservator or receiver accepts performance by the other person before the conservator or receiver makes any determination to exercise the right of repudiation of such contract under this section—

“(i) the other party shall be paid under the terms of the contract for the services performed; and

“(ii) the amount of such payment shall be treated as an administrative expense of the conservatorship or receivership.

“(C) ACCEPTANCE OF PERFORMANCE NO BAR TO SUBSEQUENT REPUDIATION.—The acceptance by any conservator or receiver of services referred to in subparagraph (B) in connection with a contract described in such subparagraph shall not affect the right of the conservator or receiver, to repudiate such contract under this section at any time after such performance.

“(8) CERTAIN QUALIFIED FINANCIAL CONTRACTS.—

“(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

“(i) COMMODITY CONTRACT.—The term ‘commodity contract’ means—

“(I) with respect to a futures commission merchant, a contract for the purchase or sale of a commodity for future delivery on, or subject to the rules of, a contract market or board of trade;

“(II) with respect to a foreign futures commission merchant, a foreign future;

“(III) with respect to a leverage transaction merchant, a leverage transaction;

“(IV) with respect to a clearing organization, a contract for the purchase or sale of a commodity for future delivery on, or subject to the rules of, a contract market or board of trade that is cleared by such clearing organization, or commodity option traded on, or subject to the rules of, a contract market or board of trade that is cleared by such clearing organization;

“(V) with respect to a commodity options dealer, a commodity option;

“(VI) any other agreement or transaction that is similar to any agreement or transaction referred to in this clause;

“(VII) any combination of the agreements or transactions referred to in this clause;

“(VIII) any option to enter into any agreement or transaction referred to in this clause;

“(IX) a master agreement that provides for an agreement or transaction referred to in any of subclauses (I) through (VIII), together with all supplements to any such master agreement, without regard to whether the master agreement provides for an agreement or transaction that is not a commodity contract under this clause, except that the master agreement shall be considered to be a commodity contract under this clause only with respect to each agreement or transaction under the master agreement that is referred to in subclause (I), (II), (III), (IV), (V), (VI), (VII), or (VIII); or

“(X) any security agreement or arrangement or other credit enhancement related to any agreement or transaction referred to in this clause, including any guarantee or reimbursement obligation in connection with any agreement or transaction referred to in this clause.

“(ii) FORWARD CONTRACT.—The term ‘forward contract’ means—

“(I) a contract (other than a commodity contract) for the purchase, sale, or transfer of a commodity or any similar good, article, service, right, or interest which is presently or in the future becomes the subject of dealing in the forward contract trade, or product or byproduct thereof, with a maturity date more than 2 days after the date the contract is entered into, including a repurchase or reverse repurchase transaction (whether or not such repurchase or reverse repurchase transaction is a repurchase agreement), consignment, lease, swap, hedge transaction, deposit, loan, option, allocated transaction, unallocated transaction, or any other similar agreement;

“(II) any combination of agreements or transactions referred to in subclauses (I) and (III);

“(III) any option to enter into any agreement or transaction referred to in subclause (I) or (II);

“(IV) a master agreement that provides for an agreement or transaction referred to in subclauses (I) through (III), together with all supplements to any such master agreement, without regard to whether the master agreement provides for an agreement or transaction that is not a forward contract under this clause, except that the master agreement shall be considered to be a forward contract under this clause only with respect to each agreement or transaction under the master agreement that is referred to in subclause (I), (II), or (III); or

“(V) any security agreement or arrangement or other credit enhancement related to any agreement or transaction referred to in subclause (I), (II), (III), or (IV), including any guarantee or reimbursement obligation in connection with any agreement or transaction referred to in any such subclause.

“(iii) PERSON.—The term ‘person’—

“(I) has the meaning given the term in section 1 of title 1, United States Code; and

“(II) includes any governmental entity.

“(iv) QUALIFIED FINANCIAL CONTRACT.—The term ‘qualified financial contract’ means any securities contract, commodity contract, forward contract, repurchase agreement, swap agreement, and any similar agreement that the Corporation determines by regulation, resolution, or order to be a qualified financial contract for purposes of this paragraph.

“(v) REPURCHASE AGREEMENT.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘repurchase agreement’ (including with respect to a reverse repurchase agreement)—

“(aa) means—

“(AA) an agreement, including related terms, which provides for the transfer of one or more certificates of deposit, mortgage-related securities (as such term is defined in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)), mortgage loans, interests in mortgage-related securities or mortgage loans, eligible bankers’ acceptances, qualified foreign government securities or securities that are direct obligations of, or that are fully guaranteed by, the United States or any agency of the United States against the transfer of funds by the transferee of such certificates of deposit, eligible bankers’ acceptances, securities, mortgage loans, or interests with a simultaneous agreement by such transferee to transfer to the transferor thereof certificates of deposit, eligible bankers’ acceptances, securities, mortgage loans, or interests as described above, at a date certain not later than 1 year after such transfers or on demand, against the transfer of funds, or any other similar agreement;

“(BB) any combination of agreements or transactions referred to in subitems (AA) and (CC);

“(CC) any option to enter into any agreement or transaction referred to in subitem (AA) or (BB);

“(DD) a master agreement that provides for an agreement or transaction referred to in subitem (AA), (BB), or (CC), together with all supplements to any such master agreement, without regard to whether the master agreement provides for an agreement or transaction that is not a repurchase agreement under this item, except that the master agreement shall be considered to be a repurchase agreement under this item only with respect to each agreement or transaction under the master agreement that is referred to in subitem (AA), (BB), or (CC); and

“(EE) any security agreement or arrangement or other credit enhancement related to any agreement or transaction referred to in any of subitems (AA) through (DD), including any guarantee or reimbursement obligation in connection with any agreement or transaction referred to in any such subitem; and

“(bb) does not include any repurchase obligation under a participation in a commercial mortgage, loan unless the Corporation determines by regulation, resolution, or order to include any such participation within the meaning of such term.

“(II) RELATED DEFINITION.—For purposes of subclause (I)(aa), the term ‘qualified foreign government security’ means a security that is a direct obligation of, or that is fully guaranteed by, the central government of a member of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (as determined by regulation or order adopted by the appropriate Federal banking authority).

“(vi) SECURITIES CONTRACT.—The term ‘securities contract’—

“(I) means—

“(aa) a contract for the purchase, sale, or loan of a security, a certificate of deposit, a mortgage loan, any interest in a mortgage loan, a group or index of securities, certificates of deposit, or mortgage loans or interests therein (including any interest therein or based on the value thereof) or any option on any of the foregoing, including any option to purchase or sell any such security, certificate of deposit, mortgage loan, interest, group or index, or option, and including any repurchase or reverse repurchase transaction on any such security, certificate of deposit,

mortgage loan, interest, group or index, or option (whether or not the repurchase or reverse repurchase transaction is a repurchase agreement);

“(bb) any option entered into on a national securities exchange relating to foreign currencies;

“(cc) the guarantee (including by novation) by or to any securities clearing agency of any settlement of cash, securities, certificates of deposit, mortgage loans or interests therein, group or index of securities, certificates of deposit, or mortgage loans or interests therein (including any interest therein or based on the value thereof) or option on any of the foregoing, including any option to purchase or sell any such security, certificate of deposit, mortgage loan, interest, group or index, or option (whether or not the settlement is in connection with any agreement or transaction referred to in any of items (aa), (bb), and (dd) through (kk));

“(dd) any margin loan;

“(ee) any extension of credit for the clearance or settlement of securities transactions;

“(ff) any loan transaction coupled with a securities collar transaction, any prepaid securities forward transaction, or any total return swap transaction coupled with a securities sale transaction;

“(gg) any other agreement or transaction that is similar to any agreement or transaction referred to in this subclause;

“(hh) any combination of the agreements or transactions referred to in this subclause;

“(ii) any option to enter into any agreement or transaction referred to in this subclause;

“(jj) a master agreement that provides for an agreement or transaction referred to in any of items (aa) through (ii), together with all supplements to any such master agreement, without regard to whether the master agreement provides for an agreement or transaction that is not a securities contract under this subclause, except that the master agreement shall be considered to be a securities contract under this subclause only with respect to each agreement or transaction under the master agreement that is referred to in item (aa), (bb), (cc), (dd), (ee), (ff), (gg), (hh), or (ii); and

“(kk) any security agreement or arrangement or other credit enhancement related to any agreement or transaction referred to in this subclause, including any guarantee or reimbursement obligation in connection with any agreement or transaction referred to in this subclause; and

“(II) does not include any purchase, sale, or repurchase obligation under a participation in a commercial mortgage loan unless the Corporation determines by regulation, resolution, or order to include any such agreement within the meaning of such term.

“(vii) SWAP AGREEMENT.—The term ‘swap agreement’ means—

“(I) any agreement, including the terms and conditions incorporated by reference in any such agreement, that is—

“(aa) an interest rate swap, option, future, or forward agreement, including a rate floor, rate cap, rate collar, cross-currency rate swap, and basis swap;

“(bb) a spot, same day-tomorrow, tomorrow-next, forward, or other foreign exchange precious metals or other commodity agreement;

“(cc) a currency swap, option, future, or forward agreement;

“(dd) an equity index or equity swap, option, future, or forward agreement;

“(ee) a debt index or debt swap, option, future, or forward agreement;

“(ff) a total return, credit spread or credit swap, option, future, or forward agreement;

“(gg) a commodity index or commodity swap, option, future, or forward agreement;

“(hh) a weather swap, option, future, or forward agreement;

“(ii) an emissions swap, option, future, or forward agreement; or

“(jj) an inflation swap, option, future, or forward agreement;

“(II) any agreement or transaction that is similar to any other agreement or transaction referred to in this clause and that is of a type that has been, is presently, or in the future becomes, the subject of recurrent dealings in the swap or other derivatives markets (including terms and conditions incorporated by reference in such agreement) and that is a forward, swap, future, option or spot transaction on one or more rates, currencies, commodities, equity securities or other equity instruments, debt securities or other debt instruments, quantitative measures associated with an occurrence, extent of an occurrence, or contingency associated with a financial, commercial, or economic consequence, or economic or financial indices or measures of economic or financial risk or value;

“(III) any combination of agreements or transactions referred to in this clause;

“(IV) any option to enter into any agreement or transaction referred to in this clause;

“(V) a master agreement that provides for an agreement or transaction referred to in any of subclauses (I) through (IV), together with all supplements to any such master agreement, without regard to whether the master agreement contains an agreement or transaction that is not a swap agreement under this clause, except that the master agreement shall be considered to be a swap agreement under this clause only with respect to each agreement or transaction under the master agreement that is referred to in subclause (I), (II), (III), or (IV); and

“(VI) any security agreement or arrangement or other credit enhancement related to any agreements or transactions referred to in any of subclauses (I) through (V), including any guarantee or reimbursement obligation in connection with any agreement or transaction referred to in any such subclause.

“(viii) TRANSFER.—The term ‘transfer’ means every mode, direct or indirect, absolute or conditional, voluntary or involuntary, of disposing of or parting with property or with an interest in property, including retention of title as a security interest and foreclosure of the equity of redemption of a System institution.

“(ix) TREATMENT OF MASTER AGREEMENT AS 1 AGREEMENT.—For purposes of this subparagraph—

“(I) any master agreement for any contract or agreement described in this subparagraph (or any master agreement for such a master agreement or agreements), together with all supplements to the master agreement, shall be treated as a single agreement and a single qualified financial contract; and

“(II) if a master agreement contains provisions relating to agreements or transactions that are not qualified financial contracts, the master agreement shall be deemed to be a qualified financial contract only with respect to those transactions that are themselves qualified financial contracts.

“(B) RIGHTS OF PARTIES TO CONTRACTS.—Subject to paragraphs (9) and (10), and notwithstanding any other provision of this Act (other than subsection (b)(9) and section 5.61(d)) or any other Federal or State law, no person shall be stayed or prohibited from exercising—

“(i) any right such person has to cause the termination, liquidation, or acceleration of any qualified financial contract with a Sys-

tem institution which arises upon the appointment of the Corporation as receiver for such System institution at any time after such appointment;

“(ii) any right under any security agreement or arrangement or other credit enhancement related to one or more qualified financial contracts described in clause (i); or

“(iii) any right to offset or net out any termination value, payment amount, or other transfer obligation arising under, or in connection with, 1 or more contracts and agreements described in clause (i), including any master agreement for such contracts or agreements.

“(C) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER PROVISIONS.—Subsection (b)(12) shall apply in the case of any judicial action or proceeding brought against any receiver referred to in subparagraph (A), or the System institution for which such receiver was appointed, by any party to a contract or agreement described in subparagraph (B)(i) with such System institution.

“(D) CERTAIN TRANSFERS NOT AVOIDABLE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (11) or any other Federal or State law relating to the avoidance of preferential or fraudulent transfers, the Corporation, whether acting as such or as conservator or receiver of a System institution, may not avoid any transfer of money or other property in connection with any qualified financial contract with a System institution.

“(ii) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN TRANSFERS.—Clause (i) shall not apply to any transfer of money or other property in connection with any qualified financial contract with a System institution if the Corporation determines that the transferee had actual intent to hinder, delay, or defraud such System institution, the creditors of such System institution, or any conservator or receiver appointed for such System institution.

“(E) CERTAIN PROTECTIONS IN EVENT OF APPOINTMENT OF CONSERVATOR.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act (other than subparagraph (G), paragraph (10), subsection (b)(9), and section 5.61(d)) or any other Federal or State law, no person shall be stayed or prohibited from exercising—

“(i) any right such person has to cause the termination, liquidation, or acceleration of any qualified financial contract with a System institution in a conservatorship based upon a default under such financial contract which is enforceable under applicable non-insolvency law;

“(ii) any right under any security agreement or arrangement or other credit enhancement related to one or more qualified financial contracts described in clause (i); and

“(iii) any right to offset or net out any termination values, payment amounts, or other transfer obligations arising under or in connection with such qualified financial contracts.

“(F) CLARIFICATION.—No provision of law shall be construed as limiting the right or power of the Corporation, or authorizing any court or agency to limit or delay, in any manner, the right or power of the Corporation to transfer any qualified financial contract in accordance with paragraphs (9) and (10) or to disaffirm or repudiate any such contract in accordance with paragraph (1).

“(G) WALKAWAY CLAUSES NOT EFFECTIVE.—

“(i) DEFINITION OF WALKAWAY CLAUSE.—In this subparagraph, the term ‘walkaway clause’ means any provision in a qualified financial contract that suspends, conditions, or extinguishes a payment obligation of a party, in whole or in part, or does not create a payment obligation of a party that would otherwise exist—

“(I) solely because of—

“(aa) the status of the party as a non-defaulting party in connection with the insolvency of a System institution that is a party to the contract; or

“(bb) the appointment of, or the exercise of rights or powers by, the Corporation as a conservator or receiver of the System institution; and

“(II) not as a result of the exercise by a party of any right to offset, setoff, or net obligations that exist under—

“(aa) the contract;

“(bb) any other contract between those parties; or

“(cc) applicable law.

“(ii) TREATMENT.—Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraphs (B) and (E), no walkaway clause shall be enforceable in a qualified financial contract of a System institution in default.

“(iii) LIMITED SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN OBLIGATIONS.—In the case of a qualified financial contract referred to in clause (ii), any payment or delivery obligations otherwise due from a party pursuant to the qualified financial contract shall be suspended from the time the receiver is appointed until the earlier of—

“(I) the time such party receives notice that such contract has been transferred pursuant to subparagraph (B); or

“(II) 5:00 p.m. (eastern time) on the business day following the date of the appointment of the receiver.

“(H) RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS.—The Corporation, in consultation with the Farm Credit Administration, may prescribe regulations requiring more detailed recordkeeping by any System institution with respect to qualified financial contracts (including market valuations), only if such System institution is subject to subclause (I), (III), or (IV) of section 5.61(b)(1)(A)(ii).

“(9) TRANSFER OF QUALIFIED FINANCIAL CONTRACTS.—

“(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

“(i) CLEARING ORGANIZATION.—The term ‘clearing organization’ has the meaning given the term in section 402 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act of 1991 (12 U.S.C. 4402).

“(ii) FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term ‘financial institution’ means a System institution, a broker or dealer, a depository institution, a futures commission merchant, or any other institution, as determined by the Corporation by regulation to be a financial institution.

“(B) REQUIREMENT.—In making any transfer of assets or liabilities of a System institution in default which includes any qualified financial contract, the conservator or receiver for such System institution shall either—

“(i) transfer to one financial institution, other than a financial institution for which a conservator, receiver, trustee in bankruptcy, or other legal custodian has been appointed, or that is otherwise the subject of a bankruptcy or insolvency proceeding—

“(I) all qualified financial contracts between any person or any affiliate of such person and the System institution in default;

“(II) all claims of such person or any affiliate of such person against such System institution under any such contract (other than any claim which, under the terms of any such contract, is subordinated to the claims of general unsecured creditors of such System institution);

“(III) all claims of such System institution against such person or any affiliate of such person under any such contract; and

“(IV) all property securing or any other credit enhancement for any contract described in subclause (I) or any claim described in subclause (II) or (III) under any such contract; or

“(ii) transfer none of the qualified financial contracts, claims, property or other credit enhancement referred to in clause (i) (with respect to such person and any affiliate of such person).

“(C) TRANSFER TO FOREIGN BANK, FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION, OR BRANCH OR AGENCY OF A FOREIGN BANK OR FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—In transferring any qualified financial contracts and related claims and property under subparagraph (B)(i), the conservator or receiver for the System institution shall not make such transfer to a foreign bank, financial institution organized under the laws of a foreign country, or a branch or agency of a foreign bank or financial institution unless, under the law applicable to such bank, financial institution, branch or agency, to the qualified financial contracts, and to any netting contract, any security agreement or arrangement or other credit enhancement related to one or more qualified financial contracts, the contractual rights of the parties to such qualified financial contracts, netting contracts, security agreements or arrangements, or other credit enhancements are enforceable substantially to the same extent as permitted under this section.

“(D) TRANSFER OF CONTRACTS SUBJECT TO THE RULES OF A CLEARING ORGANIZATION.—In the event that a conservator or receiver transfers any qualified financial contract and related claims, property, and credit enhancements pursuant to subparagraph (B)(i) and such contract is cleared by or subject to the rules of a clearing organization, the clearing organization shall not be required to accept the transferee as a member by virtue of the transfer.

“(10) NOTIFICATION OF TRANSFER.—

“(A) DEFINITION OF BUSINESS DAY.—In this paragraph, the term ‘business day’ means any day other than any Saturday, Sunday, or any day on which either the New York Stock Exchange or the Federal Reserve Bank of New York is closed.

“(B) NOTIFICATION.—If—

“(i) the conservator or receiver for a System institution in default makes any transfer of the assets and liabilities of such System institution; and

“(ii) the transfer includes any qualified financial contract, the conservator or receiver shall notify any person who is a party to any such contract of such transfer by 5:00 p.m. (eastern time) on the business day following the date of the appointment of the receiver in the case of a receivership, or the business day following such transfer in the case of a conservatorship.

“(C) CERTAIN RIGHTS NOT ENFORCEABLE.—

“(i) RECEIVERSHIP.—A person who is a party to a qualified financial contract with a System institution may not exercise any right that such person has to terminate, liquidate, or net such contract under paragraph (8)(B) of this subsection, solely by reason of or incidental to the appointment of a receiver for the System institution (or the insolvency or financial condition of the System institution for which the receiver has been appointed)—

“(I) until 5:00 p.m. (eastern time) on the business day following the date of the appointment of the receiver; or

“(II) after the person has received notice that the contract has been transferred pursuant to paragraph (9)(B).

“(ii) CONSERVATORSHIP.—A person who is a party to a qualified financial contract with a System institution may not exercise any right that such person has to terminate, liquidate, or net such contract under paragraph (8)(E) of this subsection, solely by reason of or incidental to the appointment of a conservator for the System institution (or the insolvency or financial condition of the Sys-

tem institution for which the conservator has been appointed).

“(iii) NOTICE.—For purposes of this paragraph, the Corporation as receiver or conservator of a System institution shall be deemed to have notified a person who is a party to a qualified financial contract with such System institution if the Corporation has taken steps reasonably calculated to provide notice to such person by the time specified in subparagraph (B).

“(D) TREATMENT OF BRIDGE SYSTEM INSTITUTIONS.—The following System institutions shall not be considered to be a financial institution for which a conservator, receiver, trustee in bankruptcy, or other legal custodian has been appointed or which is otherwise the subject of a bankruptcy or insolvency proceeding for purposes of paragraph (9):

“(i) A bridge System bank.

“(ii) A System institution organized by the Corporation or the Farm Credit Administration, for which a conservator is appointed either—

“(I) immediately upon the organization of the System institution; or

“(II) at the time of a purchase and assumption transaction between the System institution and the Corporation as receiver for a System institution in default.

“(11) DISAFFIRMANCE OR REPUDIATION OF QUALIFIED FINANCIAL CONTRACTS.—In exercising the rights of disaffirmance or repudiation of a conservator or receiver with respect to any qualified financial contract to which a System institution is a party, the conservator or receiver for such System institution shall either—

“(A) disaffirm or repudiate all qualified financial contracts between—

“(i) any person or any affiliate of such person; and

“(ii) the System institution in default; or

“(B) disaffirm or repudiate none of the qualified financial contracts referred to in subparagraph (A) (with respect to such person or any affiliate of such person).

“(12) CERTAIN SECURITY INTERESTS NOT AVOIDABLE.—No provision of this subsection shall be construed as permitting the avoidance of any legally enforceable or perfected security interest in any of the assets of any System institution except where such an interest is taken in contemplation of the System institution's insolvency or with the intent to hinder, delay, or defraud the System institution or the creditors of such System institution.

“(13) AUTHORITY TO ENFORCE CONTRACTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The conservator or receiver may enforce any contract, other than a director's or officer's liability insurance contract or a System institution bond, entered into by the System institution notwithstanding any provision of the contract providing for termination, default, acceleration, or exercise of rights upon, or solely by reason of, insolvency or the appointment of or the exercise of rights or powers by a conservator or receiver.

“(B) CERTAIN RIGHTS NOT AFFECTED.—No provision of this paragraph may be construed as impairing or affecting any right of the conservator or receiver to enforce or recover under a director's or officer's liability insurance contract or institution bond under other applicable law.

“(C) CONSENT REQUIREMENT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided by this section, no person may exercise any right or power to terminate, accelerate, or declare a default under any contract to which the System institution is a party, or to obtain possession of or exercise control over any property of the System institution or affect any contractual rights of the System institution, without the consent of the

conservator or receiver, as appropriate, during the 45-day period beginning on the date of the appointment of the conservator, or during the 90-day period beginning on the date of the appointment of the receiver, as applicable.

“(ii) CERTAIN EXCEPTIONS.—No provision of this subparagraph shall apply to a director or officer liability insurance contract or an institution bond, to the rights of parties to certain qualified financial contracts pursuant to paragraph (8), or shall be construed as permitting the conservator or receiver to fail to comply with otherwise enforceable provisions of such contract.

“(14) EXCEPTION FOR FEDERAL RESERVE AND THE UNITED STATES TREASURY.—No provision of this subsection shall apply with respect to—

“(A) any extension of credit from any Federal Reserve bank or the United States Treasury to any System institution; or

“(B) any security interest in the assets of the System institution securing any such extension of credit.

“(15) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—The meanings of terms used in this subsection—

“(A) are applicable for purposes of this subsection only; and

“(B) shall not be construed or applied so as to challenge or affect the characterization, definition, or treatment of any similar terms under any other law, regulation, or rule, including—

“(i) the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (12 U.S.C. 1811 note; Public Law 106-102);

“(ii) the Legal Certainty for Bank Products Act of 2000 (7 U.S.C. 27 et seq.);

“(iii) the securities laws (as that term is defined in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a))); and

“(iv) the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1 et seq.).

“(d) VALUATION OF CLAIMS IN DEFAULT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal law or the law of any State and regardless of the method which the Corporation determines to utilize with respect to a System institution in default or in danger of default, including transactions authorized under subsection (h) and section 5.61(a), this subsection shall govern the rights of the creditors of such System institution.

“(2) MAXIMUM LIABILITY.—The maximum liability of the Corporation, acting as receiver or in any other capacity, to any person having a claim against the receiver or the System institution for which such receiver is appointed shall equal the amount such claimant would have received if the Corporation had liquidated the assets and liabilities of such System institution without exercising the Corporation's authority under subsection (h) or section 5.61(a).

“(3) ADDITIONAL PAYMENTS AUTHORIZED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation may, in its discretion and in the interests of minimizing its losses, use its own resources to make additional payments or credit additional amounts to or with respect to or for the account of any claimant or category of claimants. Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal or State law, or the constitution of any State, the Corporation shall not be obligated, as a result of having made any such payment or credited any such amount to or with respect to or for the account of any claimant or category of claimants, to make payments to any other claimant or category of claimants.

“(B) MANNER OF PAYMENT.—The Corporation may make the payments or credit the amounts specified in subparagraph (A) directly to the claimants or may make such payments or credit such amounts to an open System institution to induce such System

institution to accept liability for such claims.

“(e) LIMITATION ON COURT ACTION.—Except as provided in this section, no court may take any action, except at the written request of the Board of Directors, to restrain or affect the exercise of powers or functions of the Corporation as a conservator or a receiver.

“(f) LIABILITY OF DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A director or officer of a System institution may be held personally liable for monetary damages in any civil action—

“(A) brought by, on behalf of, or at the request or direction of the Corporation;

“(B) prosecuted wholly or partially for the benefit of the Corporation—

“(i) acting as conservator or receiver of that System institution;

“(ii) acting based on a suit, claim, or cause of action purchased from, assigned by, or otherwise conveyed by that receiver or conservator; or

“(iii) acting based on a suit, claim, or cause of action purchased from, assigned by, or otherwise conveyed in whole or in part by a System institution or an affiliate of a System institution in connection with assistance provided under section 5.61(a); and

“(C) for, as determined under the applicable State law—

“(i) gross negligence; or

“(ii) any similar conduct, including conduct that demonstrates a greater disregard of a duty of care than gross negligence, such as intentional tortious conduct.

“(2) EFFECT.—Nothing in paragraph (1) impairs or affects any right of the Corporation under any other applicable law.

“(g) DAMAGES.—In any proceeding related to any claim against a System institution's director, officer, employee, agent, attorney, accountant, appraiser, or any other party employed by or providing services to a System institution, recoverable damages determined to result from the improvident or otherwise improper use or investment of any System institution's assets shall include principal losses and appropriate interest.

“(h) BRIDGE FARM CREDIT SYSTEM BANKS.—

“(1) ORGANIZATION.—

“(A) PURPOSE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—When 1 or more System banks are in default, or when the Corporation anticipates that 1 or more System banks may become in default, the Corporation may, in its discretion, organize, and the Farm Credit Administration may, in its discretion, charter, 1 or more System banks, with the powers and attributes of System banks, subject to the provisions of this subsection, to be referred to as ‘bridge System banks’.

“(ii) INTENT OF CONGRESS.—It is the intent of the Congress that, in order to prevent unnecessary hardship or losses to the customers of any System bank in default with respect to which a bridge System bank is chartered, the Corporation should—

“(I) continue to honor commitments made by the System bank in default to credit-worthy customers; and

“(II) not interrupt or terminate adequately secured loans which are transferred under this subsection and are being repaid by the debtor in accordance with the terms of the loan instrument.

“(B) AUTHORITIES.—Once chartered by the Farm Credit Administration, the bridge System bank may—

“(i) assume such liabilities of the System bank or banks in default or in danger of default as the Corporation may, in its discretion, determine to be appropriate;

“(ii) purchase such assets of the System bank or banks in default or in danger of de-

fault as the Corporation may, in its discretion, determine to be appropriate; and

“(iii) perform any other temporary function which the Corporation may, in its discretion, prescribe in accordance with this Act.

“(C) ARTICLES OF ASSOCIATION.—The articles of association and organization certificate of a bridge System bank as approved by the Corporation shall be executed by 3 representatives designated by the Corporation.

“(D) INTERIM DIRECTORS.—A bridge System bank shall have an interim board of directors consisting of not fewer than 5 nor more than 10 members appointed by the Corporation.

“(2) CHARTERING.—

“(A) CONDITIONS.—The Farm Credit Administration may charter a bridge System bank only if the Board of Directors determines that—

“(i) the amount which is reasonably necessary to operate such bridge System bank will not exceed the amount which is reasonably necessary to save the cost of liquidating 1 or more System banks in default or in danger of default with respect to which the bridge System bank is chartered;

“(ii) the continued operation of such System bank or banks in default or in danger of default with respect to which the bridge System bank is chartered is essential to provide adequate farm credit services in the 1 or more communities where each such System bank in default or in danger of default is or was providing those farm credit services; or

“(iii) the continued operation of such System bank or banks in default or in danger of default with respect to which the bridge System bank is chartered is in the best interest of the Farm Credit System or the public.

“(B) BRIDGE SYSTEM BANK TREATED AS BEING IN DEFAULT FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—A bridge System bank shall be treated as being in default at such times and for such purposes as the Corporation may, in its discretion, determine.

“(C) MANAGEMENT.—A bridge System bank, upon the granting of its charter, shall be under the management of a board of directors consisting of not fewer than 5 nor more than 10 members appointed by the Corporation, in consultation with the Farm Credit Administration.

“(D) BYLAWS.—The board of directors of a bridge System bank shall adopt such bylaws as may be approved by the Corporation.

“(3) TRANSFER OF ASSETS AND LIABILITIES.—

“(A) TRANSFER UPON GRANT OF CHARTER.—Upon the granting of a charter to a bridge System bank pursuant to this subsection, the Corporation, as receiver, may transfer any assets and liabilities of the System bank to the bridge System bank in accordance with paragraph (1).

“(B) SUBSEQUENT TRANSFERS.—At any time after a charter is granted to a bridge System bank, the Corporation, as receiver, may transfer any assets and liabilities of such System bank in default as the Corporation may, in its discretion, determine to be appropriate in accordance with paragraph (1).

“(C) EFFECTIVE WITHOUT APPROVAL.—The transfer of any assets or liabilities of a System bank in default or danger of default transferred to a bridge System bank shall be effective without any further approval under Federal or State law, assignment, or consent with respect thereto.

“(4) POWERS OF BRIDGE SYSTEM BANKS.—Each bridge System bank chartered under this subsection shall, to the extent described in the charter of the System bank in default with respect to which the bridge System bank is chartered, have all corporate powers of, and be subject to the same provisions of law as, any System bank, except that—

“(A) the Corporation may—

“(i) remove the interim directors and directors of a bridge System bank;

“(ii) fix the compensation of members of the interim board of directors and the board of directors and senior management, as determined by the Corporation in its discretion, of a bridge System bank; and

“(iii) waive any requirement established under Federal or State law which would otherwise be applicable with respect to directors of a bridge System bank, on the condition that the waiver of any requirement established by the Farm Credit Administration shall require the concurrence of the Farm Credit Administration;

“(B) the Corporation may indemnify the representatives for purposes of paragraph (1)(B) and the interim directors, directors, officers, employees, and agents of a bridge System bank on such terms as the Corporation determines to be appropriate;

“(C) no requirement under any provision of law relating to the capital of a System institution shall apply with respect to a bridge System bank;

“(D) the Farm Credit Administration Board may establish a limitation on the extent to which any person may become indebted to a bridge System bank without regard to the amount of the bridge System bank's capital or surplus;

“(E)(i) the board of directors of a bridge System bank shall elect a chairperson who may also serve in the position of chief executive officer, except that such person shall not serve either as chairperson or as chief executive officer without the prior approval of the Corporation; and

“(ii) the board of directors of a bridge System bank may appoint a chief executive officer who is not also the chairperson, except that such person shall not serve as chief executive officer without the prior approval of the Corporation;

“(F) the Farm Credit Administration may waive any requirement for a fidelity bond with respect to a bridge System bank at the request of the Corporation;

“(G) any judicial action to which a bridge System bank becomes a party by virtue of its acquisition of any assets or assumption of any liabilities of a System bank in default shall be stayed from further proceedings for a period of up to 45 days at the request of the bridge System bank;

“(H) no agreement which tends to diminish or defeat the right, title or interest of a bridge System bank in any asset of a System bank in default acquired by it shall be valid against the bridge System bank unless such agreement—

“(i) is in writing;

“(ii) was executed by such System bank in default and the person or persons claiming an adverse interest thereunder, including the obligor, contemporaneously with the acquisition of the asset by such System bank in default;

“(iii) was approved by the board of directors of such System bank in default or its loan committee, which approval shall be reflected in the minutes of said board or committee; and

“(iv) has been, continuously from the time of its execution, an official record of such System bank in default;

“(I) notwithstanding subsection 5.61(d)(2), any agreement relating to an extension of credit between a System bank, Federal Reserve bank, or the United States Treasury and any System institution which was executed before the extension of credit by such lender to such System institution shall be treated as having been executed contemporaneously with such extension of credit for purposes of subparagraph (H); and

“(J) except with the prior approval of the Corporation and the concurrence of the

Farm Credit Administration, a bridge System bank may not, in any transaction or series of transactions, issue capital stock or be a party to any merger, consolidation, disposition of substantially all of the assets or liabilities of the bridge System bank, sale or exchange of capital stock, or similar transaction, or change its charter.

“(5) CAPITAL.—

“(A) NO CAPITAL REQUIRED.—The Corporation shall not be required to—

“(i) issue any capital stock on behalf of a bridge System bank chartered under this subsection; or

“(ii) purchase any capital stock of a bridge System bank, except that notwithstanding any other provision of Federal or State law, the Corporation may purchase and retain capital stock of a bridge System bank in such amounts and on such terms as the Corporation, in its discretion, determines to be appropriate.

“(B) OPERATING FUNDS IN LIEU OF CAPITAL.—Upon the organization of a bridge System bank, and thereafter, as the Corporation may, in its discretion, determine to be necessary or advisable, the Corporation may make available to the bridge System bank, upon such terms and conditions and in such form and amounts as the Corporation may in its discretion determine, funds for the operation of the bridge System bank in lieu of capital.

“(C) AUTHORITY TO ISSUE CAPITAL STOCK.—Whenever the Farm Credit Administration Board determines it is advisable to do so, the Corporation shall cause capital stock of a bridge System bank to be issued and offered for sale in such amounts and on such terms and conditions as the Corporation may, in its discretion, determine.

“(6) EMPLOYEE STATUS.—Representatives for purposes of paragraph (1)(C), interim directors, directors, officers, employees, or agents of a bridge System bank are not, solely by virtue of service in any such capacity, officers or employees of the United States. Any employee of the Corporation, the Farm Credit Administration, or any Federal instrumentality who serves at the request of the Corporation as a representative for purposes of paragraph (1)(C), interim director, director, officer, employee, or agent of a bridge System bank shall not—

“(A) solely by virtue of service in any such capacity lose any existing status as an officer or employee of the United States for purposes of any provision of law; or

“(B) receive any salary or benefits for service in any such capacity with respect to a bridge System bank in addition to such salary or benefits as are obtained through employment with the Corporation or such Federal instrumentality.

“(7) ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Corporation may, in its discretion, provide assistance under section 5.61(a) to facilitate any merger or consolidation of a bridge System bank in the same manner and to the same extent as such assistance may be provided to a qualifying insured System bank (as defined in section 5.61(a)(2)(B)) or to facilitate a bridge System bank's acquisition of any assets or the assumption of any liabilities of a System bank in default or in danger of default.

“(8) DURATION OF BRIDGE SYSTEM BANKS.—Subject to paragraphs (10) and (11), the status of a bridge System bank as such shall terminate at the end of the 2-year period following the date it was granted a charter. The Farm Credit Administration Board may, in its discretion, extend the status of the bridge System bank as such for 3 additional 1-year periods.

“(9) TERMINATION OF BRIDGE SYSTEM BANKS STATUS.—The status of any bridge System

bank as such shall terminate upon the earliest of—

“(A) the merger or consolidation of the bridge System bank with a System institution that is not a bridge System bank, on the condition that the merger or consolidation shall be subject to the approval of the Farm Credit Administration;

“(B) at the election of the Corporation and with the approval of the Farm Credit Administration, the sale of a majority or all of the capital stock of the bridge System bank to a System institution or another bridge System bank;

“(C) at the election of the Corporation, and with the approval of the Farm Credit Administration, either the assumption of all or substantially all of the liabilities of the bridge System bank, or the acquisition of all or substantially all of the assets of the bridge System bank, by a System institution that is not a bridge System bank or other entity as permitted under applicable law; and

“(D) the expiration of the period provided in paragraph (8), or the earlier dissolution of the bridge System bank as provided in paragraph (11).

“(10) EFFECT OF TERMINATION EVENTS.—

“(A) MERGER OR CONSOLIDATION.—A bridge System bank that participates in a merger or consolidation as provided in paragraph (9)(A) shall be for all purposes a System institution, with all the rights, powers, and privileges thereof, and such merger or consolidation shall be conducted in accordance with, and shall have the effect provided in, the provisions of applicable law.

“(B) CHARTER CONVERSION.—Following the sale of a majority or all of the capital stock of the bridge System bank as provided in paragraph (9)(B), the Farm Credit Administration Board may amend the charter of the bridge System bank to reflect the termination of the status of the bridge System bank as such, whereupon the System bank shall remain a System bank, with all of the rights, powers, and privileges thereof, subject to all laws and regulations applicable thereto.

“(C) ASSUMPTION OF LIABILITIES AND SALE OF ASSETS.—Following the assumption of all or substantially all of the liabilities of the bridge System bank, or the sale of all or substantially all of the assets of the bridge System bank, as provided in paragraph (9)(C), at the election of the Corporation, the bridge System bank may retain its status as such for the period provided in paragraph (8).

“(D) AMENDMENTS TO CHARTER.—Following the consummation of a transaction described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of paragraph (9), the charter of the resulting System institution shall be amended by the Farm Credit Administration to reflect the termination of bridge System bank status, if appropriate.

“(11) DISSOLUTION OF BRIDGE SYSTEM BANK.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of State or Federal law, if the bridge System bank's status as such has not previously been terminated by the occurrence of an event specified in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of paragraph (9)—

“(i) the Corporation, after consultation with the Farm Credit Administration, may, in its discretion, dissolve a bridge System bank in accordance with this paragraph at any time; and

“(ii) the Corporation, after consultation with the Farm Credit Administration, shall promptly commence dissolution proceedings in accordance with this paragraph upon the expiration of the 2-year period following the date the bridge System bank was chartered, or any extension thereof, as provided in paragraph (8).

“(B) PROCEDURES.—The Farm Credit Administration Board shall appoint the Corporation as receiver for a bridge System bank upon determining to dissolve the bridge System bank. The Corporation as such receiver shall wind up the affairs of the bridge System bank in conformity with the provisions of law relating to the liquidation of closed System banks. With respect to any such bridge System bank, the Corporation as such receiver shall have all the rights, powers, and privileges granted by law to a receiver of any insured System bank and, notwithstanding any other provision of law in the exercise of such rights, powers, and privileges, the Corporation shall not be subject to the direction or supervision of any State agency or other Federal agency.

“(12) MULTIPLE BRIDGE SYSTEM BANKS.—The Corporation may, in the Corporation's discretion, organize, and the Farm Credit Administration may, in its discretion, charter, 2 or more bridge System banks under this subsection to assume any liabilities and purchase any assets of a single System institution in default.

“(i) CERTAIN SALES OF ASSETS PROHIBITED.—

“(1) PERSONS WHO ENGAGED IN IMPROPER CONDUCT WITH, OR CAUSED LOSSES TO, SYSTEM INSTITUTIONS.—The Corporation shall prescribe regulations which, at a minimum, shall prohibit the sale of assets of a failed System institution by the Corporation to—

“(A) any person who—

“(i) has defaulted, or was a member of a partnership or an officer or director of a corporation that has defaulted, on 1 or more obligations the aggregate amount of which exceed \$1,000,000, to such failed System institution;

“(ii) has been found to have engaged in fraudulent activity in connection with any obligation referred to in clause (i); and

“(iii) proposes to purchase any such asset in whole or in part through the use of the proceeds of a loan or advance of credit from the Corporation or from any System institution for which the Corporation has been appointed as conservator or receiver;

“(B) any person who participated, as an officer or director of such failed System institution or of any affiliate of such System institution, in a material way in transactions that resulted in a substantial loss to such failed System institution;

“(C) any person who has been removed from, or prohibited from participating in the affairs of, such failed System institution pursuant to any final enforcement action by the Farm Credit Administration;

“(D) any person who has demonstrated a pattern or practice of defalcation regarding obligations to such failed System institution; or

“(E) any person who is in default on any loan or other extension of credit from such failed System institution which, if not paid, will cause substantial loss to the System institution or the Corporation.

“(2) DEFAULTED DEBTORS.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), any person who is in default on any loan or other extension of credit from the System institution, which, if not paid, will cause substantial loss to the System institution or the Corporation, may not purchase any asset from the conservator or receiver.

“(3) SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the sale or transfer by the Corporation of any asset of any System institution to any person if the sale or transfer of the asset resolves or settles, or is part of the resolution or settlement, of—

“(A) 1 or more claims that have been, or could have been, asserted by the Corporation against the person; or

“(B) obligations owed by the person to any System institution, or the Corporation.

“(4) DEFINITION OF DEFAULT.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘default’ means a failure to comply with the terms of a loan or other obligation to such an extent that the property securing the obligation is foreclosed upon.

“(j) EXPEDITED PROCEDURES FOR CERTAIN CLAIMS.—

“(1) TIME FOR FILING NOTICE OF APPEAL.—The notice of appeal of any order, whether interlocutory or final, entered in any case brought by the Corporation against a System institution’s director, officer, employee, agent, attorney, accountant, or appraiser or any other person employed by or providing services to a System institution shall be filed not later than 30 days after the date of entry of the order. The hearing of the appeal shall be held not later than 120 days after the date of the notice of appeal. The appeal shall be decided not later than 180 days after the date of the notice of appeal.

“(2) SCHEDULING.—A court of the United States shall expedite the consideration of any case brought by the Corporation against a System institution’s director, officer, employee, agent, attorney, accountant, or appraiser or any other person employed by or providing services to a System institution. As far as practicable the court shall give such case priority on its docket.

“(3) JUDICIAL DISCRETION.—The court may modify the schedule and limitations stated in paragraphs (1) and (2) in a particular case, based on a specific finding that the ends of justice that would be served by making such a modification would outweigh the best interest of the public in having the case resolved expeditiously.

“(k) BOND NOT REQUIRED; AGENTS; FEE.—The Corporation as conservator or receiver of a System institution shall not be required to furnish bond and may appoint an agent or agents to assist in its duties as such conservator or receiver. All fees, compensation, and expenses of liquidation and administration shall be fixed by the Corporation and may be paid by it out of funds coming into its possession as such conservator or receiver.

“(l) CONSULTATION REGARDING CONSERVATORSHIPS AND RECEIVERSHIPS.—To the extent practicable—

“(1) the Farm Credit Administration shall consult with the Corporation prior to taking a preresolution action concerning a System institution that may result in a conservatorship or receivership; and

“(2) the Corporation, acting in the capacity of the Corporation as a conservator or receiver, shall consult with the Farm Credit Administration prior to taking any significant action impacting System institutions or service to System borrowers.

“(m) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall become applicable with respect to the power of the Corporation to act as a conservator or receiver on the date on which the Farm Credit Administration appoints the Corporation as a conservator or receiver under section 4.12 or 8.41.”

SEC. 5409. REPORTING.

(a) DEFINITION OF FARM LOAN.—In this section, the term “farm loan” means—

(1) a farm ownership loan under subtitle A of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1922 et seq.); and

(2) an operating loan under subtitle B of that Act (7 U.S.C. 1941 et seq.).

(b) REPORTS.—

(1) PREPARATION.—For each fiscal year, the Secretary shall prepare a report that includes—

(A) aggregate data based on a review of each outstanding farm loan made or guaranteed by the Secretary describing, for the United States and for each State and county in the United States—

(i) the age of the recipient producer;

(ii) the duration that the recipient producer has engaged in agricultural production;

(iii) the size of the farm or ranch of the recipient producer;

(iv) the race, ethnicity, and gender of the recipient producer;

(v) the agricultural commodity or commodities, or type of enterprise, for which the loan was secured;

(vi) the amount of the farm loan made or guaranteed;

(vii) the type of the farm loan made or guaranteed; and

(viii) the default rate of the farm loan made or guaranteed;

(B) for each State and county in the United States, data demonstrating the number of outstanding farm loans made or guaranteed, according to loan size cohort; and

(C) an assessment of actual loans made or guaranteed as measured against target participation rates for beginning and socially disadvantaged farmers, broken down by State, as described in sections 346(b)(2) and 355 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1994(b)(2), 2003).

(2) SUBMISSION OF REPORT.—The report described in paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) submitted—

(i) to—

(I) the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives;

(II) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives;

(III) the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate; and

(IV) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(ii) not later than December 30, 2018, and annually thereafter; and

(B) made publically available not later than 90 days after the date described in subparagraph (A)(ii).

(c) COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act (and every 5 years thereafter), the Secretary shall—

(A) prepare a comprehensive review of all reports submitted under subsection (b)(2);

(B) identify trends within data outlined in subsection (b)(1), including the extent to which target annual participation rates for beginning and socially disadvantaged farmers (as defined by the Secretary) are being met for each loan type; and

(C) provide specific actions the Department will take to improve the performance of direct and guaranteed loans with respect to underserved producers and any recommendations the Secretary may make for further congressional action.

(2) SUBMISSION OF COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW.—The comprehensive review described in paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) submitted to—

(i) the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives;

(ii) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives;

(iii) the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate; and

(iv) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) made publically available not later than 90 days after the date of submission under subparagraph (A).

(d) PRIVACY.—In preparing any report or review under this section, the Secretary shall aggregate or de-identify the data in a manner sufficient to ensure that the identity

of a recipient producer associated with the data cannot be ascertained.

SEC. 5410. SENSE OF THE SENATE.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) sections 346 and 355 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1994, 2003) reserve amounts to incentivize participation in Farm Service Agency loan programs for qualified beginning farmers and ranchers and socially disadvantaged farmers;

(2) under current law—

(A) for direct loans, 75 percent of the funding for farm ownership loans and 50 percent of operating loans are reserved for the first 11 months of the fiscal year; and

(B) for guaranteed loans, 40 percent of available funding is reserved for ownership loans and farm operating loans for the first ½ of the fiscal year; and

(3) all participants of the Farm Service Agency loan programs should strive to encourage beginning farmers and ranchers and socially disadvantaged farmers to use Farm Service Agency loans.

TITLE VI—RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Subtitle A—Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act

SEC. 6101. WATER, WASTE DISPOSAL, AND WASTEWATER FACILITY GRANTS.

Section 306(a)(2)(B) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(2)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (iii), by striking “\$100,000” each place it appears and inserting “\$200,000”; and

(2) in clause (vii), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 6102. RURAL WATER AND WASTEWATER TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING PROGRAMS.

Section 306(a)(14) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(14)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) in clause (ii), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in clause (iii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) identify options to enhance the long-term sustainability of rural water and waste systems, including operational practices, revenue enhancements, policy revisions, partnerships, consolidation, regionalization, or contract services.”;

(2) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) SELECTION PRIORITY.—In selecting recipients of grants to be made under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall give priority to—

“(i) private nonprofit organizations that have experience in providing the technical assistance and training described in subparagraph (A) to associations serving rural areas in which residents have low income and in which water supply systems or waste facilities are unhealthful; and

“(ii) recipients that will provide technical assistance and training programs to address the contamination of drinking water and surface water supplies by emerging contaminants, including per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances and perfluorooctanoic acid.”; and

(3) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by striking “1 nor more than 3” and inserting “3 percent and not more than 5”; and

(B) by striking “1 per centum” and inserting “3 percent”.

SEC. 6103. RURAL WATER AND WASTEWATER CIRCUIT RIDER PROGRAM.

Section 306(a)(22)(B) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(22)(B)) is amended by striking “\$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2014 and each fiscal year thereafter” and inserting “\$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023”.

SEC. 6104. TRIBAL COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ESSENTIAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES.

Section 306(a)(25)(C) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(25)(C)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 6105. COMMUNITY FACILITIES DIRECT LOANS AND GRANTS FOR SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER TREATMENT SERVICES.

Section 306(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(27) DIRECT LOANS AND GRANTS FOR SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER TREATMENT SERVICES.—

“(A) SELECTION PRIORITY.—In selecting recipients of loans or grants (not including loans guaranteed by the Secretary) for the development of essential community facilities under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to entities eligible for those loans or grants—

“(i) to develop facilities to provide substance use disorder (including opioid substance use disorder)—

“(I) prevention services;

“(II) treatment services;

“(III) recovery services; or

“(IV) any combination of those services; and

“(ii) that employ staff that have appropriate expertise and training in how to identify and treat individuals with substance use disorders.

“(B) USE OF FUNDS.—An eligible entity described in subparagraph (A) that receives a loan or grant described in that subparagraph may use the loan or grant funds for the development of telehealth facilities and systems to provide telehealth services for substance use disorder treatment.”.

SEC. 6106. EMERGENCY AND IMMINENT COMMUNITY WATER ASSISTANCE GRANT PROGRAM.

Section 306A of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “; and” and inserting the following: “, particularly to projects to address contamination that—

“(A) poses a threat to human health or the environment; and

“(B) was caused by circumstances beyond the control of the applicant for a grant, including circumstances that occurred over a period of time; and”;

(2) in subsection (f)(1), by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$1,000,000”;

(3) by redesignating subsection (i) as subsection (j);

(4) by inserting after subsection (h) the following:

“(i) INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE ON RURAL WATER QUALITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, the Secretary shall coordinate and chair an interagency task force to examine drinking water and surface water contamination in rural communities, particularly rural communities that are in close proximity to active or decommissioned military installations in the United States.

“(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The interagency task force shall consist of—

“(A) the Secretary;

“(B) the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers;

“(C) the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through—

“(i) the Director of the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry; and

“(ii) the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention;

“(D) the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;

“(E) the Secretary of the Interior, acting through—

“(i) the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service; and

“(ii) the Director of the United States Geological Survey;

“(F) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency; and

“(G) representatives from rural drinking and wastewater entities, State and community regulators, and appropriate scientific experts that reflect a diverse cross-section of the rural communities described in paragraph (1).

“(3) REPORT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 360 days after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, the task force shall submit to the committees described in subparagraph (B) a report that—

“(i) examines, and identifies issues relating to, water contamination in rural communities, particularly rural communities that are in close proximity to active or decommissioned military installations in the United States;

“(ii) reviews the extent to which Federal, State, and local government agencies coordinate with one another to address the issues identified under clause (i);

“(iii) recommends how Federal, State, and local government agencies can work together in the most effective, efficient, and cost-effective manner practicable, to address the issues identified under clause (i); and

“(iv) recommends changes to existing statutory requirements, regulatory requirements, or both, to improve interagency coordination and responsiveness to address the issues identified under clause (i).

“(B) COMMITTEES DESCRIBED.—The committees referred to in subparagraph (A) are—

“(i) the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives;

“(ii) the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate;

“(iii) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives;

“(iv) the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate;

“(v) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

“(vi) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.”; and

(5) in subsection (j) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “3 nor more than 5” and inserting “5 percent and not more than 7”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “\$35,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2018” and inserting “\$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023”.

SEC. 6107. WATER SYSTEMS FOR RURAL AND NATIVE VILLAGES IN ALASKA.

Section 306D of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “Alaska for” and inserting “Alaska, a consortium formed pursuant to section 325 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998 (Public Law 105-83; 111 Stat. 1597), and Native villages (as defined in section 3 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1602)) for”;

(2) in subsection (b), by inserting “for any grant awarded under subsection (a)” before the period at the end; and

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “Alaska” and inserting “Alaska, and not more than 2 percent of the amount made available under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year may be used by a consortium formed pursuant to section 325 of the Department of the Interior and Re-

lated Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998 (Public Law 105-83; 111 Stat. 1597).”.

SEC. 6108. RURAL DECENTRALIZED WATER SYSTEMS.

Section 306E of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926e) is amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and inserting “RURAL DECENTRALIZED WATER SYSTEMS”;

(2) in subsection (a), by striking “100” and inserting “60”;

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting “and subgrants” after “loans”; and

(ii) by inserting “and individually owned household decentralized wastewater systems” after “well systems”;

(B) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) TERMS AND AMOUNTS.—

“(A) TERMS OF LOANS.—A loan made with grant funds under this section—

“(i) shall have an interest rate of 1 percent; and

“(ii) shall have a term not to exceed 20 years.

“(B) AMOUNTS.—A loan or subgrant made with grant funds under this section shall not exceed \$15,000 for each water well system or decentralized wastewater system described in paragraph (1).”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) GROUND WELL WATER CONTAMINATION.—In the event of ground well water contamination, the Secretary shall allow a loan or subgrant to be made with grant funds under this section for the installation of water treatment where needed beyond the point of entry, with or without the installation of a new water well system.”;

(4) in subsection (c), by striking “productive use of individually-owned household water well systems” and inserting “effective use of individually owned household water well systems, individually owned household decentralized wastewater systems.”; and

(5) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking “\$5,000,000” and inserting “\$40,000,000”; and

(B) by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2019 through 2023”.

SEC. 6109. SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT GRANTS.

Section 310B(b)(2) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1932(b)(2)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 6110. RURAL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT GRANTS.

Section 310B(c)(4)(A) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1932(c)(4)(A)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 6111. RURAL COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT GRANTS.

Section 310B(e) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1932(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (10), by inserting “(including research and analysis based on data from the latest available Economic Census conducted by the Bureau of the Census)” after “conduct research”; and

(2) in paragraph (13), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 6112. LOCALLY OR REGIONALLY PRODUCED AGRICULTURAL FOOD PRODUCTS.

Section 310B(g)(9)(B)(iv)(I) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1932(g)(9)(B)(iv)(I)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 6113. APPROPRIATE TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER FOR RURAL AREAS PROGRAM.

Section 310B(i)(4) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1932(i)(4)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 6114. RURAL ECONOMIC AREA PARTNERSHIP ZONES.

Section 310B(j) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1932(j)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 6115. INTERMEDIARY RELENDING PROGRAM.

Section 310H of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1936b) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (i);

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

“(e) **LIMITATION ON LOAN AMOUNTS.**—The maximum amount of a loan by an eligible entity described in subsection (b) to individuals and entities for a project under subsection (c), including the unpaid balance of any existing loans, shall be the lesser of—

“(1) \$400,000; and

“(2) 50 percent of the loan to the eligible entity under subsection (a).

“(f) **APPLICATIONS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—To be eligible to receive a loan or loan guarantee under subsection (a), an eligible entity described in subsection (b) shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

“(2) **EVALUATION.**—In evaluating applications submitted under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

“(A)(i) take into consideration the previous performance of an eligible entity in carrying out projects under subsection (c); and

“(ii) in the case of satisfactory performance under clause (i), require the eligible entity to contribute less equity for subsequent loans without modifying the priority given to subsequent applications; and

“(B) in assigning priorities to applications, require an eligible entity to demonstrate that it has a governing or advisory board made up of business, civic, and community leaders who are representative of the communities of the service area, without limitation to the size of the service area.

“(g) **RETURN OF EQUITY.**—The Secretary shall establish a schedule that is consistent with the amortization schedules of the portfolio of loans made or guaranteed under subsection (a) for the return of any equity contribution made under this section by an eligible entity described in subsection (b), if the eligible entity is—

“(1) current on all principal and interest payments; and

“(2) in compliance with loan covenants.

“(h) **REGULATIONS.**—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations and establish procedures reducing the administrative requirements on eligible entities described in subsection (b), including regulations to carry out the amendments made to this section by the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018.”; and

(3) in subsection (i) (as so redesignated), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 6116. SINGLE APPLICATION FOR BROADBAND.

Section 331 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1981) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) **SINGLE APPLICATION FOR BROADBAND.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), notwithstanding any other provision of law, broadband facilities and broadband service (as defined in section 601(b) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 950bb(b)), may be funded as an incidental part of any grant, loan, or loan guarantee provided under this title or any other provision of law administered by the Secretary, acting through the rural development mission area.

“(2) **LIMITATION.**—Except as otherwise authorized by an Act of Congress, funding under paragraph (1) shall not constitute more than 10 percent of any loan for a fiscal year for any program under this title or any other provision of law administered by the Secretary, acting through the rural development mission area.

“(3) **COMPETITIVE HARM.**—The Secretary shall not provide funding under paragraph (1) if the funding would result in competitive harm to any existing grant, loan, or loan guarantee described in that paragraph.

“(4) **ELIGIBILITY.**—Funding under paragraph (1) shall be granted only for eligible projects described in section 601(d)(2) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 950bb(d)(2)).”.

SEC. 6117. LOAN GUARANTEE LOAN FEES.

(a) **CERTAIN PROGRAMS UNDER CONSOLIDATED FARM AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT.**—Section 333 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1983) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (6)(E), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) in the case of an insured or guaranteed loan issued or modified under section 306(a), charge and collect from the lender fees in such amounts as are necessary such that—

“(A) the sum of—

“(i) the total amount of fees so charged for each fiscal year; and

“(ii) the total of the amounts appropriated for the insured or guaranteed loans for the fiscal year; is equal to

“(B) the amount of the costs of subsidies for the insured or guaranteed loans for the fiscal year.”.

(b) **RURAL BROADBAND PROGRAM.**—Section 601(c) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 950bb(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **FEES.**—In the case of a loan guarantee issued or modified under this section, the Secretary shall charge and collect from the lender fees in such amounts as are necessary such that—

“(A) the sum of—

“(i) the total amount of fees so charged for each fiscal year; and

“(ii) the total of the amounts appropriated for the loan guarantees for the fiscal year; is equal to

“(B) the amount of the costs of subsidies for the loan guarantees for the fiscal year.”.

SEC. 6118. RURAL BUSINESS-COOPERATIVE SERVICE PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.

The Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act is amended by inserting after section 367 (as added by section 5305) the following:

“**SEC. 368. RURAL BUSINESS-COOPERATIVE SERVICE PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.**

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may make grants to public bodies, private nonprofit corporations, economic development authorities, institutions of higher education, federally recognized Indian Tribes, and rural cooperatives for the purpose of providing or obtaining technical assistance and training to support funding applications for programs carried out by the Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Rural Business-Cooperative Service.

“(b) **PURPOSES.**—A grant under subsection (a) may be used—

“(1) to assist communities in identifying and planning for business and economic development needs;

“(2) to identify public and private resources to finance business and small and emerging business needs;

“(3) to prepare reports and surveys necessary to request financial assistance for businesses in rural communities; and

“(4) to prepare applications for financial assistance.

“(c) **SELECTION PRIORITY.**—In selecting recipients of grants under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to grants serving persistent poverty counties and high poverty communities, as determined by the Secretary.

“(d) **FUNDING.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, to remain available until expended.

“(2) **AVAILABILITY.**—Any amounts authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (1) for any fiscal year that are not appropriated for that fiscal year may be appropriated for any succeeding fiscal year.”.

SEC. 6119. NATIONAL RURAL DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP.

Section 378 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2008m) is amended in subsections (g)(1) and (h) by striking “2018” each place it appears and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 6120. GRANTS FOR NOAA WEATHER RADIO TRANSMITTERS.

Section 379B(d) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2008p(d)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 6121. RURAL MICROENTREPRENEUR ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 379E of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2008s) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(4)(B)(ii)—

(A) in the clause heading, by striking “MAXIMUM AMOUNT” and inserting “AMOUNT”;

(B) by inserting “not less than 20 percent and” before “not more than 25 percent”; and

(C) by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “, subject to—

“(I) satisfactory performance by the microenterprise development organization under this section, and

“(II) the availability of funding.”; and

(2) in subsection (d)(2)—

(A) by striking “\$40,000,000” and inserting “\$20,000,000”; and

(B) by striking “2009 through 2018” and inserting “2019 through 2023”.

SEC. 6122. HEALTH CARE SERVICES.

Section 379G(e) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2008u(e)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 6123. STRATEGIC ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT.

Section 379H of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2008v) is amended to read as follows:

“**SEC. 379H. STRATEGIC ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT.**

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of any program under this title or administered by the Secretary, acting through the rural development mission area, as determined by the Secretary (referred to in this section as a ‘covered program’), the Secretary shall give priority to an application for a project that, as determined and approved by the Secretary—

“(1) meets the applicable eligibility requirements of this title or the other applicable authorizing law;

“(2) will be carried out in a rural area; and

“(3) supports the implementation of a strategic community investment plan described in subsection (d) on a multisectoral and multijurisdictional basis, to include considerations for improving and expanding broadband services as needed.

“(b) RESERVE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary shall reserve not more than 10 percent of the funds made available for a fiscal year for covered programs for projects that support the implementation of a strategic community investment plan described in subsection (d) on a multisectoral and multijurisdictional basis.

“(2) PERIOD.—Any funds reserved under paragraph (1) shall only be reserved for the 1-year period beginning on the date on which the funds were first made available, as determined by the Secretary.

“(c) APPROVED APPLICATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), any applicant who submitted an application under a covered program that was approved before the date of enactment of this section may amend the application to qualify for the funds reserved under subsection (b).

“(2) RURAL UTILITIES.—Any applicant who submitted an application under paragraph (2), (14), or (24) of section 306(a), or section 306A or 310B(b), that was approved by the Secretary before the date of enactment of this section shall be eligible for the funds reserved under subsection (b)—

“(A) on the same basis as an application submitted under this section; and

“(B) until September 30, 2019.

“(d) STRATEGIC COMMUNITY INVESTMENT PLANS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide assistance to rural communities in developing strategic community investment plans.

“(2) PLANS.—A strategic community investment plan described in paragraph (1) shall include—

“(A) a variety of activities designed to facilitate the vision of a rural community for the future, including considerations for improving and expanding broadband services as needed;

“(B) participation by multiple stakeholders, including local and regional partners;

“(C) leverage of applicable regional resources;

“(D) investment from strategic partners, such as—

“(i) private organizations;

“(ii) cooperatives;

“(iii) other government entities;

“(iv) Indian Tribes; and

“(v) philanthropic organizations;

“(E) clear objectives with the ability to establish measurable performance metrics;

“(F) action steps for implementation; and

“(G) any other elements necessary to ensure that the plan results in a comprehensive and strategic approach to rural economic development, as determined by the Secretary.

“(3) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate with Indian Tribes and local, State, regional, and Federal partners to develop strategic community investment plans under this subsection.

“(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, to remain available until expended.”

SEC. 6124. DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 382M(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2009aa-12(a)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

(b) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—Section 382N of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2009aa-13) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 6125. RURAL BUSINESS INVESTMENT PROGRAM.

Section 384S of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2009cc-18) is

amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

Subtitle B—Rural Electrification Act of 1936

SEC. 6201. ELECTRIC LOAN REFINANCING.

Section 2(a) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 902(a)) is amended by striking “loans in” and inserting “loans, or refinance loans made by the Secretary under this Act, in”.

SEC. 6202. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR RURAL ELECTRIFICATION LOANS.

Section 2 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 902) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, the Secretary shall enter into a memorandum of understanding with the Secretary of Energy under which the Secretary of Energy shall provide technical assistance to applicants for loans made under subsection (a) and section 4(a).

“(2) FORM OF ASSISTANCE.—The technical assistance that the Secretary may request pursuant to a memorandum of understanding entered into under paragraph (1) may include—

“(A) direct advice;

“(B) tools, maps, and training relating to—

“(i) the implementation of demand-side management of electric and telephone service in rural areas;

“(ii) energy efficiency and conservation programs; and

“(iii) on-grid and off-grid renewable energy systems; and

“(C) any other forms of assistance determined necessary by the Secretary.”

SEC. 6203. LOANS FOR TELEPHONE SERVICE.

Section 201 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 922) is amended—

(1) by striking the section designation and all that follows through “From such sums” and inserting the following:

“SEC. 201. LOANS FOR TELEPHONE SERVICE.

“From such sums”;

(2) in the second sentence, by striking “associations:” and all that follows through “same subscribers.” and inserting “associations.”; and

(3) in the sixth sentence, by striking “nor shall such loan” and all that follows through “writing” and inserting “and”.

SEC. 6204. CUSHION OF CREDIT PAYMENTS PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 313 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 940c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively;

(B) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) TERMINATION OF DEPOSIT AUTHORITY.—Effective October 1, 2018, no deposits may be made under paragraph (1).”; and

(C) in paragraph (3) (as so designated), by striking “borrower at a rate of 5 percent per annum.” and inserting the following: “borrower—

“(A) for each fiscal year through fiscal year 2018, at a rate of 5 percent; and

“(B) for fiscal year 2019 and each fiscal year thereafter, at a rate equal to—

“(i) the average interest rate used to make payments on the 5-year Treasury note for the most recent calendar quarter; but

“(ii) not greater than 5 percent.”;

(2) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”;

(ii) in clause (i) (as so designated), by striking “Fund to which shall be credited, on

a monthly basis,” and inserting the following: “Fund, to be known as the “rural economic development subaccount” (referred to in this paragraph as the “subaccount”).

“(ii) DIFFERENTIAL PAYMENTS.—For each month through September 2021, the Secretary shall credit to the subaccount”; and

(iii) in clause (ii) (as so designated), by striking “the 5 percent” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “5 percent.”;

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “is authorized, from the interest differential sums credited this subaccount” and inserting “shall, from interest differential sums credited under subparagraph (A)(ii) to the subaccount”; and

(ii) by striking “to provide” and inserting “provide”;

(C) in subparagraph (E), by striking “rural economic development”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) FUNDING.—

“(i) MANDATORY FUNDING.—Of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary shall credit to the subaccount to use for the cost of grants and loans under subparagraphs (B) through (E) \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 and 2023, to remain available until expended.

“(ii) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to other amounts available in the subaccount for the cost of grants and loans under subparagraphs (B) through (E), there is authorized to be appropriated to the subaccount for the cost of the grants and loans \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 and 2023, to remain available until expended.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 12(b)(3)(D) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 912(b)(3)(D)) is amended by striking “313(b)(2)(A)” and inserting “313(b)(2)(A)(ii)”.

(2) Section 313A of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 940c-1) is amended in subsections (c)(4)(A) and (e)(2) by striking “313(b)(2)(A)” each place it appears and inserting “313(b)(2)(A)(i)”.

SEC. 6205. GUARANTEES FOR BONDS AND NOTES ISSUED FOR ELECTRIFICATION OR TELEPHONE PURPOSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 313A of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 940c-1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “Subject to” and inserting the following:

“(1) GUARANTEES.—Subject to”;

(B) in paragraph (1) (as so designated), by striking “basis” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “basis, if the proceeds of the bonds or notes are used to make utility infrastructure loans, or refinance bonds or notes issued for those purposes, to a borrower that has at any time received, or is eligible to receive, a loan under this Act.”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) TERMS.—A bond or note guaranteed under this section shall, by agreement between the Secretary and the borrower—

“(A) be for a term of 30 years (or another term of years that the Secretary determines is appropriate); and

“(B) be repaid by the borrower—

“(i) in periodic installments of principal and interest;

“(ii) in periodic installments of interest and, at the end of the term of the bond or note, as applicable, by the repayment of the outstanding principal; or

“(iii) through a combination of the methods described in clauses (i) and (ii).”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “electrification” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “purposes described in subsection (a)(1).”;

(B) by striking paragraph (2);

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively; and

(D) in paragraph (2) (as so redesignated)—
(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “for electrification or telephone purposes” and inserting “for eligible purposes described in subsection (a)(1)”;

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “subsection (a)” and inserting “subsection (a)(1)”;

(3) in subsection (f), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—Beginning on the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, the Secretary shall continue to carry out section 313A of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 940c-1) (as amended by subsection (a)) under a Notice of Solicitation of Applications until the date on which any regulations necessary to carry out the amendments made by subsection (a) are fully implemented.

SEC. 6206. ACCESS TO BROADBAND TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES IN RURAL AREAS.

Section 601 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 950bb) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “loans and” and inserting “grants, loans, and”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “LOANS AND” and inserting “GRANTS, LOANS, AND”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by inserting “make grants and” after “Secretary shall”;

(C) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) PRIORITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In making grants, loans, or loan guarantees under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

“(i) give the highest priority to applications for projects to provide broadband service to unserved rural communities that do not have any residential broadband service;

“(ii) give priority to applications for projects to provide the maximum level of broadband service to the greatest proportion of rural households in the proposed service area identified in the application;

“(iii) give priority to applications for projects to provide rapid and expanded deployment of fixed and mobile broadband on cropland and rangeland within a service territory for use in various applications of precision agriculture;

“(iv) provide equal consideration to all eligible entities, including those that have not previously received grants, loans, or loan guarantees under paragraph (1); and

“(v) with respect to 2 or more applications that are given the same priority under clause (i), give priority to an application that requests less grant funding than loan funding.

“(B) OTHER.—After giving priority to the applications described in clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall then give priority to applications—

“(i) for projects to provide broadband service to rural communities—

“(I) with a population of less than 10,000 permanent residents;

“(II) that are experiencing outmigration and have adopted a strategic community investment plan under section 379H(d) that includes considerations for improving and expanding broadband service;

“(III) with a high percentage of low income families or persons (as defined in section 501(b) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1471(b)); or

“(IV) that are isolated from other significant population centers; and

“(ii) that were developed with the participation of, and will receive a substantial por-

tion of the funding for the project from, 1 or more stakeholders, including—

“(I) State, local, and tribal governments;

“(II) nonprofit institutions;

“(III) community anchor institutions, such as—

“(aa) public libraries;

“(bb) elementary schools and secondary schools (as defined in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801));

“(cc) institutions of higher education; and

“(dd) health care facilities;

“(IV) private entities; and

“(V) philanthropic organizations.

“(C) IDENTIFICATION OF UNSERVED COMMUNITIES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an application given the highest priority under subparagraph (A)(i), the Secretary shall confirm that each unserved rural community identified in the application is eligible for funding by—

“(I) conferring with and obtaining data from the Chair of the Federal Communications Commission and the Administrator of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration with respect to the service level in the service area proposed in the application;

“(II) reviewing any other source that is relevant to service data validation, as determined by the Secretary; and

“(III) performing site-specific testing to verify the unavailability of any residential broadband service in the unserved rural community.

“(ii) ADJUSTMENTS.—Not less often than once every 2 years, the Secretary shall review, and may adjust through notice published in the Federal Register, the unserved communities identified under clause (i).”;

(D) by redesignating paragraph (3) (as added by section 617(b)) as paragraph (4); and

(E) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) GRANT AMOUNTS.—

“(A) DEFINITION OF DEVELOPMENT COSTS.—In this paragraph, the term ‘development costs’ means costs of—

“(i) construction, including labor and materials;

“(ii) project applications; and

“(iii) other development activities, as determined by the Secretary.

“(B) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible for a grant under this section, the project that is the subject of the grant shall be carried out in a rural area.

“(C) MAXIMUM.—Except as provided in subparagraph (D), the amount of any grant made under this section shall not exceed 50 percent of the development costs of the project for which the grant is provided.

“(D) SECRETARIAL AUTHORITY TO ADJUST.—The Secretary may make grants of up to 75 percent of the development costs of the project for which the grant is provided to an eligible entity if the Secretary determines that the project serves—

“(i) an area of rural households described in paragraph (2)(A)(ii); and

“(ii) a rural community described in any of subclasses (I) through (IV) of paragraph (2)(B)(i).”;

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “loan or” and inserting “grant, loan, or”;

(II) in clause (ii), by striking “a loan application” and inserting “an application”;

(III) in clause (iii)—

(aa) by striking “service” and inserting “infrastructure”;

(bb) by striking “loan” the first place it appears;

(c) by striking “3” and inserting “5”; and

(dd) by striking “proceeds from the loan made or guaranteed under this section are” and inserting “assistance under this section is”;

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) RELATION TO UNIVERSAL SERVICE HIGH-COST SUPPORT.—The Secretary shall coordinate with the Federal Communications Commission to ensure that any grants, loans, or loan guarantees made under this section complement and do not conflict with universal service high-cost support (as defined in section 54.5 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation) provided by the Commission.”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(aa) by striking “the proceeds of a loan made or guaranteed” and inserting “assistance”;

(bb) by striking “for the loan or loan guarantee” and inserting “of the eligible entity”;

(II) in clause (i)—

(aa) by striking “15” and inserting “90”;

(bb) by striking “level of broadband service” and inserting “level of fixed broadband service, whether terrestrial or wireless.”;

(III) in clause (ii), by striking “3” and inserting “2”;

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

“(i) EXCEPTIONS.—Clause (i) shall not apply if the applicant is eligible for funding under another title of this Act.”;

(C) in paragraph (3), in subparagraph (A), by striking “loan or” and inserting “grant, loan, or”;

(D) in paragraph (4), by striking “loan or” and inserting “grant, loan, or”;

(E) in paragraph (5)(A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “loan or” and inserting “grant, loan, or”;

(F) in paragraph (6), by striking “loan or” and inserting “grant, loan, or”;

(G) by redesignating paragraph (7) as subparagraph (B) and indenting appropriately;

(H) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

“(7) APPLICATION PROCESS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide to an applicant of a grant, loan, or loan guarantee under this section feedback and decisions on funding in a timely manner.”;

(I) in paragraph (7)(B) (as so redesignated), by striking “may seek a determination of area eligibility prior to preparing a loan application under this section.” and inserting the following: “may, before preparing an application under this section—

“(i) seek a determination of area eligibility; and

“(ii) submit to the Secretary a proposal for a project, on which the Secretary shall provide feedback regarding how the proposal could be changed to improve the likelihood that the Secretary would approve the application.”;

(J) in paragraph (10)(A), by striking “15” and inserting “30”;

(K) by adding at the end the following:

“(11) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may provide eligible entities described in paragraph (1) that are applying for a grant, loan, or loan guarantee for a project described in subsection (c)(2)(A)(i) technical assistance and training—

“(i) to prepare reports and surveys necessary to request grants, loans, and loan guarantees under this section for broadband deployment;

“(ii) to improve management, including financial management, relating to the proposed broadband deployment;

“(iii) to prepare applications for grants, loans, and loan guarantees under this section; or

“(iv) to assist with other areas of need identified by the Secretary.

“(B) FUNDING.—Not less than 3 percent and not more than 5 percent of amounts appropriated to carry out this section for a fiscal year shall be used for technical assistance and training under this paragraph.”;

(4) in subsection (e)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “4-Mbps” and inserting “25-Mbps”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “1-Mbps” and inserting “3-Mbps”;

(5) in subsection (f), by striking “make a loan or loan guarantee” and inserting “provide assistance”;

(6) in subsection (j)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “loan and loan guarantee”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by inserting “grants and” after “number of”;

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “loan”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “loans and” and inserting “grants, loans, and”; and

(D) in paragraph (3), by striking “loan”;

(7) by redesignating subsections (k) and (l) as subsections (m) and (n), respectively;

(8) by inserting after subsection (j) the following:

“(k) BROADBAND BUILDOUT DATA.—As a condition of receiving a grant, loan, or loan guarantee under this section, a recipient of assistance shall provide to the Secretary complete, reliable, and precise geolocation information that indicates the location of new broadband service that is being provided or upgraded within the service territory supported by the grant, loan, or loan guarantee not later than 30 days after the earlier of—

“(1) the date of completion of any project milestone established by the Secretary; or

“(2) the date of completion of the project.

“(l) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS.—The Secretary may obligate, but not disperse, funds under this Act before the completion of otherwise required environmental, historical, or other types of reviews if the Secretary determines that a subsequent site-specific review shall be adequate and easily accomplished for the location of towers, poles, or other broadband facilities in the service area of the borrower without compromising the project or the required reviews.”;

(9) in subsection (m) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “\$25,000,000” and inserting “\$150,000,000”; and

(ii) by striking “2008 through 2018” and inserting “2019 through 2023”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(A)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) set aside at least 1 percent to be used for—

“(I) conducting oversight under this section; and

“(II) implementing accountability measures and related activities authorized under this section.”; and

(10) in subsection (n) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking “loan or” and inserting “grant, loan, or”; and

(B) by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 6207. COMMUNITY CONNECT GRANT PROGRAM.

Title VI of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 950bb et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 604. COMMUNITY CONNECT GRANT PROGRAM.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ELIGIBLE BROADBAND SERVICE.—The term ‘eligible broadband service’ means broadband service that has the capability to transmit data at a speed specified by the Secretary, which may not be less than the applicable minimum download and upload speeds established by the Federal Communications Commission in defining the term ‘advanced telecommunications capability’ for purposes of section 706 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (47 U.S.C. 1302).

“(2) ELIGIBLE SERVICE AREA.—The term ‘eligible service area’ means an area in which broadband service capacity is less than—

“(A) a 10-Mbps downstream transmission capacity; and

“(B) a 1-Mbps upstream transmission capacity.

“(3) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘eligible entity’ means a legally organized entity that—

“(i) is—

“(I) an incorporated organization;

“(II) an Indian Tribe or Tribal organization;

“(III) a State;

“(IV) a unit of local government; or

“(V) any other legal entity, including a cooperative, a private corporation, or a limited liability company, that is organized on a for-profit or a not-for-profit basis; and

“(ii) has the legal capacity and authority to enter into a contract, to comply with applicable Federal laws, and to own and operate broadband facilities, as proposed in the application submitted by the entity for a grant under the Program.

“(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term ‘eligible entity’ does not include—

“(i) an individual; or

“(ii) a partnership.

“(4) PROGRAM.—The term ‘Program’ means the Community Connect Grant Program established under subsection (b).

“(5) RURAL AREA.—The term ‘rural area’ has the meaning given the term in section 601(b)(3)(A).

“(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a program, to be known as the ‘Community Connect Grant Program’, to provide grants to eligible entities to finance broadband transmission in rural areas.

“(c) ELIGIBLE PROJECTS.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under the Program shall use the grant to carry out a project that—

“(1) provides eligible broadband service to, within the proposed eligible service area described in the application submitted by the eligible entity—

“(A) each essential community facility funded under section 306(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)); and

“(B) any required facilities necessary to offer that eligible broadband service to each residential and business customer; and

“(2) for not less than 2 years—

“(A) furnishes free wireless eligible broadband service to a community center described in subsection (d)(1)(B);

“(B) provides not fewer than 2 computer access points for that free wireless eligible broadband service; and

“(C) covers the cost of bandwidth to provide free eligible broadband service to each essential community facility funded under section 306(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)) within the proposed eligible service area described in the application submitted by the eligible entity.

“(d) USES OF GRANT FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under the Program may use the grant for—

“(A) the construction, acquisition, or leasing of facilities (including spectrum), land, or buildings to deploy eligible broadband service; and

“(B) the improvement, expansion, construction, or acquisition of a community center within the proposed eligible service area described in the application submitted by the eligible entity.

“(2) INELIGIBLE USES.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under the Program shall not use the grant for—

“(A) the duplication of any existing broadband service provided by another entity in the eligible service area; or

“(B) operating expenses, except as provided in—

“(i) subsection (c)(2)(C) with respect to free wireless eligible broadband service; and

“(ii) paragraph (1)(A) with respect to spectrum.

“(3) FREE ACCESS FOR COMMUNITY CENTERS.—Of the amounts provided to an eligible entity under a grant under the Program, the eligible entity shall use to carry out paragraph (1)(B) not greater than the lesser of—

“(A) 10 percent; and

“(B) \$150,000.

“(e) MATCHING FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under the Program shall provide a cash contribution in an amount that is not less than 15 percent of the amount of the grant.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—A cash contribution described in paragraph (1)—

“(A) shall be used solely for the project for which the eligible entity receives a grant under the Program; and

“(B) shall not include any Federal funds, unless a Federal statute specifically provides that those Federal funds may be considered to be from a non-Federal source.

“(f) APPLICATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant under the Program, an eligible entity shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

“(2) REQUIREMENT.—An application submitted by an eligible entity under paragraph (1) shall include documentation sufficient to demonstrate the availability of funds to satisfy the requirement of subsection (e).

“(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$50,000,000 for each fiscal year.”.

SEC. 6208. TRANSPARENCY IN THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE LOAN PROGRAM.

Title VI of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 950bb et seq.) (as amended by section 6207) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 605. TRANSPARENCY IN THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE LOAN PROGRAM.

“(a) PUBLIC NOTICE OF APPLICATIONS FOR ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register, and promptly make available to the public, a fully searchable database on the website of Rural Utilities Service that contains, at a minimum—

“(1) notice of each application for a loan from the Telecommunications Infrastructure Loan and Guarantee Program under this Act describing the application, including—

“(A) the identity of the applicant;

“(B) a description of the application, including—

“(i) each census block proposed to be served by the applicant; and

“(ii) the amount and type of support requested by the applicant;

“(C) the status of the application;

“(D) the estimated number and proportion of households in each census block under subparagraph (B)(i) that are without telecommunications service; and

“(E) a list of the census block groups, in a manner specified by the Secretary, to which the applicant proposes to provide service; and

“(2) notice of each borrower receiving assistance under the Telecommunications Infrastructure Loan and Guarantee Program under this Act, including—

“(A) the name of the borrower;

“(B) the type of assistance being received; and

“(C) the purpose for which the borrower is receiving the assistance; and

“(3) such other information as is sufficient to allow the public to understand the assistance provided under the Telecommunications Infrastructure Loan and Guarantee Program under this Act.

“(b) OPPORTUNITY FOR THE PUBLIC TO SUBMIT INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall, with respect to an application for a loan under the Telecommunications Infrastructure Loan and Guarantee Program under this Act—

“(1) for a period of not less than 15 days after the date on which the notice required by subsection (a)(1) is provided with respect to the application, provide an opportunity for an interested party to voluntarily submit information concerning the services that the party offers in the census blocks described in subsection (a)(1)(B)(i), such that the Secretary may assess whether approving the application would result in any duplication of lines, facilities, or systems that are providing reasonably adequate services; and

“(2) if no interested party submits information under paragraph (1), consider the number of providers in the census block group to be established by using broadband deployment data from the most recent Form 477 data collection of the Federal Communications Commission.”.

SEC. 6209. REFINANCING OF BROADBAND AND TELEPHONE LOANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 201 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 922) is amended, in the fifth sentence, by striking “furnishing telephone service in rural areas;” and all that follows through “40 per centum of any loan made under this title.” and inserting “furnishing telephone service in rural areas, including indebtedness of recipients on another telecommunications loan made under this Act.”.

(b) BROADBAND.—Section 601(i) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 950bb(i)) is amended by striking “Act if the use of” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “Act, or on any other loan if that loan would have been for an eligible purpose under this Act.”.

SEC. 6210. CYBERSECURITY AND GRID SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS.

Title III of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 931 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 319. CYBERSECURITY AND GRID SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS.

“(a) DEFINITION OF CYBERSECURITY AND GRID SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS.—In this section, the term ‘cybersecurity and grid security improvements’ means investment in the development, expansion, and modernization of rural utility infrastructure that addresses known cybersecurity and grid security risks.

“(b) LOANS AND LOAN GUARANTEES.—The Secretary may make or guarantee loans under this title and title I for cybersecurity and grid security improvements.”.

Subtitle C—Miscellaneous

SEC. 6301. DISTANCE LEARNING AND TELEMEDICINE.

(a) SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER TREATMENT SERVICES.—Section 2333(c) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 950aaa-2(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER TREATMENT SERVICES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall make available not less than 20 percent of amounts made available under section 2335A for financial assistance under this chapter for substance use disorder treatment services.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—In the case of a fiscal year for which the Secretary determines that there are not sufficient qualified applicants to receive financial assistance for substance use disorder treatment services to reach the 20-percent requirement under subparagraph (A), the Secretary may make available less than 20 percent of amounts made available under section 2335A for those services.”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 2335A of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 950aaa-5) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1(b) of Public Law 102-551 (7 U.S.C. 950aaa note) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 6302. RURAL ENERGY SAVINGS PROGRAM.

Section 6407 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8107a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2), by striking “efficiency,” and inserting “efficiency (including cost-effective on- or off-grid renewable energy or energy storage systems).”; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (7) as paragraphs (5) through (8), respectively;

(B) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) ELIGIBILITY FOR OTHER LOANS.—The Secretary shall not include any debt incurred by a borrower under this section in the calculation of the debt-equity ratio of the borrower for purposes of eligibility for loans under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 901 et seq.).”; and

(C) in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (5) (as so redesignated), by striking “(6)” and inserting “(7).”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(9) ACCOUNTING.—The Secretary shall take appropriate steps to streamline the accounting requirements on borrowers under this section while maintaining adequate assurances of the repayment of the loans.”;

(3) in subsection (d)(1)(A), by striking “3 percent” and inserting “6 percent”;

(4) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i);

(5) by inserting after subsection (g) the following:

“(h) PUBLICATION.—Not later than 120 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall publish a description of—

“(1) the number of applications received under this section for that fiscal year;

“(2) the number of loans made to eligible entities under this section for that fiscal year; and

“(3) the recipients of the loans described in paragraph (2).”; and

(6) in subsection (i) (as so redesignated), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 6303. RURAL HEALTH AND SAFETY EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 502(i) of the Rural Development Act of 1972 (7 U.S.C. 2662(i)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

“(5) SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER EDUCATION AND PREVENTION.—In making grants under this subsection, the Secretary shall give priority to an applicant that will use the grant for substance use disorder education, prevention, or treatment.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Title V of the Rural Development Act of 1972 (7 U.S.C. 2661 et seq.) (as amended by subsection (a)) is amended—

(1) in section 502, in the matter preceding subsection (a), by inserting “(referred to in this title as the ‘Secretary’)” after “Agriculture”; and

(2) by striking “Secretary of Agriculture” each place it appears (other than in section 502 in the matter preceding subsection (a)) and inserting “Secretary”.

SEC. 6304. NORTHERN BORDER REGIONAL COMMISSION REAUTHORIZATION.

(a) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF REGIONAL COMMISSIONS.—Section 15304(c)(3)(A) of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking “unanimous” and inserting “majority”.

(b) ECONOMIC AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT GRANTS.—Section 15501 of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (7), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (9); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

“(8) to grow the capacity for successful community economic development in its region; and”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “paragraphs (1) through (3)” and inserting “paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (7).”; and

(3) in subsection (f), by striking the period at the end and inserting “, except that financial assistance may be used as otherwise authorized by this subtitle to attract businesses to the region from outside the United States.”.

(c) STATE CAPACITY BUILDING GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) COMMISSION.—The term “Commission” means the Northern Border Regional Commission established by section 15301(a)(3) of title 40, United States Code.

(B) COMMISSION STATE.—The term “Commission State” means each of the States of Maine, New Hampshire, New York, and Vermont.

(C) ELIGIBLE COUNTY.—The term “eligible county” means a county described in section 15733 of title 40, United States Code.

(D) PROGRAM.—The term “program” means the State capacity building grant program established under paragraph (2).

(2) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall establish a State capacity building grant program to provide grants to Commission States to carry out the purpose under paragraph (3).

(3) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the program is to support the efforts of Commission States—

(A) to better support business retention and expansion in eligible counties;

(B) to create programs to encourage job creation and workforce development;

(C) to prepare economic and infrastructure plans for eligible counties;

(D) to expand access to high-speed broadband;

(E) to encourage initiatives that drive investments in transportation, water, wastewater, and other critical infrastructure;

(F) to create initiatives to increase the effectiveness of local or regional economic developers; and

(G) to implement new or innovative economic development practices that will better position the Commission States to compete in the global economy.

(4) USE OF FUNDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Funds from a grant under the program may be used to support a project, program, or expense of the Commission State in an eligible county.

(B) LIMITATION.—Funds from a grant under the program shall not be used for—

(i) the purchase of furniture, fixtures, or equipment; or

(ii) the compensation of—

(1) any State member of the Commission (as described in section 15301(b)(1)(B) of title 40, United States Code); or

(II) any State alternate member of the Commission (as described in section 15301(b)(2)(B) of title 40, United States Code).

(5) ANNUAL WORK PLAN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—For each fiscal year, before providing a grant under the program, each Commission State shall provide to the Commission an annual work plan that includes the proposed use of the grant.

(B) APPROVAL.—No grant under the program shall be provided to a Commission State unless the Commission has approved the annual work plan of the State.

(6) AMOUNT OF GRANT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The amount of a grant provided to a Commission State under the program shall be an amount equal to the share of the State of administrative expenses of the Commission for a fiscal year (as determined under section 15304(c) of title 40, United States Code).

(B) APPROVAL.—For each fiscal year, a grant provided under the program shall be approved and made available as part of the approval of the annual budget of the Commission.

(7) GRANT AVAILABILITY.—Funds from a grant under the program shall be available only during the fiscal year for which the grant is provided.

(8) REPORT.—Each fiscal year, each Commission State shall submit to the Commission and make publicly available a report that describes the use of the grant funds and the impact of the program in the State.

(9) FUNDING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as the Commission determines to be necessary, subject to the condition that the Commission may use not more than \$5,000,000 to carry out this subsection for any fiscal year.

(B) SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT.—Funds made available to carry out this subsection shall supplement and not supplant funds made available for the Commission and other activities of the Commission.

(d) NORTHERN BORDER REGIONAL COMMISSION.—Section 15733 of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting “Belknap,” before “Carroll,”; and

(B) by inserting “Cheshire,” before “Coos,”; and

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by inserting “Addison, Bennington,” before “Caledonia,”;

(B) by inserting “Chittenden,” before “Essex,”;

(C) by striking “and” and inserting “Orange,” and

(D) by inserting “, Rutland, Washington, Windham, and Windsor” after “Orleans”.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 15751(a) of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

(f) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Chapters 1, 2, 3, and 4 of subtitle V of title 40, United States Code, are redesignated as chapters 151, 153, 155, and 157, respectively.

TITLE VII—RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND RELATED MATTERS

Subtitle A—National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977

SEC. 7101. PURPOSES OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION.

Section 1402 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3101) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (8), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(9) support international collaboration that leverages resources and advances priority food and agricultural interests of the United States, such as—

“(A) addressing emerging plant and animal diseases;

“(B) improving crop varieties and animal breeds; and

“(C) developing safe, efficient, and nutritious food systems.”.

SEC. 7102. MATTERS RELATING TO CERTAIN SCHOOL DESIGNATIONS AND DECLARATIONS.

(a) STUDY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES.—Section 1404(14) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103(14)) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—

“(i) DEFINITION.—The terms ‘NLGCA Institution’ and ‘non-land-grant college of agriculture’ mean a public college or university offering a baccalaureate or higher degree in the study of agricultural sciences, forestry, or both in any area of study described in clause (ii).

“(ii) CLARIFICATION.—An area of study referred to in clause (i) may include any of the following:

“(I) Agriculture.

“(II) Agricultural business and management.

“(III) Agricultural economics.

“(IV) Agricultural mechanization.

“(V) Agricultural production operations.

“(VI) Aquaculture.

“(VII) Agricultural and food products processing.

“(VIII) Agricultural and domestic animal services.

“(IX) Equestrian or equine studies.

“(X) Applied horticulture or horticulture operations.

“(XI) Ornamental horticulture.

“(XII) Greenhouse operations and management.

“(XIII) Turf and turfgrass management.

“(XIV) Plant nursery operations and management.

“(XV) Floriculture or floristry operations and management.

“(XVI) International agriculture.

“(XVII) Agricultural public services.

“(XVIII) Agricultural and extension education services.

“(XIX) Agricultural communication or agricultural journalism.

“(XX) Animal sciences.

“(XXI) Food science.

“(XXII) Plant sciences.

“(XXIII) Soil sciences.

“(XXIV) Forestry.

“(XXV) Forest sciences and biology.

“(XXVI) Natural resources or conservation.

“(XXVII) Natural resources management and policy.

“(XXVIII) Natural resource economics.

“(XXXI) Urban forestry.

“(XXX) Wood science and wood products or pulp or paper technology.

“(XXXI) Range science and management.

“(XXXII) Agricultural engineering.

“(XXXIII) Any other area, as determined appropriate by the Secretary.”; and

(2) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “any institution designated under” after “include”;

(B) by striking clause (i); and

(C) in clause (ii)—

(i) by striking “(ii) any institution designated under—”;

(ii) by striking subclause (IV);

(iii) in subclause (II), by adding “or” at the end;

(iv) in subclause (III), by striking “; or” at the end and inserting a period; and

(v) by redesignating subclauses (I), (II), and (III) as clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively, and indenting appropriately.

(b) DESIGNATION REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish a process to review each designated NLGCA Institution (as defined in section 1404(14)(A) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103(14)(A))) to ensure compliance with that section (as amended by subsection (a)).

(2) VIOLATION.—If the Secretary determines under paragraph (1) that an NLGCA Institution is not in compliance with section 1404(14)(A) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103(14)(A)) (as amended by subsection (a)), the designation of that NLGCA Institution shall be revoked.

SEC. 7103. NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, EDUCATION, AND ECONOMICS ADVISORY BOARD.

Section 1408(h) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3123(h)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7104. CITRUS DISEASE SUBCOMMITTEE OF SPECIALTY CROP COMMITTEE.

Section 1408A(a)(2)(D) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3123a(a)(2)(D)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7105. VETERINARY SERVICES GRANT PROGRAM.

Section 1415B of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3151b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(2)—

(A) by striking “to qualified” and inserting the following: “to—

“(A) qualified”;

(B) in subparagraph (A) (as so designated), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) qualified entities for the purpose of exposing students in grades 11 and 12 to education and career opportunities in food animal medicine.”; and

(2) in subsection (h)—

(A) by striking the subsection designation and heading and inserting the following:

“(h) FUNDING.—

“(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—”;

(B) in paragraph (1) (as so designated), by striking “for fiscal year 2014 and each fiscal year thereafter” and inserting “for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2023”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) PRIORITY.—The Secretary shall award not less than ⅔ of amounts made available for grants under this section to qualified entities with a focus on food animal medicine.”.

SEC. 7106. GRANTS AND FELLOWSHIPS FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE SCIENCES EDUCATION.

Section 1417(m)(2) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3152(m)(2)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7107. RESEARCH EQUIPMENT GRANTS.

The National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 is amended by inserting after section 1418 (7 U.S.C. 3153) the following:

“SEC. 1419. RESEARCH EQUIPMENT GRANTS.

“(a) DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE INSTITUTION.—In this section, the term ‘eligible institution’ means—

“(1) an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a))); or

“(2) a State cooperative institution.

“(b) GRANTS.—The Secretary may award competitive grants to eligible institutions for the acquisition of special purpose scientific research equipment for use in the food and agricultural sciences programs of those institutions.

“(c) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The amount of a grant under subsection (b) shall not exceed \$500,000.

“(d) PROHIBITION ON CHARGE OF INDIRECT COSTS.—The cost of the acquisition or depreciation of equipment purchased with a grant under this section shall not be—

“(1) charged as an indirect cost against another Federal grant; or

“(2) included as part of the indirect cost pool for purposes of calculating the indirect cost rate of an eligible institution.

“(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”.

SEC. 7108. AGRICULTURAL AND FOOD POLICY RESEARCH CENTERS.

Section 1419A(e) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3155(e)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7109. EDUCATION GRANTS TO ALASKA NATIVE SERVING INSTITUTIONS AND NATIVE HAWAIIAN SERVING INSTITUTIONS.

Section 1419B of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3156) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(3), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7110. NEXT GENERATION AGRICULTURE TECHNOLOGY CHALLENGE.

Subtitle C of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3151 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1419C. NEXT GENERATION AGRICULTURE TECHNOLOGY CHALLENGE.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a next generation agriculture technology challenge competition to provide an incentive for the development of innovative mobile technology that removes barriers to entry in the marketplace for beginning farmers and ranchers (as defined in section 2501(a) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(a))).

“(b) AMOUNT.—The Secretary may award not more than \$1,000,000 in the aggregate to 1 or more winners of the competition under subsection (a).”.

SEC. 7111. NUTRITION EDUCATION PROGRAM.

Section 1425(f) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3175(f)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7112. AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR FEDERAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH FACILITIES.

Section 1431 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act Amendments of 1985 (Public Law 99-198; 99 Stat. 1556; 128 Stat. 900) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7113. CONTINUING ANIMAL HEALTH AND DISEASE RESEARCH PROGRAMS.

Section 1433(c)(1) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3195(c)(1)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7114. EXTENSION AT 1890 LAND-GRANT COLLEGES, INCLUDING TUSKEGEE UNIVERSITY; REPORT.

Section 1444 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3221) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (4); and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(g) REPORT.—The Secretary shall annually submit to Congress a report describing the allocations made to, and matching funds received by—

“(1) eligible institutions under this section; and

“(2) institutions designated under the Act of July 2, 1862 (commonly known as the ‘First Morrill Act’) (12 Stat. 503, chapter 130; 7 U.S.C. 301 et seq.).”.

SEC. 7115. REPORT ON AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AT 1890 LAND-GRANT COLLEGES, INCLUDING TUSKEGEE UNIVERSITY.

Section 1445 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3222) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) REPORT.—The Secretary shall annually submit to Congress a report describing the allocations made to, and matching funds received by—

“(1) eligible institutions under this section; and

“(2) institutions designated under the Act of July 2, 1862 (commonly known as the ‘First Morrill Act’) (12 Stat. 503, chapter 130; 7 U.S.C. 301 et seq.).”.

SEC. 7116. GRANTS TO UPGRADE AGRICULTURAL AND FOOD SCIENCES FACILITIES AT 1890 LAND-GRANT COLLEGES, INCLUDING TUSKEGEE UNIVERSITY.

Section 1447(b) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3222b(b)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7117. GRANTS TO UPGRADE AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SCIENCES FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT AT INSULAR AREA LAND-GRANT INSTITUTIONS.

Section 1447B(d) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3222b-2(d)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7118. NEW BEGINNING FOR TRIBAL STUDENTS.

Subtitle G of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3221 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1450. NEW BEGINNING FOR TRIBAL STUDENTS.

“(a) DEFINITION OF TRIBAL STUDENT.—In this section, the term ‘Tribal student’ means a student at a land-grant college or university that is a member of an Indian tribe (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304)).

“(b) NEW BEGINNING INITIATIVE.—

“(1) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary may make competitive grants to land-grant col-

leges and universities to provide identifiable support specifically targeted for Tribal students.

“(2) APPLICATION.—A land-grant college or university that desires to receive a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may require.

“(3) USE OF FUNDS.—A land-grant college or university that receives a grant under this section shall use the grant funds to support Tribal students through—

“(A) recruiting;

“(B) tuition and related fees;

“(C) experiential learning; and

“(D) student services, including—

“(i) tutoring;

“(ii) counseling;

“(iii) academic advising; and

“(iv) other student services that would increase the retention and graduation rate of Tribal students enrolled at the land-grant college or university, as determined by the Secretary.

“(4) MATCHING FUNDS.—A land-grant college or university that receives a grant under this section shall provide matching funds toward the cost of carrying out the activities described in this section in an amount equal to not less than 100 percent of the grant award.

“(5) MAXIMUM AMOUNT PER STATE.—No State shall receive, through grants made under this section to land-grant colleges and universities located in the State, more than \$500,000 per year.

“(c) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry and the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate a report that includes an itemized list of grant funds distributed under this section, including the specific form of assistance, and the number of Tribal students assisted and the graduation rate of Tribal students at land-grant colleges and universities receiving grants under this section.

“(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”.

SEC. 7119. HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTIONS.

Section 1455(c) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3241(c)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7120. BINATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

Section 1458(e) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3291(e)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “FULL PAYMENT OF FUNDS MADE AVAILABLE FOR CERTAIN” and inserting “CERTAIN”;

(2) by striking “Notwithstanding” and inserting the following:

“(1) FULL PAYMENT OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding”;

(3) in paragraph (1) (as so designated)—

(A) by striking “Israel-United States” and inserting “United States-Israel”; and

(B) by inserting “(referred to in this subsection as the ‘BARD Fund’)” after “Development Fund”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) ACTIVITIES.—Activities under the BARD Fund to promote and support agricultural research and development that are of mutual benefit to the United States and Israel shall—

“(A) be carried out by the Secretary in a manner consistent with this section;

“(B) accelerate the demonstration, development, and application of agricultural solutions resulting from or relating to BARD Fund programs, including BARD Fund-sponsored research and innovations in drip irrigation, pesticides, aquaculture, livestock, poultry, disease control, and farm equipment; and

“(C) encourage research carried out by governmental, nongovernmental, and private entities, including through collaboration with colleges and universities, research institutions, and the private sector.”

SEC. 7121. PARTNERSHIPS TO BUILD CAPACITY IN INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND TEACHING.

The National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 is amended by inserting after section 1458 (7 U.S.C. 3291) the following:

“SEC. 1458A. PARTNERSHIPS TO BUILD CAPACITY IN INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND TEACHING.

“(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to build the capacity, and improve the performance, of covered Institutions and agricultural higher education institutions in lower and middle income countries performing, or desiring to perform, activities substantially similar to agricultural research, extension, and teaching activities (referred to in this section as ‘agricultural higher education institutions in developing countries’) in order to solve food, health, nutrition, rural income, and environmental challenges, especially among chronically food insecure populations, including by—

“(1) promoting partnerships between covered Institutions and agricultural higher education institutions in developing countries; and

“(2) leveraging the capacity of covered Institutions to partner with agricultural higher education institutions in developing countries.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) 1862 INSTITUTION; 1890 INSTITUTION; 1994 INSTITUTION.—The terms ‘1862 Institution’, ‘1890 Institution’, and ‘1994 Institution’ have the meanings given the terms in section 2 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7601).

“(2) COVERED INSTITUTION.—The term ‘covered Institution’ means—

“(A) an 1862 Institution;

“(B) an 1890 Institution;

“(C) a 1994 Institution;

“(D) an NLGCA Institution;

“(E) an Hispanic-serving agricultural college or university; and

“(F) a cooperating forestry school.

“(c) AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY.—To carry out the purpose of this section, the Secretary may promote cooperation and coordination between covered Institutions and agricultural higher education institutions in developing countries through—

“(1) improving extension by—

“(A) encouraging the exchange of research materials and results between covered Institutions and agricultural higher education institutions in developing countries;

“(B) facilitating the broad dissemination of agricultural research through extension; and

“(C) assisting with efforts to plan and initiate extension services in lower and middle income countries;

“(2) improving agricultural research by—

“(A) in partnership with agricultural higher education institutions in developing countries, encouraging research that addresses problems affecting food production and security, human nutrition, agriculture, forestry, livestock, and fisheries, including local challenges; and

“(B) supporting and strengthening national agricultural research systems in lower and middle income countries;

“(3) supporting the participation of covered Institutions in programs of international organizations, such as the United Nations, the World Bank, regional development banks, and international agricultural research centers;

“(4) improving agricultural teaching and education by—

“(A) in partnership with agricultural higher education institutions in developing countries, supporting education and teaching relating to food and agricultural sciences, including technical assistance, degree training, research collaborations, classroom instruction, workforce training, and education programs; and

“(B) assisting with efforts to increase student capacity, including to encourage equitable access for women and other underserved populations, at agricultural higher education institutions in developing countries by promoting partnerships with, and improving the capacity of, covered Institutions;

“(5) assisting covered Institutions in strengthening their capacity for food, agricultural, and related research, extension, and teaching programs relevant to agricultural development activities in lower and middle income countries to promote the application of new technology to improve education delivery;

“(6) providing support for the internationalization of resident instruction programs of covered Institutions;

“(7) establishing a program, to be coordinated by the Director of the National Institute of Food and Agriculture and the Administrator of the Foreign Agricultural Service, to place interns from covered Institutions in, or in service to benefit, lower and middle income countries; and

“(8) establishing a program to provide fellowships to students at covered Institutions to study at foreign agricultural colleges and universities.

“(d) ENHANCING LINKAGES.—The Secretary shall enhance the linkages among covered Institutions, the Federal Government, international research centers, counterpart research, extension, and teaching agencies and institutions in developed countries and developing countries—

“(1) to carry out the purpose described in subsection (a); and

“(2) to make a substantial contribution to the cause of improved food and agricultural progress throughout the world.

“(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”

SEC. 7122. COMPETITIVE GRANTS FOR INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE AND EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

Section 1459A(c)(2) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3292b(c)(2)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7123. UNIVERSITY RESEARCH.

Section 1463 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3311) is amended by striking “2018” each place it appears in subsections (a) and (b) and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7124. EXTENSION SERVICE.

Section 1464 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3312) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7125. SUPPLEMENTAL AND ALTERNATIVE CROPS; HEMP.

Section 1473D of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3319d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”; and

(B) by striking “crops,” and inserting “crops (including canola).”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by inserting “for agronomic rotational purposes and as a habitat for honey bees and other pollinators” after “alternative crops”; and

(B) by striking “commodities whose” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “commodities.”;

(3) in subsection (c)(3)(E), by inserting “(including hemp (as defined in section 297A of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946))” after “material”; and

(4) in subsection (e)(2), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7126. NEW ERA RURAL TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM.

Section 1473E of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3319e) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)(B)—

(A) in clause (ii), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in clause (iii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) precision agriculture.”; and

(2) in subsection (d), by striking “2008 through 2012” and inserting “2019 through 2023”.

SEC. 7127. CAPACITY BUILDING GRANTS FOR NLGCA INSTITUTIONS.

Section 1473F(b) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3319i(b)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7128. AGRICULTURE ADVANCED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY PILOT.

Subtitle K of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3310 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1473H. AGRICULTURE ADVANCED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY PILOT.

“(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to promote advanced research and development through a pilot program targeting high-priority research needs for qualified products and projects, agricultural technologies, and research tools.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ADVANCED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—The term ‘advanced research and development’ means research and development activities used to overcome long-term and high-risk research challenges in agriculture and food through—

“(A) targeted acceleration of novel, early stage innovative agricultural research with promising technology applications and products; or

“(B) development of qualified products and projects, agricultural technologies, or innovative research tools, which may include—

“(i) prototype testing, preclinical development, or field experimental use;

“(ii) assessing and assisting with product approval, clearance, or need for a license under—

“(I) the Animal Health Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 8301 et seq.);

“(II) the Plant Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.); or

“(III) other applicable law; or

“(iii) manufacturing and commercialization of a product.

“(2) AGARDA.—The term ‘AGARDA’ means the Agriculture Advanced Research and Development Authority established by subsection (c)(1).

“(3) AGRICULTURAL TECHNOLOGY.—The term ‘agricultural technology’ means machinery and other equipment engineered for an applicable and novel use in agriculture, natural resources, and food relating to the research and development of qualified products and projects.

“(4) DIRECTOR.—The term ‘Director’ means the Director of the AGARDA.

“(5) FUND.—The term ‘Fund’ means the Agriculture Advanced Research and Development Fund established by subsection (e)(1).

“(6) OTHER TRANSACTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘other transaction’ means a transaction other than a procurement contract, grant, or cooperative agreement.

“(B) INCLUSION.—The term ‘other transaction’ includes a transaction described in subsection (c)(6)(A).

“(7) PERSON.—The term ‘person’ means—

- “(A) an individual;
- “(B) a partnership;
- “(C) a corporation;
- “(D) an association;
- “(E) an entity;
- “(F) a public or private corporation;
- “(G) a Federal, State, or local government agency or department; and

“(H) an institution of higher education, including a land-grant college or university and a non-land-grant college of agriculture.

“(8) QUALIFIED PRODUCT OR PROJECT.—The term ‘qualified product or project’ means advanced research and development of—

“(A) engineering, mechanization, or technology improvements that will address challenges relating to growing, harvesting, handling, processing, storing, packing, and distribution of agricultural products;

“(B) plant disease or plant pest recovery countermeasures to intentional or unintentional biological or natural threats, including—

- “(i) replacement or resistant plant cultivars or varieties;
- “(ii) other enhanced management strategies, including novel chemical, biological, or cultural approaches; or
- “(iii) diagnostic or surveillance technology; and

“(C) veterinary countermeasures to intentional or unintentional biological threats (including naturally occurring threats), including—

- “(i) animal vaccine or therapeutic products (including anti-infective products); or
- “(ii) diagnostic or surveillance technology.

“(9) RESEARCH TOOL.—The term ‘research tool’ means a device, technology, procedure, biological material, reagent, computer system, computer software, or analytical technique that is developed to assist in the discovery, development, or manufacture of a qualified product or project.

“(c) AGRICULTURE ADVANCED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Department of Agriculture the Agriculture Advanced Research and Development Authority to address long-term and high-risk challenges in the development of—

- “(A) qualified products and projects;
- “(B) agricultural technologies; and
- “(C) research tools.

“(2) GOALS.—The goals of the AGARDA are—

- “(A) to enhance the economic viability, security, and sustainability of agriculture to ensure that the United States is competitive and maintains a technological lead globally;
- “(B) to develop and deploy advanced solutions to prevent, prepare, and protect against unintentional and intentional

threats to agriculture and food in the United States;

“(C) to overcome the long-term and high-risk technological barriers in the development of agricultural technologies that enhance export competitiveness, environmental sustainability, and resilience to extreme weather; and

“(D) to ensure that the United States maintains a technological lead in developing and deploying advanced agricultural technologies that increase economic opportunities for farmers, ranchers, and rural communities.

“(3) LEADERSHIP.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The AGARDA shall be a component of the Office of the Chief Scientist.

“(B) DIRECTOR.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The AGARDA shall be headed by a Director, who shall be appointed by the Chief Scientist.

“(ii) QUALIFICATIONS.—The Director shall be an individual who, by reason of professional background and experience, is especially qualified to advise the Chief Scientist on, and manage research programs addressing, matters pertaining to—

- “(I) advanced research and development;
- “(II) qualified products and projects;
- “(III) agricultural technologies;
- “(IV) research tools; and
- “(V) long-term and high-risk challenges relating to the matters described in subclauses (I) through (IV).

“(iii) RELATIONSHIP WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.—The Director shall report to the Chief Scientist.

“(4) DUTIES.—To achieve the goals described in paragraph (2), the Secretary, acting through the Director, shall accelerate advanced research and development by—

- “(A) identifying and promoting revolutionary advances in fundamental sciences;
- “(B) translating scientific discoveries and cutting-edge inventions into technological innovations;

“(C) incubating and accelerating transformational advances in areas in which industry by itself is not likely to undertake advanced research and development because of the high-risk technological or financial uncertainty;

“(D) collaborating with Federal agencies, relevant industries, academia, international agencies, the Foundation for Food and Agriculture Research, and other persons to carry out the goals described in paragraph (2), including convening, at a minimum, annual meetings or working groups to demonstrate the operation and effectiveness of advanced research and development of qualified products and projects, agricultural technologies, and research tools;

“(E) conducting ongoing searches for, and support calls for, potential advanced research and development of agricultural technologies, qualified products and projects, and research tools;

“(F) awarding grants and entering into contracts, cooperative agreements, or other transactions under paragraph (6) for advanced research and development of agricultural technology, qualified products and projects, and research tools;

“(G) establishing issue-based multidisciplinary discovery teams to reduce the time and cost of solving specific problems that—

- “(i) are composed of representatives from Federal and State agencies, professional groups, academia, and industry;

“(ii) seek novel and effective solutions; and

“(iii) encourage data sharing and translation of research to field use; and

“(H) connecting interested persons with offices or employees authorized by the Secretary to advise those persons regarding requirements under relevant laws that impact

the development, commercialization, and technology transfer of qualified products and projects, agricultural technologies, and research tools.

“(5) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants and entering into contracts, cooperative agreements, or other transactions under paragraph (4)(F), the Secretary shall give priority to projects that accelerate the advanced research and development of—

“(A) new technologies to address critical research needs for specialty crops; and

“(B) qualified products and projects that prevent, protect, and prepare against intentional and unintentional threats to agriculture and food.

“(6) OTHER TRANSACTION AUTHORITIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the pilot program under this section, the Secretary shall have the authority to enter into other transactions in the same manner and subject to the same terms and conditions as transactions that the Secretary of Defense may enter into under section 2371 of title 10, United States Code.

“(B) SCOPE.—The authority of the Secretary to enter into contracts, cooperative agreements, and other transactions under this subsection shall be in addition to the authorities under this Act and title I of the Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1964 (7 U.S.C. 3318a), to use contracts, cooperative agreements, and grants in carrying out the pilot program under this section.

“(C) GUIDELINES.—The Secretary shall establish guidelines regarding the use of the authority under subparagraph (A).

“(D) TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER.—In entering into other transactions, the Secretary may negotiate terms for technology transfer in the same manner as a Federal laboratory under paragraphs (1) through (4) of section 12(b) of the Stevenson-Wyder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3710a(b)).

“(7) AVAILABILITY OF DATA.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall require that, as a condition of being awarded a contract or grant or entering into a cooperative agreement or other transaction under paragraph (4)(F), a person shall make available to the Secretary on an ongoing basis, and submit to the Secretary on request of the Secretary, all data relating to or resulting from the activities carried out by the person pursuant to this section.

“(B) EXEMPTION FROM DISCLOSURE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—This subparagraph shall be considered a statute described in section 552(b)(3)(B) of title 5, United States Code.

“(ii) EXEMPTION.—The following information shall be exempt from disclosure and withheld from the public:

“(I) Specific technical data or scientific information that is created or obtained under this section that reveals significant and not otherwise publicly known vulnerabilities of existing agriculture and food defenses against biological, chemical, nuclear, or radiological threats.

“(II) Trade secrets or commercial or financial information that is privileged or confidential (within the meaning of section 552(b)(4) of title 5, United States Code) and obtained in the conduct of research or as a result of activities under this section from a non-Federal party participating in a contract, grant, cooperative agreement, or other transaction under this section.

“(iii) REVIEW.—Information that results from research and development activities conducted under this section and that would be a trade secret or commercial or financial information that is privileged or confidential if the information had been obtained from a non-Federal party participating in a cooperative agreement or other transaction shall

be withheld from disclosure under clause (ii) for 5 years.

“(8) MILESTONE-BASED PAYMENTS ALLOWED.—In awarding contracts and grants and entering into cooperative agreements or other transactions under paragraph (4)(F), the Secretary may—

“(A) use milestone-based awards and payments; and

“(B) terminate a project for not meeting technical milestones.

“(9) USE OF EXISTING PERSONNEL AUTHORITIES.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary may appoint highly qualified individuals to scientific or professional positions on the same terms and conditions as provided in section 620(b)(4) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7657(b)(4)).

“(10) REPORT AND EVALUATION.—

“(A) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate an annual report examining the actions undertaken and results generated by the AGARDA.

“(B) EVALUATION.—After the date on which the AGARDA has been in operation for 3 years, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an evaluation—

“(i) to be completed and submitted to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate not later than 1 year after the date on which the Comptroller General began conducting the evaluation;

“(ii) describing the extent to which the AGARDA is achieving the goals described in paragraph (2); and

“(iii) including a recommendation on whether the AGARDA should be continued, terminated, or expanded.

“(d) STRATEGIC PLAN.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 360 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall develop and make publicly available a strategic plan describing the strategic vision that the AGARDA shall use—

“(A) to make determinations for future investments during the period of effectiveness of this section; and

“(B) to achieve the goals described in subsection (c)(2).

“(2) DISSEMINATION.—The Secretary shall carry out such activities as the Secretary determines to be appropriate to disseminate the information contained in the strategic plan under paragraph (1) to persons who may have the capacity to substantially contribute to the activities described in that strategic plan.

“(3) COORDINATION; CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall—

“(A) update and coordinate the strategic coordination plan under section 221(d)(7) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 with the strategic plan developed under paragraph (1) for activities relating to agriculture and food defense countermeasure development and procurement; and

“(B) in developing the strategic plan under paragraph (1), consult with—

“(i) the National Agricultural Research, Extension, Education, and Economics Advisory Board established under section 1408(a);

“(ii) the specialty crops committee established under section 1408A(a)(1);

“(iii) relevant agriculture research agencies of the Federal Government;

“(iv) the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine;

“(v) the National Veterinary Stockpile Intra-Government Advisory Committee for Strategic Steering; and

“(vi) other appropriate parties, as determined by the Secretary.

“(e) FUNDS.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury the Agriculture Advanced Research and Development Fund, which shall be administered by the Secretary, acting through the Director—

“(A) for the purpose of carrying out this section; and

“(B) in the same manner and subject to the same terms and conditions as are applicable to the Secretary of Defense under section 2371 of title 10, United States Code.

“(2) DEPOSITS INTO FUND.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Director, may accept and deposit into the Fund monies received pursuant to cost recovery or contribution under a contract, grant, cooperative agreement, or other transaction under this section.

“(B) CLARIFICATION.—Nothing in this paragraph authorizes the use of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out this section.

“(3) FUNDING.—In addition to funds otherwise deposited in the Fund under paragraph (1) or (2), there is authorized to be appropriated to the Fund \$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, to remain available until expended.

“(f) TERMINATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.—The authority provided by this section terminates effective September 30, 2023.”.

SEC. 7129. AQUACULTURE ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

Section 1477(a)(2) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3324(a)(2)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7130. REPEAL OF RANGELAND RESEARCH PROGRAMS.

Subtitle M of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3331 et seq.) is repealed.

SEC. 7131. SPECIAL AUTHORIZATION FOR BIOSECURITY PLANNING AND RESPONSE.

Section 1484(a)(2) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3351(a)(2)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7132. DISTANCE EDUCATION AND RESIDENT INSTRUCTION GRANTS PROGRAM FOR INSULAR AREA INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

(a) DISTANCE EDUCATION GRANTS FOR INSULAR AREAS.—Section 1490(f)(2) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3362(f)(2)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

(b) RESIDENT INSTRUCTION GRANTS FOR INSULAR AREAS.—Section 1491(c)(2) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3363(c)(2)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7133. LIMITATION ON DESIGNATION OF ENTITIES ELIGIBLE TO RECEIVE FUNDS UNDER A CAPACITY PROGRAM.

Subtitle P of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3371 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1493. LIMITATION ON DESIGNATION OF ENTITIES ELIGIBLE TO RECEIVE FUNDS UNDER A CAPACITY PROGRAM.

“(a) DEFINITION OF CAPACITY PROGRAM.—In this section, the term ‘capacity program’ means each of the following agricultural research, extension, education, and related programs:

“(1) The programs for which funds are made available under subsections (b) and (c)

of section 3 of the Smith-Lever Act (7 U.S.C. 343).

“(2) The program for which funds are made available under the Hatch Act of 1887 (7 U.S.C. 361a et seq.).

“(3) The program for which funds are made available under section 1444.

“(4) The program for which funds are made available under section 1445.

“(5) The grant program authorized under section 1447.

“(6) The program for which funds are made available under Public Law 87-788 (commonly known as the ‘McIntire-Stennis Cooperative Forestry Act’) (16 U.S.C. 582a et seq.).

“(7) Any other agricultural research, extension, or education program relating to capacity and infrastructure, as determined by the Secretary.

“(b) LIMITATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under paragraph (2), and notwithstanding any other provision of law, no additional entity designated after the date of enactment of this section shall be eligible to receive funds under a capacity program.

“(2) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(A) 1994 INSTITUTIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply in the case of a designation of a 1994 Institution under section 2 of Public Law 87-788 (commonly known as the ‘McIntire-Stennis Cooperative Forestry Act’) (16 U.S.C. 582a-1).

“(B) EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES.—In the case of extraordinary circumstances or a situation that would lead to an inequitable result, as determined by the Secretary, the Secretary may determine that an entity designated after the date of enactment of this section is eligible to receive funds under a capacity program.

“(c) NO INCREASE IN STATE FUNDING.—No State shall receive an increase in the amount of capacity program funding as a result of the designation of additional entities as eligible to receive funds under a capacity program.”.

SEC. 7134. SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM FOR STUDENTS ATTENDING 1890 INSTITUTIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Act of August 30, 1890 (commonly known as the “Second Morrill Act”) (26 Stat. 417, chapter 841; 7 U.S.C. 321 et seq.), brought about the establishment of the following 19 public, African-American land-grant colleges and universities:

- (A) Alabama A&M University.
- (B) Alcorn State University.
- (C) Central State University.
- (D) Delaware State University.
- (E) Florida A&M University.
- (F) Fort Valley State University.
- (G) Kentucky State University.
- (H) Langston University.
- (I) Lincoln University.
- (J) North Carolina A&T State University.
- (K) Prairie View A&M University.
- (L) South Carolina State University.
- (M) Southern University System.
- (N) Tennessee State University.
- (O) Tuskegee University.
- (P) University of Arkansas Pine Bluff.
- (Q) University of Maryland Eastern Shore.
- (R) Virginia State University.
- (S) West Virginia State University.

(2) Funding for agricultural education, research, and extension at the colleges and universities described in paragraph (1) is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Agriculture with each farm bill, which is enacted approximately every 5 years.

(3) The Agricultural Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-79; 128 Stat. 649) authorizes the appropriation of Federal funds for research, education, and extension activities at the

colleges and universities described in paragraph (1) and the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016 (Public Law 114-113; 129 Stat. 2245) appropriated \$19,000,000 for education grants for the colleges and universities described in paragraph (1).

(4) There is a great need to increase the number of young African-Americans seeking careers in the food and agricultural sciences (as defined in section 1404 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103)), including agribusiness, food production, distribution, and retailing, the clothing industries, energy and renewable fuels, and farming marketing, finance, and distribution.

(5) Scholarship funding provided to increase the number of young African-American individuals seeking a career in the food and agricultural sciences shall be provided with the caveat that those scholarship students shall commit to pursue a career in the food and agricultural sciences, including agribusiness, food production, distribution, and retailing, the clothing industries, energy and renewable fuels, and farming marketing, finance, and distribution.

(6) The average age of farmers and producers in the United States is 60 years of age and continues to rise.

(7) Beginning farmers and ranchers (as defined in section 7405 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 3319f)) need greater assistance in the financing of their education because of the increased startup costs associated with farming, such as the purchase of land and farming equipment.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section and the amendment made by this section are—

(1) to address the national crisis posed by the aging farmer and producer population in the United States;

(2) to increase the number of young African-American individuals seeking a career in the food and agricultural sciences (as defined in section 1404 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103)), including careers in agribusiness, food production, distribution, and retailing, the clothing industries, energy and renewable fuels, and farming marketing, finance, and distribution;

(3) to reduce the average age of farmers and producers in the United States;

(4) to provide greater assistance to beginning farmers and ranchers (as defined in section 7405 of Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 3319f)); and

(5) to provide scholarships to 1890 land-grant students seeking careers in the food and agricultural sciences.

(c) SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM FOR STUDENTS ATTENDING 1890-INSTITUTIONS.—Subtitle G of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3221 et seq.) (as amended by section 7118) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1451. SCHOLARSHIPS FOR STUDENTS AT 1890 LAND-GRANT COLLEGES, INCLUDING TUSKEGEE UNIVERSITY.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a grant program under which the Secretary shall award a grant to each 1890 Institution (as defined in section 2 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7601)) (referred to in this section as an ‘eligible institution’), to award scholarships to individuals who—

“(1) seek to attend the eligible institution; and

“(2) intend to pursue a career in the food and agricultural sciences, including a career

in agribusiness, food production, distribution, and retailing, the clothing industries, energy and renewable fuels, and farming marketing, finance, and distribution.

“(b) FUNDING.—

“(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$19,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.

“(2) ALLOCATION.—Of the funds made available under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall allocate to each eligible institution \$1,000,000.”

Subtitle B—Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990

SEC. 7201. BEST UTILIZATION OF BIOLOGICAL APPLICATIONS.

Section 1624 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5814) is amended in the first sentence by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7202. INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS.

Section 1627(d) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5821(d)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7203. SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFER PROGRAM.

Section 1628(f)(2) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5831(f)(2)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7204. NATIONAL TRAINING PROGRAM.

Section 1629(i) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5832(i)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7205. NATIONAL STRATEGIC GERmplasm AND CULTIVAR COLLECTION ASSESSMENT AND UTILIZATION PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1632(d) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5841(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (7); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following:

“(6) develop and implement a national strategic germplasm and cultivar collection assessment and utilization plan that takes into consideration the resources and research necessary to address the significant backlog of characterization and maintenance of existing accessions considered to be critical to preserve the viability of, and public access to, germplasm and cultivars; and”.

(b) PLAN PUBLICATION.—Section 1633 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5842) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) PLAN PUBLICATION.—On completion of the development of the plan described in section 1632(d)(6), the Secretary shall make the plan available to the public.”.

SEC. 7206. NATIONAL GENETICS RESOURCES PROGRAM.

(a) ADVISORY COUNCIL.—Section 1634 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5843) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”;

(B) in the second sentence of paragraph (1) (as so designated), by striking “The advisory” and inserting the following:

“(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The advisory”;

(C) in paragraph (2) (as so designated), by striking “nine” and inserting “13”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) RECOMMENDATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In making recommendations under paragraph (1), the advisory council shall include recommendations on—

“(i) the state of public cultivar development, including—

“(I) an analysis of existing cultivar research investments;

“(II) the research gaps relating to the development of cultivars across a diverse range of crops; and

“(III) an assessment of the state of commercialization of federally funded cultivars;

“(ii) the training and resources needed to meet future breeding challenges;

“(iii) the appropriate levels of Federal funding for cultivar development for under-served crops and geographic areas; and

“(iv) the development of the plan described in section 1632(d)(6).”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “Two-thirds” and inserting “6”; and

(ii) by inserting “economics and policy,” after “agricultural sciences.”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “One-third” and inserting “3”; and

(ii) by inserting “community development,” after “public policy.”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) 4 of the members shall be appointed from among individuals with expertise in public cultivar and animal breed development.

“(4) 4 of the members shall be appointed from among individuals representing—

“(A) 1862 Institutions (as defined in section 2 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7601));

“(B) 1890 Institutions (as defined in section 2 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7601));

“(C) eligible institutions (as defined in section 502(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1101a(a))); or

“(D) 1994 Institutions (as defined in section 532 of the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 301 note; Public Law 103-382)).”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1635(b)(2) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5844(b)(2)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7207. NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL WEATHER INFORMATION SYSTEM.

Section 1641(c) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5855(c)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7208. AGRICULTURAL GENOME TO PHENOME INITIATIVE.

Section 1671 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5924) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by inserting “TO PHENOME” after “GENOME”;

(2) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) GOALS.—The goals of this section are—

“(1) to expand knowledge concerning genomes and phenomes of crops and animals of importance to the agriculture sector of the United States;

“(2) to understand how variable weather, environments, and production systems impact the growth and productivity of specific varieties of crops and species of animals in order to provide greater accuracy in predicting crop and animal performance under variable conditions;

“(3) to support research that leverages plant and animal genomic information with phenotypic and environmental data through an interdisciplinary framework, leading to a novel understanding of plant and animal

processes that affect growth, productivity, and the ability to predict performance, which will result in the deployment of superior varieties and species to producers and improved crop and animal management recommendations for farmers and ranchers;

“(4) to catalyze and coordinate research that links genomics and predictive phenomics at different sites across the United States to achieve advances in crops and animals that generate societal benefits;

“(5) to combine fields such as genetics, genomics, plant physiology, agronomy, climatology, and crop modeling with computation and informatics, statistics, and engineering;

“(6) to combine fields such as genetics, genomics, animal physiology, meat science, animal nutrition, and veterinary science with computation and informatics, statistics, and engineering;

“(7) to focus on crops and animals that will yield scientifically important results that will enhance the usefulness of many other crops and animals;

“(8) to build on genomic research, such as the Plant Genome Research Project and the National Animal Genome Research Program, to understand gene function in production environments that is expected to have considerable returns for crops and animals of importance to the agriculture of the United States;

“(9) to develop improved data analytics to enhance understanding of the biological function of genes;

“(10) to allow resources developed under this section, including data, software, germplasm, and other biological materials, to be openly accessible to all persons, subject to any confidentiality requirements imposed by law; and

“(11) to encourage international partnerships with each partner country responsible for financing its own research.”;

(3) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) DUTIES OF SECRETARY.—The Secretary of Agriculture (referred to in this section as the ‘Secretary’) shall conduct a research initiative, to be known as the ‘Agricultural Genome to Phenome Initiative’, for the purpose of—

“(1) studying agriculturally significant crops and animals in production environments to achieve sustainable and secure agricultural production;

“(2) ensuring that current gaps in existing knowledge of agricultural crop and animal genetics and phenomics are filled;

“(3) identifying and developing a functional understanding of relevant genes from animals and agronomically relevant genes from crops that are of importance to the agriculture sector of the United States;

“(4) ensuring future genetic improvement of crops and animals of importance to the agriculture sector of the United States;

“(5) studying the relevance of diverse germplasm as a source of unique genes that may be of importance in the future;

“(6) enhancing genetics to reduce the economic impact of pathogens on crops and animals of importance to the agriculture sector of the United States;

“(7) disseminating findings to relevant audiences; and

“(8) otherwise carrying out this section.”;

(4) in subsection (c)(1), by inserting “, acting through the National Institute of Food and Agriculture,” after “The Secretary”;

(5) in subsection (e), by inserting “to Phenome” after “Genome”; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$30,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”.

SEC. 7209. HIGH-PRIORITY RESEARCH AND EXTENSION INITIATIVES.

(a) HIGH-PRIORITY RESEARCH AND EXTENSION AREAS.—Section 1672(d) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5925(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(11) NATIONAL TURFGRASS RESEARCH INITIATIVE.—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purposes of—

“(A) carrying out or enhancing research related to turfgrass and sod issues;

“(B) enhancing production and uses of turfgrass for the general public;

“(C) identifying new turfgrass varieties with superior drought, heat, cold, and pest tolerance to reduce water, fertilizer, and pesticide use;

“(D) selecting genetically superior turfgrasses and development of improved technologies for managing commercial, residential, and recreational turf areas;

“(E) producing grasses that aid in mitigating soil erosion, protect against pollutant runoff into waterways, and provide other environmental benefits;

“(F) investigating, preserving, and protecting native plant species, including grasses not currently used in turf systems;

“(G) creating systems for more economical and viable turfgrass seed and sod production throughout the United States; and

“(H) investigating the turfgrass phytobiome and developing biologic products to enhance soil, enrich plants, and mitigate pests.

“(12) NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT.—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purposes of examining nutrient management based on the source, rate, timing, and placement of crop nutrients.

“(13) MACADAMIA TREE HEALTH INITIATIVE.—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purposes of—

“(A) developing and disseminating science-based tools and treatments to combat the macadamia felted coccid (*Eriococcus ironsidei*); and

“(B) establishing an areawide integrated pest management program in areas affected by, or areas at risk of being affected by, the macadamia felted coccid (*Eriococcus ironsidei*).

“(14) CHRONIC WASTING DISEASE.—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purposes of supporting research projects at land-grant colleges and universities (as defined in section 1404 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103)) with established deer research programs for the purposes of treating, mitigating, or eliminating chronic wasting disease in free-ranging white-tailed deer populations.”.

(b) PULSE CROP HEALTH INITIATIVE.—Section 1672(e)(5) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5925(e)(5)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

(c) TRAINING COORDINATION FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE PROTECTION.—Section 1672(f)(5) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5925(f)(5)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

(d) POLLINATOR PROTECTION.—Section 1672(g) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5925(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraphs (1)(B), (2)(B), and (3), by striking “2018” each place it appears and inserting “2023”;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5) and (7), respectively;

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) POLLINATOR HEALTH TASK FORCE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (referred to in this paragraph as the ‘Administrator’), shall reconstitute the Pollinator Health Task Force (referred to in this paragraph as the ‘Task Force’) to carry out the purposes described in subparagraph (B).

“(B) PURPOSES.—The Task Force shall—

“(i) address issues relating to pollinator health and disease, pollinator population decline, and Federal pollinator protection activities; and

“(ii) ensure effective implementation of the 2015 National Pollinator Health Strategy, as modified under subparagraph (D)(i).

“(C) COMPOSITION.—

“(i) CO-CHAIRS.—The Secretary and the Administrator shall serve as co-chairs of the Task Force.

“(ii) MEMBERS.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The Task Force shall be composed of not less than 15 members, each of whom shall be appointed by the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator.

“(II) MEMBERS.—The members of the Task Force—

“(aa) shall include a qualified representative from each of—

“(AA) the Department of State;

“(BB) the Department of Defense;

“(CC) the Department of the Interior;

“(DD) the Department of Housing and Urban Development;

“(EE) the Department of Transportation;

“(FF) the Department of Energy;

“(GG) the Department of Education;

“(HH) the Council on Environmental Quality;

“(II) the Domestic Policy Council;

“(JJ) the General Services Administration;

“(KK) the National Science Foundation;

“(LL) the National Security Council;

“(MM) the Office of Management and Budget;

“(NN) the Food and Drug Administration; and

“(OO) the Office of Science and Technology Policy; and

“(bb) may include—

“(AA) 1 or more qualified representatives from any other Federal department, agency, or office, as determined by the Secretary and the Administrator; and

“(BB) 1 or more nongovernmental individuals that possess adequate scientific credentials to make meaningful contributions to the activities of the Task Force, as determined by the Secretary and the Administrator.

“(D) DUTIES.—The Task Force shall—

“(i) review and modify the 2015 National Pollinator Health Strategy to reflect the evolving science on which it is based;

“(ii) implement the 2015 National Pollinator Health Strategy as modified under clause (i);

“(iii) ensure that Federal resources are used effectively to improve pollinator habitat and health;

“(iv) engage in regular collaboration with the Department of Agriculture, other governmental and institutional entities, and private persons to leverage Federal funding to create public-private partnerships that will achieve the long-term improvement of pollinator habitat and health, consistent with the 2016 Pollinator Partnership Action Plan; and

“(v) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, host a joint summit of the

Department of Agriculture and the Environmental Protection Agency on crop protection tools that examines—

“(I) the science relating to the impact of crop protection tools on pollinators;

“(II) the techniques used to mitigate the impact of crop protection tools; and

“(III) the gaps in research relating to crop protection tools.

“(E) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than December 31 of each year, the Task Force shall submit a report—

“(i) to—

“(I) the Secretary;

“(II) the Administrator;

“(III) the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives; and

“(IV) the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate; and

“(ii) that describes—

“(I) the work carried out by the Task Force under subparagraph (D); and

“(II) the recommendations of the Task Force for the next steps that should be taken to carry out the purposes described in subparagraph (B).”;

(4) by inserting after paragraph (5) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(6) ENHANCED COORDINATION OF HONEYBEE AND POLLINATOR RESEARCH.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Chief Scientist shall coordinate research, education, and economic activities in the Department of Agriculture relating to native and managed pollinator health.

“(B) DUTIES.—To carry out subparagraph (A), the Chief Scientist shall—

“(i) assign an individual to serve in the Office of the Chief Scientist as a Honeybee and Pollinator Research Coordinator, who—

“(I) may be—

“(aa) an employee of the Department of Agriculture at the time of appointment; and

“(bb) a detailee from the research, economics, and education mission area; and

“(II) shall be responsible for leading the efforts of the Chief Scientist in carrying out subparagraph (A);

“(ii) implement the pollinator health research efforts described in the 2015 report of the Pollinator Health Task Force entitled ‘Pollinator Research Action Plan’;

“(iii) establish annual strategic priorities and goals for the Department of Agriculture for native and managed pollinator research;

“(iv) communicate those priorities and goals to each agency in the Department of Agriculture, the managed pollinator industry, and relevant grant recipients under programs administered by the Secretary; and

“(v) coordinate and identify all research needed and conducted by the Department of Agriculture and relevant grant recipients under programs administered by the Secretary on native and managed pollinator health to ensure consistency and reduce unintended duplication of effort.

“(C) POLLINATOR RESEARCH.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In coordinating research under subparagraph (A), the Chief Scientist shall ensure that research is conducted—

“(I) to evaluate the impact of horticultural and agricultural pest management practices on native and managed pollinator colonies in diverse agro-ecosystems;

“(II) to document pesticide residues—

“(aa) that are found in native and managed pollinator colonies; and

“(bb) that are associated with typical commercial crop pest management practices;

“(III) with respect to native and managed pollinator colonies visiting crops for crop pollination or honey production purposes, to document—

“(aa) the strength and health of those colonies;

“(bb) survival, growth, reproduction, and production of those colonies;

“(cc) pests, pathogens, and viruses that affect those colonies;

“(dd) environmental conditions of those colonies; and

“(ee) any other relevant information, as determined by the Chief Scientist;

“(IV) to document best management practices and other practices in place for managed pollinators and crop managers with respect to healthy populations of managed pollinators;

“(V) to evaluate the effectiveness of—

“(aa) conservation practices that target the specific needs of native and managed pollinator habitats; and

“(bb) incentives that allow for the expansion of native and managed pollinator forage acreage;

“(VI) in the case of commercially managed pollinator colonies, to continue gathering data on—

“(aa) annual colony losses;

“(bb) rising input costs associated with managing colonies; and

“(cc) the overall economic value of commercially managed pollinators to the food economy; and

“(VII) relating to any other aspect of native and managed pollinators, as determined by the Chief Scientist, in consultation with scientific experts.

“(ii) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Chief Scientist shall—

“(I) make publicly available the results of the research described in clause (i); and

“(II) in the case of the research described in clause (i)(VI), immediately publish any data or reports that were previously produced by the Department of Agriculture but not made publicly available.”;

(5) in paragraph (7) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by inserting “AND NATIVE AND MANAGED POLLINATORS” after “DISORDER”; and

(B) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by striking “regarding how” and inserting the following: “regarding—

“(i) how”;

(ii) in clause (i) (as so designated), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) the establishment of a sufficiently funded large-scale multiyear field research project to evaluate the impact of horticultural and agricultural pest management practices on native and managed pollinator colonies in diverse agro-ecosystems; and

“(iii) the development of crop-specific best management practices that balance the needs of crop managers with the health of native and managed pollinator colonies.”.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1672(h) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5925(h)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7210. ORGANIC AGRICULTURE RESEARCH AND EXTENSION INITIATIVE.

Section 1672B of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5925b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(7), by striking “conservation” and inserting “conservation, soil health.”; and

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) \$40,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 and 2020;

“(E) \$45,000,000 for fiscal year 2021; and

“(F) \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2022 and each fiscal year thereafter.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by striking “FOR FISCAL YEARS 2014 THROUGH 2018”; and

(ii) by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7211. FARM BUSINESS MANAGEMENT.

Section 1672D(d)(2) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5925f(d)(2)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7212. URBAN, INDOOR, AND OTHER EMERGING AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION INITIATIVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 is amended by inserting after section 1672D (7 U.S.C. 5925f) the following:

“SEC. 1672E. URBAN, INDOOR, AND OTHER EMERGING AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION INITIATIVE.

“(a) COMPETITIVE RESEARCH AND EXTENSION GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—In consultation with the Urban Agriculture and Innovative Production Advisory Committee established under section 222(b) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994, the Secretary may make competitive grants to support research, education, and extension activities for the purposes of enhancing urban, indoor, and other emerging agricultural production by—

“(1) facilitating the development of urban, indoor, and other emerging agricultural production, harvesting, transportation, aggregation, packaging, distribution, and markets;

“(2) assessing and developing strategies to remediate contaminated sites;

“(3) determining and developing the best production management and integrated pest management practices;

“(4) assessing the impacts of shipping and transportation on nutritional value;

“(5) identifying and promoting the horticultural, social, and economic factors that contribute to successful urban, indoor, and other emerging agricultural production;

“(6) analyzing the means by which new agricultural sites are determined, including an evaluation of soil quality, condition of a building, or local community needs;

“(7) exploring new and innovative technologies that minimize energy, lighting systems, water, and other inputs for increased food production;

“(8) examining building material efficiencies and structural upgrades for the purpose of optimizing growth of agricultural products;

“(9) studying and developing new crop varieties and innovative agricultural products to connect to new markets; or

“(10) examining the impacts of crop exposure to urban elements on environmental quality and food safety.

“(b) GRANT TYPES AND PROCESS.—Subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (4), paragraph (7), and paragraph (11)(B) of subsection (b) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 3157) shall apply with respect to the making of grants under this section.

“(c) PRIORITY.—The Secretary may give priority to grant proposals that involve—

“(1) the cooperation of multiple entities; or

“(2) States or regions with a high concentration of or significant interest in urban farms, rooftop farms, and indoor production facilities.

“(d) FUNDING.—

“(1) MANDATORY FUNDING.—Of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary shall use to carry out this section \$4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, to remain available until expended.

“(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to amounts made available under

paragraph (1), there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”.

(b) DATA COLLECTION ON URBAN, INDOOR, AND EMERGING AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 360 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct as a follow-on study to the census of agriculture conducted in the calendar year 2017 under section 2 of the Census of Agriculture Act of 1997 (7 U.S.C. 2204g) a census of urban, indoor, and other emerging agricultural production, including information about—

(A) community gardens and farms located in urban areas, suburbs, and urban clusters;

(B) rooftop farms, outdoor vertical production, and green walls;

(C) indoor farms, greenhouses, and high-tech vertical technology farms;

(D) hydroponic, aeroponic, and aquaponic farm facilities; and

(E) other innovations in agricultural production, as determined by the Secretary.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection \$14,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2019 through 2021.

SEC. 7213. CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE AT 1890 INSTITUTIONS.

Section 1673 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5926) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE AT 1890S INSTITUTIONS.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish not less than 3 centers of excellence, each led by an 1890 Institution (as defined in section 2 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7601)), to focus on 1 or more of the areas described in paragraph (2).

“(2) AREAS OF FOCUS.—

“(A) STUDENT SUCCESS AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.—A center of excellence established under paragraph (1) may engage in activities to ensure that students have the skills and education needed to work in agriculture and food industries, agriculture science, technology, engineering, mathematics, and related fields of study.

“(B) NUTRITION, HEALTH, WELLNESS, AND QUALITY OF LIFE.—A center of excellence established under paragraph (1) may carry out research, education, and extension programs that increase access to healthy food, improve nutrition, mitigate preventive disease, and develop strategies to assist limited resource individuals in accessing health and nutrition resources.

“(C) FARMING SYSTEMS, RURAL PROSPERITY, AND ECONOMIC SUSTAINABILITY.—A center of excellence established under paragraph (1) may share best practices with farmers to improve agricultural production, processing, and marketing, reduce urban food deserts, examine new uses for traditional and non-traditional crops, animals, and natural resources, and continue activities carried out by the Center of Innovative and Sustainable Small Farms, Ranches, and Forest Lands.

“(D) GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY AND DEFENSE.—A center of excellence established under paragraph (1) may engage in international partnerships that strengthen agricultural development in developing countries, partner with international researchers regarding new and emerging animal and plant pests and diseases, engage in agricultural disaster recovery, and continue activities carried out by the Center for International Engagement.

“(E) NATURAL RESOURCES, ENERGY, AND ENVIRONMENT.—A center of excellence established under paragraph (1) may focus on protecting and managing domestic natural re-

sources for current and future production of food and agricultural products.

“(F) EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES.—A center of excellence established under paragraph (1) may focus on the development of emerging technologies to increase agricultural productivity, enhance small farm economic viability, and improve rural communities by developing genetic and sensor technologies for food and agriculture and providing technology training to farmers.

“(3) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, and every year thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report describing—

“(A) the resources invested in the centers of excellence established under paragraph (1); and

“(B) the work being done by those centers of excellence.

“(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”.

SEC. 7214. ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM FOR FARMERS WITH DISABILITIES.

Section 1680(c)(1)(B) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5933(c)(1)(B)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7215. NATIONAL RURAL INFORMATION CENTER CLEARINGHOUSE.

Section 2381(e) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 3125b(e)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

Subtitle C—Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998

SEC. 7301. NATIONAL FOOD SAFETY TRAINING, EDUCATION, EXTENSION, OUT-REACH, AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 405(j) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7625(j)) is amended by striking “there are authorized” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “there is authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”.

SEC. 7302. INTEGRATED RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION COMPETITIVE GRANTS PROGRAM.

Section 406(e) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7626(e)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7303. SUPPORT FOR RESEARCH REGARDING DISEASES OF WHEAT, TRITICALE, AND BARLEY CAUSED BY FUSARIUM GRAMINEARUM OR BY TILLETIA INDICA.

Section 408(e) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7628(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following: “(3) \$15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”.

SEC. 7304. GRANTS FOR YOUTH ORGANIZATIONS.

Section 410(d)(2) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7630(d)(2)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7305. SPECIALTY CROP RESEARCH INITIATIVE.

(a) INDUSTRY NEEDS.—Section 412(b) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7632(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) through (E) as subparagraphs (C) through (F); and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) size-controlling rootstock systems for perennial crops;”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “including threats to specialty crop pollinators;” and inserting the following: “such as—

“(A) threats to specialty crop pollinators;

“(B) emerging and invasive species; and

“(C) a more effective understanding and utilization of existing natural enemy complexes;”;

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking “efforts to improve” and inserting the following: “efforts—

“(A) to improve”;

(B) in subparagraph (A) (as so designated), by adding “and” at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) to achieve a better understanding of—

“(i) the soil rhizosphere microbiome;

“(ii) pesticide application systems and certified drift-reduction technologies; and

“(iii) systems to improve and extend the storage life of specialty crops;”;

(4) in paragraph (4), by striking “including improved mechanization and technologies that delay or inhibit ripening; and” and inserting the following: “such as—

“(A) mechanization and automation of labor-intensive tasks in production and processing;

“(B) technologies that delay or inhibit ripening;

“(C) decision support systems driven by phenology and environmental factors;

“(D) improved monitoring systems for agricultural pests; and

“(E) effective systems for preharvest and postharvest management of quarantine pests; and”.

(b) FUNDING.—Section 412(k) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7632(k)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “FOR FISCAL YEARS 2014 THROUGH 2018”;

(B) by striking “In addition” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition”; and

(C) in subparagraph (A) (as so designated), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as subparagraph (B) of paragraph (2) and indenting appropriately; and

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively.

SEC. 7306. FOOD ANIMAL RESIDUE AVOIDANCE DATABASE PROGRAM.

Section 604(e) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7642(e)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7307. OFFICE OF PEST MANAGEMENT POLICY.

Section 614(f)(2) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7653(f)(2)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7308. FORESTRY PRODUCTS ADVANCED UTILIZATION RESEARCH.

Section 617(f)(1) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7655b(f)(1)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

Subtitle D—Other Laws

SEC. 7401. CRITICAL AGRICULTURAL MATERIALS ACT.

(a) HEMP RESEARCH.—Section 5(b)(9) of the Critical Agricultural Materials Act (7 U.S.C. 178c(b)(9)) is amended by inserting “, and including hemp (as defined in section 297A of

the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946” after “hydrocarbon-containing plants”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 16(a)(2) of the Critical Agricultural Materials Act (7 U.S.C. 178n(a)(2)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7402. EQUITY IN EDUCATIONAL LAND-GRANT STATUS ACT OF 1994.

(a) DEFINITION OF 1994 INSTITUTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 532 of the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 301 note; Public Law 103-382) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (11);

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (12) through (23) and (25) through (35) as paragraphs (11) through (22) and (26) through (36), respectively;

(C) in paragraph (20) (as so redesignated), by striking “College” and inserting “University”;

(D) by inserting after paragraph (22) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(23) Nueta Hidatsa Sahnish College.”; and

(E) by inserting after paragraph (24) the following:

“(25) Red Lake Nation College.”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) take effect on October 1, 2018.

(b) ENDOWMENT FOR 1994 INSTITUTIONS.—Section 533(b) of the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 301 note; Public Law 103-382) is amended in the first sentence by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

(c) INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY BUILDING GRANTS.—Section 535 of the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 301 note; Public Law 103-382) is amended by striking “2018” each place it appears in subsections (b)(1) and (c) and inserting “2023”.

(d) RESEARCH GRANTS.—Section 536(c) of the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 301 note; Public Law 103-382) is amended in the first sentence by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7403. RESEARCH FACILITIES ACT.

Section 6(a) of the Research Facilities Act (7 U.S.C. 390d(a)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7404. AGRICULTURAL AND FOOD RESEARCH INITIATIVE.

Subsection (b) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 3157(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) in clause (vi), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in clause (vii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(viii) soil health.”; and

(B) in subparagraph (E)—

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

(ii) in clause (iv), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(v) automation or mechanization in the production and distribution of specialty crops, with a focus on labor-intensive tasks.”;

(2) in paragraph (6)—

(A) in subparagraph (D), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) to an institution to carry out collaboration in biomedical and agricultural research using existing research models.”; and

(3) in paragraph (11)(A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7405. EXTENSION DESIGN AND DEMONSTRATION INITIATIVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 3157) is amended by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) EXTENSION DESIGN AND DEMONSTRATION INITIATIVE.—

“(1) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this subsection is to encourage the design of adaptive prototype systems for extension and education that seek to advance the application, translation, and demonstration of scientific discoveries and other agricultural research for the adoption and understanding of food, agricultural, and natural resources practices, techniques, methods, and technologies using digital or other novel platforms.

“(2) GRANTS.—The Secretary shall award grants on a competitive basis—

“(A) for the design of 1 or more extension and education prototype systems—

“(i) that leverage digital platforms or other novel means of translating, delivering, or demonstrating agricultural research; and

“(ii) to adapt, apply, translate, or demonstrate scientific findings, data, technology, and other research outcomes to producers, the agricultural industry, and other interested persons or organizations; and

“(B) to demonstrate, by incorporating analytics and specific metrics, the value, impact, and return on the Federal investment of a prototype system designed under subparagraph (A) as a model for use by other eligible entities described in paragraph (3) for improving, modernizing, and adapting applied research, demonstration, and extension services.

“(3) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—An entity that is eligible to receive a grant under paragraph (2) is—

“(A) a State agricultural experiment station; and

“(B) a land-grant college or university (as defined in section 1404 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103)).

“(4) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall award grants under paragraph (2) to not fewer than 2 and not more than 5 eligible entities described in paragraph (3) that represent a diversity of regions, commodities, and agricultural or food production issues.

“(5) TERM.—The term of a grant awarded under paragraph (2) shall be not longer than 5 years.

“(6) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, to remain available until expended.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 3157) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(2), by striking “subsection—” in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) and all that follows through “for the planning” in subparagraph (B) and inserting “subsection for the planning”; and

(2) in subsection (h), by inserting “, (d),” after “subsections (b)”.

SEC. 7406. RENEWABLE RESOURCES EXTENSION ACT OF 1978.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 6 of the Renewable Resources Extension Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 1675) is amended in the first sentence by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

(b) TERMINATION DATE.—Section 8 of the Renewable Resources Extension Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 1671 note; Public Law 95-306) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7407. NATIONAL AQUACULTURE ACT OF 1980.

Section 10 of the National Aquaculture Act of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 2809) is amended by striking

“2018” each place it appears and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7408. REPEAL OF REVIEW OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE.

Section 7404 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 3101 note; Public Law 107-171) is repealed.

SEC. 7409. BIOMASS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

Section 9008 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8108) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) carbon dioxide that—

“(i) is intended for permanent sequestration or utilization; and

“(ii) is a byproduct of the production of the products described in subparagraphs (A) and (B).”;

(2) in subsection (d)(2)(A)—

(A) in clause (xii), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) by redesignating clause (xiii) as clause (xiv); and

(C) by inserting after clause (xii) the following:

“(xiii) an individual with expertise in carbon dioxide capture, utilization, and sequestration; and”;

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(B)—

(i) in clause (ii), by striking “and” at the end; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) to permanently sequester or utilize carbon dioxide that is produced as a byproduct of the production of biobased products; and”;

(B) in paragraph (3)(B)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) the development of technologies to permanently sequester or utilize carbon dioxide that is produced as a byproduct of the production of biobased products.”; and

(4) in subsection (h)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (D), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) \$3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7410. REINSTATEMENT OF MATCHING REQUIREMENT FOR FEDERAL FUNDS USED IN EXTENSION WORK AT THE UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 208(c) of the District of Columbia Public Postsecondary Education Reorganization Act (88 Stat. 1428; sec. 38-1202.09(c), D.C. Official Code) is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following: “Such sums may be used to pay not more than ½ of the total cost of providing such extension work.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 2018.

SEC. 7411. ENHANCED USE LEASE AUTHORITY PILOT PROGRAM.

Section 308 of the Federal Crop Insurance Reform and Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 3125a note; Public Law 103-354) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(6)(A), by striking “10 years” and inserting “15 years”; and

(2) in subsection (d)(2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “6, 8, and 10 years” and inserting “13 years”.

SEC. 7412. TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION OVER PORTION OF HENRY A. WALLACE BELTSVILLE AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTER, BELTSVILLE, MARYLAND.

(a) **TRANSFER AUTHORIZED.**—Subject to subsection (e), the Secretary may transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury administrative jurisdiction over a parcel of real property at the Henry A. Wallace Beltsville Agricultural Research Center consisting of approximately 100 acres, which was originally acquired by the United States through land acquisitions in 1910 and 1925, and is generally located off of Poultry Road lying between Powder Mill Road and Odell Road in Beltsville, Maryland, for the purpose of facilitating the establishment of Bureau of Engraving and Printing facilities on the parcel.

(b) **LEGAL DESCRIPTION AND MAP.**—

(1) **PREPARATION.**—The Secretary shall prepare a legal description and map of the parcel of real property to be transferred under subsection (a).

(2) **FORCE OF LAW.**—The legal description and map prepared under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary may correct errors in the legal description and map.

(c) **TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—The transfer of administrative jurisdiction under subsection (a) shall be subject to easements, valid existing rights, and such other reservations, terms, and conditions as the Secretary considers to be necessary.

(d) **WAIVER.**—The parcel of real property under subsection (a) is exempt from Federal screening for other possible use due to an identified Federal need for the parcel as the site of Bureau of Engraving and Printing facilities.

(e) **CONDITIONS FOR TRANSFER.**—As a condition of the transfer of administrative jurisdiction under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury shall agree to pay the Secretary the costs incurred to carry out the transfer of administrative jurisdiction under subsection (a), including the costs for—

- (1) any environmental or administrative analysis required by law with respect to the parcel to be transferred under subsection (a);
- (2) a survey, if needed; and
- (3) any hazardous substances assessment of the parcel to be transferred under subsection (a).

(f) **HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For the parcel to be transferred under subsection (a), the Secretary shall meet the applicable disclosure requirements relating to hazardous substances.

(2) **REMEDIATION.**—The Secretary shall not be required to remediate or abate any hazardous substances disclosed under paragraph (1) or any other hazardous pollutants, contaminants, or waste that may be present at or on the parcel on the date of the transfer of administrative jurisdiction under subsection (a).

SEC. 7413. FOUNDATION FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE RESEARCH.

Section 7601 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 5939) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(1)(D), by inserting “and agriculture stakeholders” after “community”;

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(C)(ii)(I), by inserting “agriculture or” before “agricultural research”;

(B) in paragraph (4)(A)—

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

(ii) by redesignating clause (iv) as clause (v); and

(iii) by inserting after clause (iii) the following:

“(iv) actively solicit and accept funds, gifts, grants, devises, or bequests of real or personal property made to the Foundation, including from private entities; and”;

(3) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(A)(iii), by striking “any”;

(B) in paragraph (3)(B)—

(i) in clause (i)(I)—

(I) in the matter preceding item (aa), by inserting “and post online” before “a report”;

(II) in item (aa), by striking “accomplishments; and” and inserting “accomplishments and how those activities align to the challenges identified in the strategic plan under clause (iv)”;

(III) in item (bb), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(IV) by adding at the end the following:

“(cc) a description of available agricultural research programs and priorities for the upcoming fiscal year.”;

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) **STAKEHOLDER NOTICE.**—The Foundation shall publish an annual notice with a description of agricultural research priorities under this section for the upcoming fiscal year, including—

“(I) a schedule for funding competitions;

“(II) a discussion of how applications for funding will be evaluated; and

“(III) how the Foundation will communicate information about funded awards to the public to ensure that grantees and partners understand the objectives of the Foundation.

“(iv) **STRATEGIC PLAN.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, the Foundation shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a strategic plan describing a path for the Foundation to become self-sustaining, including—

“(I) a forecast of major agricultural challenge opportunities identified by the scientific advisory councils of the Foundation and approved by the Board, including short- and long-term objectives;

“(II) an overview of the efforts that the Foundation will take to be transparent in each of the processes of the Foundation, including—

“(aa) processes relating to grant awards, including the selection, review, and notification processes;

“(bb) communication of past, current, and future research priorities; and

“(cc) plans to solicit and respond to public input on the opportunities identified in the strategic plan;

“(III) a description of financial goals and benchmarks for the next 10 years, including a detailed plan for raising funds in amounts greater than the amounts required under this section; and

“(IV) other related issues, as determined by the Board.”;

(4) in subsection (g)(1)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “MANDATORY FUNDING” and inserting “FUNDING”;

(B) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “On the date” and inserting the following:

“(i) **ESTABLISHMENT FUNDING.**—On the date”;

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) **ENHANCED FUNDING.**—On the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary shall transfer to the Foundation to carry out this section \$200,000,000, to remain available until expended.”;

(C) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “The Foundation” and inserting the following:

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Foundation”;

(ii) in clause (i) (as so designated)—

(I) by striking “purposes” and inserting “purposes, duties, and powers”;

(II) by striking “non-Federal matching funds for each expenditure” and inserting “matching funds from a non-Federal source, including a generic agricultural commodity promotion, research, and information program”;

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) **EFFECT.**—Nothing in this section requires the Foundation to require a matching contribution from an individual grantee as a condition of receiving a grant under this section.”.

SEC. 7414. ASSISTANCE FOR FORESTRY RESEARCH UNDER THE MCINTIRE-STENNIS COOPERATIVE FORESTRY ACT.

Section 2 of Public Law 87-788 (commonly known as the “McIntire-Stennis Cooperative Forestry Act”) (16 U.S.C. 582a-1) is amended in the second sentence—

(1) by striking “and” before “1890 Institutions”;

(2) by inserting “and 1994 Institutions (as defined in section 532 of the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 301 note; Public Law 103-382)) that offer an associate’s degree or a baccalaureate degree in forestry,” before “and (b)”.

SEC. 7415. LEGITIMACY OF INDUSTRIAL HEMP RESEARCH.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 7606 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 5940) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (a) and (b) as subsections (b) and (a), respectively, and moving the subsections so as to appear in alphabetical order;

(2) in subsection (b) (as so redesignated), in the subsection heading, by striking “IN GENERAL” and inserting “INDUSTRIAL HEMP RESEARCH”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) **STUDY AND REPORT.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall conduct a study of agricultural pilot programs—

“(A) to determine the economic viability of the domestic production and sale of industrial hemp; and

“(B) that shall include a review of—

“(i) each agricultural pilot program; and

“(ii) any other agricultural or academic research relating to industrial hemp.

“(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1).”.

(b) **REPEAL.**—Effective on the date that is 1 year after the date on which the Secretary establishes a plan under section 297C of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, section 7606 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 5940) is repealed.

SEC. 7416. COLLECTION OF DATA RELATING TO BARLEY AREA PLANTED AND HARVESTED.

For all acreage reports published after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the National Agricultural Statistics Service, shall include the State of New York in the States surveyed to produce the table entitled “Barley Area Planted and Harvested” in those reports.

SEC. 7417. COLLECTION OF DATA RELATING TO THE SIZE AND LOCATION OF DAIRY FARMS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Economic Research Service, shall update the report entitled “Changes in the Size

and Location of US Dairy Farms” contained in the report of the Economic Research Service entitled “Profits, Costs, and the Changing Structure of Dairy Farming” and published in September 2007.

(b) REQUIREMENT.—In updating the report described in subsection (a), the Secretary shall include an expanded Table 2 of that report containing the full range of herd sizes that are detailed in Table 1 of that report.

SEC. 7418. AGRICULTURE INNOVATION CENTER DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

Section 6402 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 1632b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e)(1), by striking “subsection (i)” and inserting “subsection (h)”;

(2) by striking subsection (g);

(3) by redesignating subsections (h) and (i) as subsections (g) and (h), respectively; and

(4) in subsection (h) (as so redesignated), by striking “is authorized” and all that follows through “2018” and inserting “are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section”.

SEC. 7419. SMITH-LEVER COMMUNITY EXTENSION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3(d) of the Smith-Lever Act (7 U.S.C. 343(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(d) ADMINISTRATION, TECHNICAL, AND EXTENSION SERVICES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”;

(2) in paragraph (1) (as designated by paragraph (1)), by striking the second sentence; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) COMPETITIVE FUNDING.—The Secretary of Agriculture may provide funding, on a competitive basis, to—

“(A) a college or university eligible to receive funds under the Act of August 30, 1890 (7 U.S.C. 321-326a and 328), including Tuskegee University; or

“(B) a 1994 Institution (as defined in section 532 of the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 301 note; Public Law 103-382)) for—

“(i) the Children, Youth, and Families at Risk funding program under subsection (b)(3); and

“(ii) the Federally Recognized Tribes Extension Program.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 3(f) of the Smith Lever Act (7 U.S.C. 343(f)) is amended—

(A) by striking “There shall” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There shall”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) EXCEPTION NOT APPLICABLE.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a 1994 Institution receiving funding under subsection (d)(2)(B) for the Children, Youth, and Families at Risk funding program under subsection (b)(3) or for the Federally Recognized Tribes Extension Program.”.

(2) Section 533(a)(2)(A) of the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 301 note; Public Law 103-382) is amended by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

“(ii) the Smith-Lever Act (7 U.S.C. 341 et seq.), except as provided under—

“(I) section 3(b)(3) of that Act (7 U.S.C. 343(b)(3)); or

“(II) paragraph (2) of section 3(d) of that Act (7 U.S.C. 343(d)); or”.

Subtitle E—Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008

PART I—AGRICULTURAL SECURITY

SEC. 7501. AGRICULTURAL BIOSECURITY COMMUNICATION CENTER.

Section 14112(c)(2) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8912(c)(2)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7502. ASSISTANCE TO BUILD LOCAL CAPACITY IN AGRICULTURAL BIOSECURITY PLANNING, PREPARATION, AND RESPONSE.

Section 14113 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8913) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)(B), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(2)(B), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7503. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURAL COUNTERMEASURES.

Section 14121(b)(2) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8921(b)(2)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7504. AGRICULTURAL BIOSECURITY GRANT PROGRAM.

Section 14122(e)(2) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8922(e)(2)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

PART II—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 7511. FARM AND RANCH STRESS ASSISTANCE NETWORK.

Section 7522 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 5936) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “to support cooperative programs between State cooperative extension services and nonprofit organizations” and inserting “to eligible entities described in subsection (c)”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking paragraph (5);

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (4) as subparagraphs (A) through (D), respectively, and indenting the subparagraphs appropriately;

(C) by striking subparagraph (B) (as so redesignated) and inserting the following:

“(B) training, including training programs and workshops, for—

“(i) advocates for individuals who are engaged in farming, ranching, and other occupations relating to agriculture; and

“(ii) other individuals and entities that may assist individuals who—

“(I) are engaged in farming, ranching, and other occupations relating to agriculture; and

“(II) are in crisis;”;

(D) in subparagraph (C) (as so redesignated), by adding “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(E) in subparagraph (D) (as so redesignated), by striking “activities; and” and inserting “activities, including the dissemination of information and materials; or”;

(F) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) (as so redesignated), by striking “be used to initiate” and inserting the following: “be used—

“(1) to initiate”; and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) to enter into contracts, on a multiyear basis, with community-based, direct-service organizations to initiate, expand, or sustain programs described in paragraph (1) and subsection (a).”;

(3) by striking subsections (c) and (d) and inserting the following:

“(c) ELIGIBLE RECIPIENTS.—The Secretary may award a grant under this section to—

“(1) a State department of agriculture;

“(2) a State cooperative extension service;

“(3) a qualified nonprofit organization, as determined by the Secretary;

“(4) an entity providing appropriate services, as determined by the Secretary, in 1 or more States; or

“(5) a partnership carried out by 2 or more entities described in paragraphs (1) through (4).

“(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the

Secretary to carry out this section \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.

“(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall submit to Congress and any other relevant Federal department or agency, and make publicly available, a report describing the state of behavioral and mental health of individuals who are engaged in farming, ranching, and other occupations relating to agriculture.

“(2) CONTENTS.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include—

“(A) an inventory and assessment of efforts to support the behavioral and mental health of individuals who are engaged in farming, ranching, and other occupations relating to agriculture by—

“(i) the Federal Government, States, and units of local government;

“(ii) communities comprised of those individuals;

“(iii) healthcare providers;

“(iv) State cooperative extension services; and

“(v) other appropriate entities, as determined by the Secretary;

“(B) a description of the challenges faced by individuals who are engaged in farming, ranching, and other occupations relating to agriculture that may impact the behavioral and mental health of farmers and ranchers;

“(C) a description of how the Department of Agriculture can improve coordination and cooperation with Federal health departments and agencies, including the Department of Health and Human Services, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, the Health Resources and Services Administration, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the National Institutes of Health, to best address the behavioral and mental health of individuals who are engaged in farming, ranching, and other occupations relating to agriculture;

“(D) a long-term strategy for responding to the challenges described under subparagraph (B) and recommendations based on best practices for further action to be carried out by appropriate Federal departments or agencies to improve Federal Government response and seek to prevent suicide among individuals who are engaged in farming, ranching, and other occupations relating to agriculture; and

“(E) an evaluation of the impact of suicide among individuals who are engaged in farming, ranching, and other occupations relating to agriculture on—

“(i) the agricultural workforce;

“(ii) agricultural production;

“(iii) rural families and communities; and

“(iv) succession planning.”.

SEC. 7512. NATURAL PRODUCTS RESEARCH PROGRAM.

Section 7525(e) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 5937(e)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7513. SUN GRANT PROGRAM.

Section 7526(g) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8114(g)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 7514. MECHANIZATION AND AUTOMATION FOR SPECIALTY CROPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct a review of the programs of the Department of Agriculture that affect the production or processing of specialty crops.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The review under subsection (a) shall identify—

(1) programs that currently are, or previously have been, effectively used to accelerate the development and use of automation or mechanization in the production or processing of specialty crops; and

(2) programs that may be more effectively used to accelerate the development and use of automation or mechanization in the production or processing of specialty crops.

(c) STRATEGY.—With respect to programs identified under subsection (b), the Secretary shall develop and implement a strategy to accelerate the development and use of automation and mechanization in the production or processing of specialty crops.

Subtitle F—Matching Funds Requirement

SEC. 7601. MATCHING FUNDS REQUIREMENT.

(a) REPEAL.—Subtitle P of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3371) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND TEACHING POLICY ACT OF 1977.—

(A) NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, EDUCATION, AND ECONOMICS ADVISORY BOARD.—Section 1408(c)(1) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3123(c)(1)) is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) the annual establishment of national priorities, as determined by the Board;”.

(B) GRANTS TO ENHANCE RESEARCH CAPACITY IN SCHOOLS OF VETERINARY MEDICINE.—Section 1415(a) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3151(a)) is amended—

(i) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary;” and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—A State receiving a grant under paragraph (1) shall provide State matching funds equal to not less than the amount of the grant.”.

(C) AQUACULTURE ASSISTANCE GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 1475(b) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3322(b)) is amended by striking “The Secretary” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), the Secretary may make competitive grants to entities eligible for grants under paragraph (2) for research and extension to facilitate or expand promising advances in the production and marketing of aquacultural food species and products and to enhance the safety and wholesomeness of those species and products, including the development of reliable supplies of seed stock and therapeutic compounds.

“(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—The Secretary may make a competitive grant under paragraph (1) to—

“(A) a land-grant or seagrant college or university;

“(B) a State agricultural experiment station;

“(C) a college, university, or Federal laboratory having a demonstrable capacity to conduct aquacultural research, as determined by the Secretary; or

“(D) a nonprofit private research institution.

“(3) MATCHING STATE GRANTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall not make a grant under paragraph (1) unless the State in which the grant recipient is located makes a grant to that recipient in an amount equal to not less than the amount of the grant under paragraph (1) (of which State amount an in-kind contribution shall not exceed 50 percent).

“(B) FEDERAL LABORATORIES.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to a grant to a Federal laboratory.”.

(2) FOOD, AGRICULTURE, CONSERVATION, AND TRADE ACT OF 1990.—

(A) FEDERAL-STATE MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 1623(d)(2) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5813(d)(2)) is amended by striking the second sentence.

(B) AGRICULTURAL GENOME INITIATIVE.—Section 1671 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5924) (as amended by section 7208) is amended—

(i) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g); and

(ii) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

“(f) MATCHING FUNDS REQUIREMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), with respect to a grant or cooperative agreement under this section that provides a particular benefit to a specific agricultural commodity, the recipient of funds under the grant or cooperative agreement shall provide non-Federal matching funds (including funds from a generic agricultural commodity promotion, research, and information program) equal to not less than the amount provided under the grant or cooperative agreement.

“(2) IN-KIND SUPPORT.—Non-Federal matching funds described in paragraph (1) may include in-kind support.

“(3) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive the matching funds requirement under paragraph (1) with respect to a research project if the Secretary determines that—

“(A) the results of the project are of a particular benefit to a specific agricultural commodity, but those results are likely to be applicable to agricultural commodities generally; or

“(B)(i) the project—

“(I) involves a minor commodity; and

“(II) deals with scientifically important research; and

“(ii) the recipient is unable to satisfy the matching funds requirement.”.

(C) HIGH-PRIORITY RESEARCH AND EXTENSION INITIATIVES.—Section 1672(a) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5925(a)) is amended—

(i) by striking “The Secretary of Agriculture” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Agriculture”;

(ii) in paragraph (1) (as so designated), in the second sentence, by striking “The Secretary shall” and inserting the following:

“(3) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall;” and

(iii) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) MATCHING FUNDS REQUIREMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (C), an entity receiving a grant under paragraph (1) shall provide non-Federal matching funds (including funds from a generic agricultural commodity promotion, research, and information program) equal to not less than the amount of the grant.

“(B) IN-KIND SUPPORT.—Non-Federal matching funds described in subparagraph (A) may include in-kind support.

“(C) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive the matching funds requirement under subparagraph (A) with respect to a research project if the Secretary determines that—

“(i) the results of the project are of a particular benefit to a specific agricultural commodity, but those results are likely to be applicable to agricultural commodities generally; or

“(ii)(I) the project—

“(aa) involves a minor commodity; and

“(bb) deals with scientifically important research; and

“(II) the recipient is unable to satisfy the matching funds requirement.”.

(D) ORGANIC AGRICULTURE RESEARCH AND EXTENSION INITIATIVE.—Section 1672B of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5925b) (as amended by section 7210) is amended—

(i) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), and (e) as subsections (d), (e), and (f), respectively; and

(ii) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), an entity receiving a grant under subsection (a) shall provide non-Federal matching funds (including funds from a generic agricultural commodity promotion, research, and information program) equal to not less than the amount of the grant.

“(2) IN-KIND SUPPORT.—Non-Federal matching funds described in paragraph (1) may include in-kind support.

“(3) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive the matching funds requirement under paragraph (1) with respect to a research project if the Secretary determines that—

“(A) the results of the project are of a particular benefit to a specific agricultural commodity, but those results are likely to be applicable to agricultural commodities generally; or

“(B)(i) the project—

“(I) involves a minor commodity; and

“(II) deals with scientifically important research; and

“(ii) the recipient is unable to satisfy the matching funds requirement.”.

(3) AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION REFORM ACT OF 1998.—

(A) INTEGRATED RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION COMPETITIVE GRANTS PROGRAM.—Section 406 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7626) is amended—

(i) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively; and

(ii) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) MATCHING FUNDS REQUIREMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), with respect to a grant under this section that provides a particular benefit to a specific agricultural commodity, the recipient of the grant shall provide non-Federal matching funds (including funds from a generic agricultural commodity promotion, research, and information program) equal to not less than the amount of the grant.

“(2) IN-KIND SUPPORT.—Non-Federal matching funds described in paragraph (1) may include in-kind support.

“(3) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive the matching funds requirement under paragraph (1) with respect to a research project if the Secretary determines that—

“(A) the results of the project are of a particular benefit to a specific agricultural commodity, but those results are likely to be applicable to agricultural commodities generally; or

“(B)(i) the project—

“(I) involves a minor commodity; and

“(II) deals with scientifically important research; and

“(ii) the recipient is unable to satisfy the matching funds requirement.”.

(B) SPECIALTY CROP RESEARCH INITIATIVE.—Section 412(g) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7632(g)) is amended—

(i) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(ii) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An entity receiving a grant under this section shall provide non-

Federal matching funds (including funds from a generic agricultural commodity promotion, research, and information program) equal to not less than the amount of the grant.

“(B) IN-KIND SUPPORT.—Non-Federal matching funds described in subparagraph (A) may include in-kind support.”.

(4) OTHER LAWS.—

(A) SUN GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 7526(c)(1)(C)(iv) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8114(c)(1)(C)(iv)) is amended by striking subclause (IV).

(B) AGRICULTURE AND FOOD RESEARCH INITIATIVE.—Subsection (b)(9) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 3157(b)(9)) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking clause (iii);

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in clause (i), by striking “clauses (ii) and (iii),” and inserting “clause (ii),”; and

(II) by striking clause (iii); and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) APPLIED RESEARCH.—An entity receiving a grant under paragraph (5)(B) for applied research that is commodity-specific and not of national scope shall provide non-Federal matching funds equal to not less than the amount of the grant.”.

(c) APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.—

(1) GRANTS AWARDED AFTER OCTOBER 1, 2018.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply with respect to grants described in subsection (b) that are awarded after October 1, 2018.

(2) GRANTS AWARDED ON OR BEFORE OCTOBER 1, 2018.—Notwithstanding the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b), a matching funds requirement in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act under a provision of law amended by subsection (a) or (b) shall continue to apply to a grant described in subsection (b) that is awarded on or before October 1, 2018.

TITLE VIII—FORESTRY

Subtitle A—Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978

SEC. 8101. STATE AND PRIVATE FOREST LANDSCAPE-SCALE RESTORATION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 13A of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2109a) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 13A. STATE AND PRIVATE FOREST LANDSCAPE-SCALE RESTORATION PROGRAM.

“(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to encourage collaborative, science-based restoration of priority forest landscapes.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term ‘Indian tribe’ has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

“(2) NONINDUSTRIAL PRIVATE FOREST LAND.—The term ‘nonindustrial private forest land’ means land that—

“(A) is rural, as determined by the Secretary;

“(B) has existing tree cover or is suitable for growing trees; and

“(C) is owned by any private individual, group, association, corporation, Indian tribe, or other private legal entity.

“(3) STATE FOREST LAND.—The term ‘State forest land’ means land that—

“(A) is rural, as determined by the Secretary; and

“(B) is under State or local governmental ownership and considered to be non-Federal forest land.

“(c) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary, in consultation with State foresters or appropriate State agencies, shall establish a competitive grant program to provide financial

and technical assistance to encourage collaborative, science-based restoration of priority forest landscapes.

“(d) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an applicant shall submit to the Secretary, through the State forester or appropriate State agency, a State and private forest landscape-scale restoration proposal based on a restoration strategy that—

“(1) is complete or substantially complete;

“(2) is for a multiyear period;

“(3) covers nonindustrial private forest land or State forest land;

“(4) is accessible by wood-processing infrastructure; and

“(5) is based on the best available science.

“(e) PLAN CRITERIA.—A State and private forest landscape-scale restoration proposal submitted under this section shall include plans—

“(1) to reduce the risk of uncharacteristic wildfires;

“(2) to improve fish and wildlife habitats, including the habitats of threatened and endangered species;

“(3) to maintain or improve water quality and watershed function;

“(4) to mitigate invasive species, insect infestation, and disease;

“(5) to improve important forest ecosystems;

“(6) to measure ecological and economic benefits, including air quality and soil quality and productivity; and

“(7) to take other relevant actions, as determined by the Secretary.

“(f) PRIORITIES.—In making grants under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to plans that—

“(1) further a statewide forest assessment and resource strategy;

“(2) promote cross boundary landscape collaboration; and

“(3) leverage public and private resources.

“(g) COLLABORATION AND CONSULTATION.—The Chief of the Forest Service, the Chief of the Natural Resources Conservation Service, and relevant stakeholders shall collaborate and consult on an ongoing basis regarding—

“(1) administration of the program established under this section; and

“(2) identification of other applicable resources for landscape-scale restoration.

“(h) MATCHING FUNDS REQUIRED.—As a condition of receiving a grant under this section, the Secretary shall require the recipient of the grant to provide funds or in-kind support from non-Federal sources in an amount that is at least equal to the amount of Federal funds.

“(i) COORDINATION AND PROXIMITY ENCOURAGED.—In making grants under this section, the Secretary may consider coordination with and proximity to other landscape-scale projects on other land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary, the Secretary of the Interior, or a Governor of a State, including under—

“(1) the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program established under section 4003 of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (16 U.S.C. 7303);

“(2) landscape areas designated for insect and disease treatments under section 602 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6591a);

“(3) good neighbor authority under section 19;

“(4) stewardship end result contracting projects authorized under section 604 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6591c);

“(5) appropriate State-level programs; and

“(6) other relevant programs, as determined by the Secretary.

“(j) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall promulgate such regulations as the Sec-

retary determines necessary to carry out this section.

“(k) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report on—

“(1) the status of development, execution, and administration of selected projects;

“(2) the accounting of program funding expenditures; and

“(3) specific accomplishments that have resulted from landscape-scale projects.

“(l) FUND.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Treasury a fund, to be known as the ‘State and Private Forest Landscape-Scale Restoration Fund’ (referred to in this subsection as the ‘Fund’), to be used by the Secretary to make grants under this section.

“(2) CONTENTS.—The Fund shall consist of such amounts as are appropriated to the Fund under paragraph (3).

“(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Fund \$20,000,000 for each fiscal year beginning with the first full fiscal year after the date of enactment of this subsection through fiscal year 2023, to remain available until expended.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 13B of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2109b) is repealed.

(2) Section 19(a)(4)(C) of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2113(a)(4)(C)) is amended by striking “sections 13A and 13B” and inserting “section 13A”.

Subtitle B—Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act of 1978

SEC. 8201. REPEAL OF RECYCLING RESEARCH.

Section 9 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 1648) is repealed.

SEC. 8202. REPEAL OF FORESTRY STUDENT GRANT PROGRAM.

Section 10 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 1649) is repealed.

Subtitle C—Global Climate Change Prevention Act of 1990

SEC. 8301. REPEALS.

(a) BIOMASS ENERGY DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—Section 2410 of the Global Climate Change Prevention Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6708) is repealed.

(b) INTERAGENCY COOPERATION TO MAXIMIZE BIOMASS GROWTH.—Section 2411 of the Global Climate Change Prevention Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6709) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “to—” and all that follows through “such forests and lands” in paragraph (2) and inserting “to develop a program to manage forests and land on Department of Defense military installations”.

Subtitle D—Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003

SEC. 8401. PROMOTING CROSS-BOUNDARY WILDFIRE MITIGATION.

Section 103 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6513) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) CROSS-BOUNDARY HAZARDOUS FUEL REDUCTION PROJECTS.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) HAZARDOUS FUEL REDUCTION PROJECT.—The term ‘hazardous fuel reduction project’ means a hazardous fuel reduction project described in paragraph (2).

“(B) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The term ‘non-Federal land’ includes—

“(i) State land;

- “(ii) county land;
- “(iii) Tribal land;
- “(iv) private land; and
- “(v) other non-Federal land.

“(2) GRANTS.—The Secretary may make grants to State foresters to support hazardous fuel reduction projects that incorporate treatments in landscapes across ownership boundaries on Federal and non-Federal land, particularly in areas identified as priorities in applicable State-wide forest resource assessments or strategies under section 2A(a) of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2101a(a)), as mutually agreed to by the State forester and the Regional Forester.

“(3) LAND TREATMENTS.—To conduct and fund treatments for hazardous fuel reduction projects carried out by State foresters using grants under paragraph (2), the Secretary may use the authorities of the Secretary relating to cooperation and technical and financial assistance, including the good neighbor authority under—

“(A) section 8206 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (16 U.S.C. 2113a); and

“(B) section 331 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001 (16 U.S.C. 1011 note; Public Law 106-291).

“(4) COOPERATION.—In carrying out a hazardous fuel reduction project using a grant under paragraph (2) on non-Federal land, the State forester, in consultation with the Secretary—

“(A) shall consult with any applicable owners of the non-Federal land; and

“(B) shall not implement the hazardous fuel reduction project on non-Federal land without the consent of the owner of the non-Federal land.

“(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection \$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”

SEC. 8402. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR HAZARDOUS FUEL REDUCTION ON FEDERAL LAND.

Section 108 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6518) is amended by striking “\$760,000,000 for each fiscal year” and inserting “\$660,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023”.

SEC. 8403. REPEAL OF BIOMASS COMMERCIAL UTILIZATION GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 203 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6531) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6501 note; Public Law 108-148) is amended by striking the item relating to section 203.

SEC. 8404. WATER SOURCE PROTECTION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6541 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 303. WATER SOURCE PROTECTION PROGRAM.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) END WATER USER.—The term ‘end water user’ means a non-Federal entity, including—

- “(A) a State;
- “(B) a political subdivision of a State;
- “(C) an Indian tribe;
- “(D) a utility;
- “(E) a municipal water system;
- “(F) an irrigation district;
- “(G) a nonprofit organization; and
- “(H) a corporation.

“(2) FOREST MANAGEMENT ACTIVITY.—The term ‘forest management activity’ means a project carried out by the Secretary on National Forest System land.

“(3) FOREST PLAN.—The term ‘forest plan’ means a land management plan prepared by the Forest Service for a unit of the National Forest System pursuant to section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604).

“(4) NON-FEDERAL PARTNER.—The term ‘non-Federal partner’ means an end water user with whom the Secretary has entered into a partnership agreement under subsection (c)(1).

“(5) PROGRAM.—The term ‘Program’ means the Water Source Protection Program established under subsection (b).

“(6) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service.

“(7) WATER SOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The term ‘water source management plan’ means the water source management plan developed under subsection (d)(1).

“(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish and maintain a program, to be known as the ‘Water Source Protection Program’, to carry out watershed protection and restoration projects on National Forest System land.

“(c) WATER SOURCE INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the Program, the Secretary may enter into water source investment partnership agreements with end water users to protect and restore the condition of National Forest watersheds that provide water to the end water users.

“(2) FORM.—A partnership agreement described in paragraph (1) may take the form of—

- “(A) a memorandum of understanding;
- “(B) a cost-share or collection agreement;
- “(C) a long-term funding matching commitment; or
- “(D) another appropriate instrument, as determined by the Secretary.

“(d) WATER SOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the Program, the Secretary, in cooperation with the non-Federal partners and applicable State, local, and Tribal governments, may develop a water source management plan that describes the proposed implementation of watershed protection and restoration projects under the Program.

“(2) REQUIREMENT.—A water source management plan shall be conducted in a manner consistent with the forest plan applicable to the National Forest System land on which the watershed protection and restoration project is carried out.

“(3) ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS.—The Secretary may conduct a single environmental impact statement or similar analysis required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.)—

“(A) for each watershed protection and restoration project included in the water source management plan; or

“(B) as part of the development of, or after the finalization of, the water source management plan.

“(e) FOREST MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To the extent that forest management activities are necessary to protect, maintain, or enhance water quality, and in accordance with paragraph (2), the Secretary shall carry out forest management activities as part of watershed protection and restoration projects carried out on National Forest System land, with the primary purpose of—

- “(A) protecting a municipal water supply system;
- “(B) restoring forest health from insect infestations and disease; or
- “(C) any combination of the purposes described in subparagraphs (A) and (B).

“(2) COMPLIANCE.—The Secretary shall carry out forest management activities under paragraph (1) in accordance with—

- “(A) this Act;
- “(B) the applicable water source management plan;
- “(C) the applicable forest plan; and
- “(D) other applicable laws.

“(f) ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT OF 1973.—In carrying out the Program, the Secretary may use the Manual on Adaptive Management of the Department of the Interior, including any associated guidance, to comply with the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

“(g) FUNDS AND SERVICES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the Program, the Secretary may accept and use funding, services, and other forms of investment and assistance from non-Federal partners to implement the water source management plan.

“(2) MATCHING FUNDS REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall require the contribution of funds or in-kind support from non-Federal partners to be in an amount that is at least equal to the amount of Federal funds.

“(3) MANNER OF USE.—The Secretary may accept and use investments described in paragraph (1) directly or indirectly through the National Forest Foundation.

“(4) WATER SOURCE PROTECTION FUND.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary may establish a Water Source Protection Fund to match funds or in-kind support contributed by non-Federal partners under paragraph (1).

“(B) USE OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.

“(C) PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may make multiyear commitments, if necessary, to implement 1 or more partnership agreements under subsection (c).”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6501 note; Public Law 108-148) is amended by striking the item relating to section 303 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 303. Water Source Protection Program.”

SEC. 8405. WATERSHED CONDITION FRAMEWORK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6541 et seq.) (as amended by section 8404(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 304. WATERSHED CONDITION FRAMEWORK.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service (referred to in this section as the ‘Secretary’), shall establish and maintain a Watershed Condition Framework for National Forest System land—

“(1) to evaluate and classify the condition of watersheds, taking into consideration—

- “(A) water quality and quantity;
- “(B) aquatic habitat and biota;
- “(C) riparian and wetland vegetation;
- “(D) the presence of roads and trails;
- “(E) soil type and condition;
- “(F) groundwater-dependent ecosystems;
- “(G) relevant terrestrial indicators, such as fire regime, risk of catastrophic fire, forest and rangeland vegetation, invasive species, and insects and disease; and
- “(H) other significant factors, as determined by the Secretary;

“(2) to identify for protection and restoration up to 5 priority watersheds in each National Forest, and up to 2 priority watersheds in each national grassland, taking into consideration the impact of the condition of the watershed condition on—

- “(A) wildfire behavior;

“(B) flood risk;
 “(C) fish and wildlife;
 “(D) drinking water supplies;
 “(E) irrigation water supplies;
 “(F) forest-dependent communities; and
 “(G) other significant impacts, as determined by the Secretary;

“(3) to develop a watershed protection and restoration action plan for each priority watershed that—

“(A) takes into account existing restoration activities being implemented in the watershed; and

“(B) includes, at a minimum—

“(i) the major stressors responsible for the impaired condition of the watershed;

“(ii) a set of essential projects that, once completed, will address the identified stressors and improve watershed conditions;

“(iii) a proposed implementation schedule;

“(iv) potential partners and funding sources; and

“(v) a monitoring and evaluation program;

“(4) to prioritize protection and restoration activities for each watershed restoration action plan;

“(5) to implement each watershed protection and restoration action plan; and

“(6) to monitor the effectiveness of protection and restoration actions and indicators of watershed health.

“(b) **COORDINATION.**—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

“(1) coordinate with interested non-Federal landowners and State, Tribal, and local governments within the relevant watershed; and

“(2) provide for an active and ongoing public engagement process.

“(c) **EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (2) of subsection (a), the Secretary may identify a watershed as a priority for rehabilitation in the Watershed Condition Framework without using the process described in that subsection if a Forest Supervisor determines that—

“(1) a wildfire has significantly diminished the condition of the watershed; and

“(2) the emergency stabilization activities of the Burned Area Emergency Response Team are insufficient to return the watershed to proper function.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents for the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6501 note; Public Law 108-148) (as amended by section 8404(b)) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 303 the following:

“Sec. 304. Watershed Condition Framework.”.

SEC. 8406. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS TO COMBAT INSECT INFESTATIONS AND RELATED DISEASES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 406 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6556) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 406. TERMINATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.

“The authority provided by this title terminates effective October 1, 2023.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents for the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6501 note; Public Law 108-148) is amended by striking the item relating to section 406 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 406. Termination of effectiveness.”.

SEC. 8407. HEALTHY FORESTS RESERVE PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 508(b) of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6578(b)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”; and

(2) by striking “2018.” and inserting “2023.”.

SEC. 8408. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR DESIGNATION OF TREATMENT AREAS.

Section 602 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6591a) is amended by striking subsection (f).

SEC. 8409. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OF COLLABORATIVE RESTORATION PROJECTS.

Section 603(c) of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6591b(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) **EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES.**—The Secretary shall apply the extraordinary circumstances procedures under section 220.6 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), when using the categorical exclusion under this section.”.

Subtitle E—Repeal or Reauthorization of Miscellaneous Forestry Programs

SEC. 8501. REPEAL OF REVISION OF STRATEGIC PLAN FOR FOREST INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS.

Section 8301 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (16 U.S.C. 1642 note; Public Law 113-79) is repealed.

SEC. 8502. SEMIARID AGROFORESTRY RESEARCH CENTER.

Section 1243(d) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 1642 note; Public Law 101-624) is amended by striking “annually” and inserting “for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023”.

SEC. 8503. NATIONAL FOREST FOUNDATION ACT.

(a) **MATCHING FUNDS.**—Section 405(b) of the National Forest Foundation Act (16 U.S.C. 583j-3(b)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Section 410(b) of the National Forest Foundation Act (16 U.S.C. 583j-8(b)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 8504. CONVEYANCE OF FOREST SERVICE ADMINISTRATIVE SITES.

Section 503(f) of the Forest Service Facility Realignment and Enhancement Act of 2005 (16 U.S.C. 580d note; Public Law 109-54) is amended by striking “2016” and inserting “2023”.

Subtitle F—Forest Management

SEC. 8601. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) **NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM.**—The term “National Forest System” has the meaning given the term in section 11(a) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1609(a)).

(2) **PUBLIC LAND.**—The term “public land” has the meaning given the term “public lands” in section 103 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702).

PART I—EXPEDITED ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS AND AVAILABILITY OF CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS TO EXPEDITE FOREST MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

SEC. 8611. CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION FOR GREATER SAGE-GROUSE AND MULE DEER HABITAT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Title VI of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6591 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 606. CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION FOR GREATER SAGE-GROUSE AND MULE DEER HABITAT.

“(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **COVERED VEGETATION MANAGEMENT ACTIVITY.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘covered vegetation management activity’ means any activity described in subparagraph (B) that—

“(i)(I) is carried out on National Forest System land administered by the Forest Service; or

“(II) is carried out on public land administered by the Bureau of Land Management;

“(ii) with respect to public land, meets the objectives of the order of the Secretary of the Interior numbered 3336 and dated January 5, 2015;

“(iii) conforms to an applicable forest plan or land use plan;

“(iv) protects, restores, or improves greater sage-grouse or mule deer habitat in a sagebrush steppe ecosystem as described in—

“(I) Circular 1416 of the United States Geological Survey entitled ‘Restoration Handbook for Sagebrush Steppe Ecosystems with Emphasis on Greater Sage-Grouse Habitat—Part 1. Concepts for Understanding and Applying Restoration’ (2015); or

“(II) the habitat guidelines for mule deer published by the Mule Deer Working Group of the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies;

“(v) will not permanently impair—

“(I) the natural state of the treated area;

“(II) outstanding opportunities for solitude;

“(III) outstanding opportunities for primitive, unconfined recreation;

“(IV) economic opportunities consistent with multiple-use management; or

“(V) the identified values of a unit of the National Landscape Conservation System;

“(vi)(I) restores native vegetation following a natural disturbance;

“(II) prevents the expansion into greater sage-grouse or mule deer habitat of—

“(aa) juniper, pinyon pine, or other associated conifers; or

“(bb) nonnative or invasive vegetation;

“(III) reduces the risk of loss of greater sage-grouse or mule deer habitat from wildfire or any other natural disturbance; or

“(IV) provides emergency stabilization of soil resources after a natural disturbance; and

“(vii) provides for the conduct of restoration treatments that—

“(I) maximize the retention of old-growth and large trees, as appropriate for the forest type;

“(II) consider the best available scientific information to maintain or restore the ecological integrity, including maintaining or restoring structure, function, composition, and connectivity;

“(III) are developed and implemented through a collaborative process that—

“(aa) includes multiple interested persons representing diverse interests; and

“(bb)(AA) is transparent and nonexclusive; or

“(BB) meets the requirements for a resource advisory committee under subsections (c) through (f) of section 205 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7125); and

“(IV) may include the implementation of a proposal that complies with the eligibility requirements of the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program under section 4003(b) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (16 U.S.C. 7303(b)).

“(B) **DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES.**—An activity referred to in subparagraph (A) is—

“(i) manual cutting and removal of juniper trees, pinyon pine trees, other associated conifers, or other nonnative or invasive vegetation;

“(ii) mechanical mastication, cutting, or mowing, mechanical piling and burning, chaining, broadcast burning, or yarding;

“(iii) removal of cheat grass, medusa head rye, or other nonnative, invasive vegetation;

“(iv) collection and seeding or planting of native vegetation using a manual, mechanical, or aerial method;

“(v) seeding of nonnative, noninvasive, ruderal vegetation only for the purpose of emergency stabilization;

“(vi) targeted use of an herbicide, subject to the condition that the use shall be in accordance with applicable legal requirements, Federal agency procedures, and land use plans;

“(vii) targeted livestock grazing to mitigate hazardous fuels and control noxious and invasive weeds;

“(viii) temporary removal of wild horses or burros in the area in which the activity is being carried out to ensure treatment objectives are met;

“(ix) in coordination with the affected permit holder, modification or adjustment of permissible usage under an annual plan of use of a grazing permit issued by the Secretary concerned to achieve restoration treatment objectives;

“(x) installation of new, or modification of existing, fencing or water sources intended to control use or improve wildlife habitat; or

“(xi) necessary maintenance of, repairs to, rehabilitation of, or reconstruction of an existing permanent road or construction of temporary roads to accomplish the activities described in this subparagraph.

“(C) EXCLUSIONS.—The term ‘covered vegetation management activity’ does not include—

“(i) any activity conducted in a wilderness area or wilderness study area;

“(ii) any activity for the construction of a permanent road or permanent trail;

“(iii) any activity conducted on Federal land on which, by Act of Congress or Presidential proclamation, the removal of vegetation is restricted or prohibited;

“(iv) any activity conducted in an area in which activities under subparagraph (B) would be inconsistent with the applicable land and resource management plan; or

“(v) any activity conducted in an inventoried roadless area.

“(2) SECRETARY CONCERNED.—The term ‘Secretary concerned’ means—

“(A) the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to National Forest System land; and

“(B) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to public land.

“(3) TEMPORARY ROAD.—The term ‘temporary road’ means a road that is—

“(A) authorized—

“(i) by a contract, permit, lease, other written authorization; or

“(ii) pursuant to an emergency operation;

“(B) not intended to be part of the permanent transportation system of a Federal department or agency;

“(C) not necessary for long-term resource management;

“(D) designed in accordance with standards appropriate for the intended use of the road, taking into consideration—

“(i) safety;

“(ii) the cost of transportation; and

“(iii) impacts to land and resources; and

“(E) managed to minimize—

“(i) erosion; and

“(ii) the introduction or spread of invasive species.

“(b) CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary concerned shall develop a categorical exclusion (as defined in section 1508.4 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation)) for covered vegetation management activities carried out to protect, restore, or improve habitat for greater sage-grouse or mule deer.

“(2) ADMINISTRATION.—In developing and administering the categorical exclusion under paragraph (1), the Secretary concerned shall—

“(A) comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

“(B) with respect to National Forest System land, apply the extraordinary circumstances procedures under section 220.6 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), in determining whether to use the categorical exclusion;

“(C) with respect to public land, apply the extraordinary circumstances procedures under section 46.215 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), in determining whether to use the categorical exclusion; and

“(D) consider—

“(i) the relative efficacy of landscape-scale habitat projects;

“(ii) the likelihood of continued declines in the populations of greater sage-grouse and mule deer in the absence of landscape-scale vegetation management; and

“(iii) the need for habitat restoration activities after wildfire or other natural disturbances.

“(c) IMPLEMENTATION OF COVERED VEGETATIVE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE RANGE OF GREATER SAGE-GROUSE AND MULE DEER.—If the categorical exclusion developed under subsection (b) is used to implement a covered vegetative management activity in an area within the range of both greater sage-grouse and mule deer, the covered vegetative management activity shall protect, restore, or improve habitat concurrently for both greater sage-grouse and mule deer.

“(d) LONG-TERM MONITORING AND MAINTENANCE.—Before commencing any covered vegetation management activity that is covered by the categorical exclusion under subsection (b), the Secretary concerned shall develop a long-term monitoring and maintenance plan, covering at least the 20-year period beginning on the date of commencement, to ensure that management of the treated area does not degrade the habitat gains secured by the covered vegetation management activity.

“(e) DISPOSAL OF VEGETATIVE MATERIAL.—Subject to applicable local restrictions, any vegetative material resulting from a covered vegetation management activity that is covered by the categorical exclusion under subsection (b) may be—

“(1) used for—

“(A) fuel wood; or

“(B) other products; or

“(2) piled or burned, or both.

“(f) TREATMENT FOR TEMPORARY ROADS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (a)(1)(B)(xi), any temporary road constructed in carrying out a covered vegetation management activity that is covered by the categorical exclusion under subsection (b)—

“(A) shall be used by the Secretary concerned for the covered vegetation management activity for not more than 2 years; and

“(B) shall be decommissioned by the Secretary concerned not later than 3 years after the earlier of the date on which—

“(i) the temporary road is no longer needed; and

“(ii) the project is completed.

“(2) REQUIREMENT.—A treatment under paragraph (1) shall include reestablishing native vegetative cover—

“(A) as soon as practicable; but

“(B) not later than 10 years after the date of completion of the applicable covered vegetation management activity.

“(g) LIMITATIONS.—

“(1) PROJECT SIZE.—A covered vegetation management activity that is covered by the categorical exclusion under subsection (b) may not exceed 3,000 acres.

“(2) LOCATION.—A covered vegetation management activity carried out on National

Forest System land that is covered by the categorical exclusion under subsection (b) shall be limited to areas designated under section 602(b), as of the date of enactment of this section.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The table of contents for the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6501 note; Public Law 108-148) is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to title VI the following:

“Sec. 602. Designation of treatment areas.

“Sec. 603. Administrative review.

“Sec. 604. Stewardship end result contracting projects.

“Sec. 605. Wildfire resilience projects.

“Sec. 606. Categorical exclusion for greater sage-grouse and mule deer habitat.”.

PART II—MISCELLANEOUS FOREST MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

SEC. 8621. ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY FOR SALE OR EXCHANGE OF SMALL PARCELS OF NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LAND.

(a) INCREASE IN MAXIMUM VALUE OF SMALL PARCELS.—Section 3 of Public Law 97-465 (commonly known as the “Small Tract Act of 1983”) (16 U.S.C. 521e) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “\$150,000” and inserting “\$500,000”.

(b) ADDITIONAL CONVEYANCE PURPOSES.—Section 3 of Public Law 97-465 (16 U.S.C. 521e) (as amended by subsection (a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) parcels of 40 acres or less that are determined by the Secretary—

“(A) to be physically isolated from other Federal land;

“(B) to be inaccessible; or

“(C) to have lost National Forest character;

“(5) parcels of 10 acres or less that are not eligible for conveyance under paragraph (2) but are encroached on by a permanent habitable improvement for which there is no evidence that the encroachment was intentional or negligent; or

“(6) parcels used as a cemetery (including a parcel of not more than 1 acre adjacent to the parcel used as a cemetery), a landfill, or a sewage treatment plant under a special use authorization issued or otherwise authorized by the Secretary.”.

(c) DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS.—Section 2 of Public Law 97-465 (16 U.S.C. 521d) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “The Secretary is authorized” and inserting the following:

“(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORITY; CONSIDERATION.—The Secretary is authorized”;

(2) in paragraph (2), in the second sentence, by striking “The Secretary shall insert” and inserting the following:

“(b) INCLUSION OF TERMS, COVENANTS, CONDITIONS, AND RESERVATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall insert”;

(3) in subsection (b) (as so designated)—

(A) by striking “covenants” and inserting “covenants”; and

(B) in the second sentence by striking “The preceding sentence shall not” and inserting the following:

“(2) LIMITATION.—Paragraph (1) shall not”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS.—

“(1) DEPOSIT IN SISK FUND.—The net proceeds derived from any sale or exchange conducted under paragraph (4), (5), or (6) of section 3 shall be deposited in the fund established under Public Law 90-171 (commonly known as the ‘Sisk Act’) (16 U.S.C. 484a).

“(2) USE.—Amounts deposited under paragraph (1) shall be available to the Secretary until expended for—

“(A) the acquisition of land or interests in land for administrative sites for the National Forest System in the State from which the amounts were derived;

“(B) the acquisition of land or interests in land for inclusion in the National Forest System in that State, including land or interests in land that enhance opportunities for recreational access; or

“(C) the reimbursement of the Secretary for costs incurred in preparing a sale conducted under the authority of section 3 if the sale is a competitive sale.”.

SEC. 8622. FOREST SERVICE PARTICIPATION IN ACES PROGRAM.

Section 8302 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (16 U.S.C. 3851a) is amended—

(1) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) TERMINATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.—The authority provided to the Secretary to carry out this section terminates effective October 1, 2023.”.

SEC. 8623. AUTHORIZATION FOR LEASE OF FOREST SERVICE SITES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATIVE SITE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “administrative site” means—

(i) any facility or improvement, including curtilage, that was acquired or is used specifically for purposes of administration of the National Forest System;

(ii) any Federal land that—

(I) is associated with a facility or improvement described in clause (i) that was acquired or is used specifically for purposes of administration of Forest Service activities; and

(II) underlies or abuts the facility or improvement; and

(iii) for each fiscal year, not more than 10 isolated, undeveloped parcels of not more than 40 acres each.

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term “administrative site” does not include—

(i) any land within a unit of the National Forest System that is exclusively designated for natural area or recreational purposes;

(ii) any land within—

(I) a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System;

(II) a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; or

(III) a National Monument; or

(iii) any Federal land that the Secretary determines—

(I) is needed for resource management purposes or to provide access to other land or water; or

(II) would be in the public interest not to lease.

(2) FACILITY OR IMPROVEMENT.—The term “facility or improvement” includes—

(A) a forest headquarters;

(B) a ranger station;

(C) a research station or laboratory;

(D) a dwelling;

(E) a warehouse;

(F) a scaling station;

(G) a fire-retardant mixing station;

(H) a fire-lookout station;

(I) a guard station;

(J) a storage facility;

(K) a telecommunication facility; and

(L) any other administrative installation for conducting Forest Service activities.

(3) MARKET ANALYSIS.—The term “market analysis” means the identification and study of the market for a particular economic good or service.

(b) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary may lease an administrative site that is under the

jurisdiction of the Secretary in accordance with this section.

(c) IDENTIFICATION OF ELIGIBLE SITES.—A regional forester, in consultation with forest supervisors in the region, may submit to the Secretary a recommendation for administrative sites in the region that the regional forester considers eligible for leasing under this section.

(d) CONSULTATION WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC NOTICE.—Before making an administrative site available for lease under this section, the Secretary shall—

(1) consult with government officials of the community and of the State in which the administrative site is located; and

(2) provide public notice of the proposed lease.

(e) LEASE REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) SIZE.—An administrative site or compound of administrative sites under a single lease under this section may not exceed 40 acres.

(2) CONFIGURATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE SITES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—To facilitate the lease of an administrative site under this section, the Secretary may configure the administrative site—

(i) to maximize the marketability of the administrative site; and

(ii) to achieve management objectives.

(B) SEPARATE TREATMENT OF FACILITY OR IMPROVEMENT.—A facility or improvement on an administrative site to be leased under this section may be severed from the land and leased under a separate lease under this section.

(3) CONSIDERATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A person to which a lease of an administrative site is made under this section shall provide to the Secretary consideration described in subparagraph (B) in an amount that is not less than the market value of the administrative site, as determined in accordance with subparagraph (C).

(B) FORM OF CONSIDERATION.—The consideration referred to in subparagraph (A) may be—

(i) cash;

(ii) in-kind, including—

(I) the construction of new facilities or improvements, the title to which shall be transferred by the lessee to the Secretary;

(II) the maintenance, repair, improvement, or restoration of existing facilities or improvements; and

(III) other services relating to activities that occur on the administrative site, as determined by the Secretary; or

(iii) any combination of the consideration described in clauses (i) and (ii).

(C) DETERMINATION OF MARKET VALUE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall determine the market value of an administrative site to be leased under this section—

(I) by conducting an appraisal in accordance with—

(aa) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions established in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 4601 et seq.); and

(bb) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice; or

(II) by competitive lease.

(ii) IN-KIND CONSIDERATION.—The Secretary shall determine the market value of any in-kind consideration under subparagraph (B)(ii).

(4) CONDITIONS.—The lease of an administrative site under this section shall be subject to such conditions, including bonding, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(5) RIGHT OF FIRST REFUSAL.—Subject to terms and conditions that the Secretary determines to be necessary, the Secretary shall offer to lease an administrative site to the

municipality or county in which the administrative site is located before seeking to lease the administrative site to any other person.

(f) RELATION TO OTHER LAWS.—

(1) FEDERAL PROPERTY DISPOSAL.—Chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code, shall not apply to the lease of an administrative site under this section.

(2) LEAD-BASED PAINT AND ASBESTOS ABATEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any provision of law relating to the mitigation or abatement of lead-based paint or asbestos-containing building materials, the Secretary shall not be required to mitigate or abate lead-based paint or asbestos-containing building materials with respect to an administrative site to be leased under this section.

(B) PROCEDURES.—With respect to an administrative site to be leased under this section that has lead-based paint or asbestos-containing building materials, the Secretary shall—

(i) provide notice to the person to which the administrative site will be leased of the presence of the lead-based paint or asbestos-containing building material; and

(ii) obtain written assurance from that person that the person will comply with applicable Federal, State, and local laws relating to the management of lead-based paint and asbestos-containing building materials.

(3) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW.—The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) shall apply to the lease of an administrative site under this section, except that, in any environmental review or analysis required under that Act for the lease of an administrative site under this section, the Secretary shall be required only—

(A) to analyze the most reasonably foreseeable use of the administrative site, as determined through a market analysis;

(B) to determine whether to include any conditions under subsection (e)(4); and

(C) to evaluate the alternative of not leasing the administrative site in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(4) COMPLIANCE WITH LOCAL LAWS.—A person that leases an administrative site under this section shall comply with all applicable State and local zoning laws, building codes, and permit requirements for any construction activities that occur on the administrative site.

(g) USE OF CONSIDERATION.—Cash consideration for a lease of an administrative site under this section shall be available to the Secretary, until expended and without further appropriation, to pay—

(1) any necessary and incidental costs incurred by the Secretary in connection with—

(A) the acquisition, improvement, maintenance, reconstruction, or construction of a facility or improvement for the National Forest System; and

(B) the lease of an administrative site under this section; and

(2) reasonable commissions or fees for brokerage services obtained in connection with the lease, subject to the conditions that the Secretary—

(A) determines that the services are in the public interest; and

(B) shall provide public notice of any brokerage services contract entered into in connection with a lease under this section.

(h) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATIONS.—

(1) ANTICIPATED USE OF AUTHORITY.—As part of the annual budget justification documents provided to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Secretary shall include—

(A) a list of the anticipated leases to be made, including the anticipated revenue that may be obtained, under this section;

(B) a description of the intended use of any revenue obtained under a lease under this section, including a list of any projects that cost more than \$500,000; and

(C) a description of accomplishments during previous years using the authority of the Secretary under this section.

(2) CHANGES TO LEASE LIST.—If the Secretary desires to lease an administrative site under this section that is not included on a list provided under paragraph (1)(A), the Secretary shall submit to the congressional committees described in paragraph (3) a notice of the proposed lease, including the anticipated revenue that may be obtained from the lease.

(3) USE OF AUTHORITY.—Not less frequently than once each year, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report describing each lease made by the Secretary under this section during the period covered by the report.

(1) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The authority of the Secretary to make a lease of an administrative site under this section expires on October 1, 2023.

(2) EFFECT ON LEASE AGREEMENT.—Paragraph (1) shall not affect the authority of the Secretary to carry out this section in the case of any lease agreement that was entered into by the Secretary before October 1, 2023.

SEC. 8624. GOOD NEIGHBOR AUTHORITY.

(a) INCLUSION OF INDIAN TRIBES.—Section 8206(a) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (16 U.S.C. 2113a(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “land and non-Federal land” and inserting “land, non-Federal land, and land owned by an Indian tribe”;

(2) in paragraph (5), by inserting “or Indian tribe” after “affected State”;

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (7) and (8), respectively; and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (5) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(6) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term ‘Indian tribe’ has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).”

(b) INCLUSION OF COUNTIES.—Section 8206 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (16 U.S.C. 2113a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by inserting “or county, as applicable,” after “Governor”;

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (9) (as amended by subsection (a)) as paragraphs (3) through (10), respectively;

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) COUNTY.—The term ‘county’ means—
“(A) the appropriate executive official of an affected county; or

“(B) in any case in which multiple counties are affected, the appropriate executive official of a compact of the affected counties.”;

(D) in paragraph (5) (as so redesignated), by inserting “or county, as applicable,” after “Governor”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by inserting “or county” after “Governor”;

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “cooperative agreement or contract entered into under subsection (a)” and inserting “good neighbor agreement”;

(C) in paragraph (3), by inserting “or county” after “Governor”;

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) RECEIPTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any payment made by a county to the Secretary under a project conducted under a good neighbor agreement shall not be considered to be monies received from National Forest System land or Bureau of Land Management land, as applicable.”.

SEC. 8625. WILDLAND-URBAN INTERFACE.

To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall prioritize the expenditure of hazardous fuels funding for projects within the wildland-urban interface (as defined in section 101 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6511)).

SEC. 8626. CHATTAHOOCHEE-OCONEE NATIONAL FOREST LAND ADJUSTMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) certain National Forest System land in the State of Georgia consists of isolated tracts that are inefficient to manage or have lost their principal value for National Forest purposes;

(2) the disposal of that National Forest System land would be in the public interest; and

(3) proceeds from the sale of National Forest System land under subsection (b)(1) would be used best by the Forest Service to purchase land for National Forest purposes in the State of Georgia.

(b) LAND CONVEYANCE AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, the Secretary may sell or exchange any or all rights, title, and interest of the United States in and to the National Forest System land described in paragraph (2)(A).

(2) LAND AUTHORIZED FOR DISPOSAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The National Forest System land referred to in paragraph (1) is the 30 tracts of land totaling approximately 3,841 acres that are generally depicted on the 2 maps entitled “Priority Land Adjustments, State of Georgia, U.S. Forest Service—Southern Region, Oconee and Chattahoochee National Forests, U.S. Congressional Districts—8, 9, 10 & 14” and dated September 24, 2013.

(B) MAPS.—The maps described in subparagraph (A) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Forest Supervisor, Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forest, until such time as the land is sold or exchanged.

(C) MODIFICATION OF BOUNDARIES.—The Secretary may modify the boundaries of the National Forest System land described in subparagraph (A) based on land management considerations.

(3) FORM OF CONVEYANCE.—

(A) QUITCLAIM DEED.—The Secretary shall convey National Forest System land sold or exchanged under paragraph (1) by quitclaim deed.

(B) RESERVATIONS.—The Secretary may reserve any rights-of-way or other rights or interests in National Forest System land sold or exchanged under paragraph (1) that the Secretary considers necessary for management purposes or to protect the public interest.

(4) VALUATION.—

(A) MARKET VALUE.—The Secretary may not sell or exchange National Forest System land under paragraph (1) for less than market value, as determined by appraisal or through competitive bid.

(B) APPRAISAL REQUIREMENTS.—Any appraisal under subparagraph (A) shall be—

(i) consistent with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions or the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice; and

(ii) subject to the approval of the Secretary.

(5) CONSIDERATION.—

(A) CASH.—Consideration for a sale of National Forest System land or equalization of an exchange under paragraph (1) shall be paid in cash.

(B) EXCHANGE.—Notwithstanding section 206(b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716(b)), the Secretary may accept a cash equalization payment in excess of 25 percent of the value of any National Forest System land exchanged under paragraph (1).

(6) METHOD OF SALE.—

(A) OPTIONS.—The Secretary may sell National Forest System land under paragraph (1) at public or private sale, including competitive sale by auction, bid, or otherwise, in accordance with such terms, conditions, and procedures as the Secretary determines are in the best interest of the United States.

(B) SOLICITATIONS.—The Secretary may—

(i) make public or private solicitations for the sale or exchange of National Forest System land under paragraph (1); and

(ii) reject any offer that the Secretary determines is not adequate or not in the public interest.

(7) BROKERS.—The Secretary may—

(A) use brokers or other third parties in the sale or exchange of National Forest System land under paragraph (1); and

(B) from the proceeds of a sale, pay reasonable commissions or fees.

(c) TREATMENT OF PROCEEDS.—

(1) DEPOSIT.—Subject to subsection (b)(7)(B), the Secretary shall deposit the proceeds of a sale or a cash equalization payment received from the sale or exchange of National Forest System land under subsection (b)(1) in the fund established under Public Law 90-171 (commonly known as the “Sisk Act”) (16 U.S.C. 484a).

(2) AVAILABILITY.—Subject to paragraph (3), amounts deposited under paragraph (1) shall be available to the Secretary until expended, without further appropriation, for the acquisition of land for National Forest purposes in the State of Georgia.

(3) PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION.—Nothing in this section authorizes the use of funds deposited under paragraph (1) to be used to acquire land without the written consent of the owner of the land.

SEC. 8627. TENNESSEE WILDERNESS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) MAP.—The term “Map” means the map entitled “Proposed Wilderness Areas and Additions-Cherokee National Forest” and dated January 20, 2010.

(2) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of Tennessee.

(b) ADDITIONS TO CHEROKEE NATIONAL FOREST.—

(1) DESIGNATION OF WILDERNESS.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following parcels of Federal land in the Cherokee National Forest in the State are designated as wilderness and as additions to the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(A) Certain land comprising approximately 9,038 acres, as generally depicted as the “Upper Bald River Wilderness” on the Map and which shall be known as the “Upper Bald River Wilderness”.

(B) Certain land comprising approximately 348 acres, as generally depicted as the “Big Frog Addition” on the Map and which shall be incorporated in, and shall be considered to be a part of, the Big Frog Wilderness.

(C) Certain land comprising approximately 630 acres, as generally depicted as the “Little Frog Mountain Addition NW” on the Map and which shall be incorporated in, and shall be considered to be a part of, the Little Frog Mountain Wilderness.

(D) Certain land comprising approximately 336 acres, as generally depicted as the “Little Frog Mountain Addition NE” on the Map and which shall be incorporated in, and shall be considered to be a part of, the Little Frog Mountain Wilderness.

(E) Certain land comprising approximately 2,922 acres, as generally depicted as the “Sampson Mountain Addition” on the Map and which shall be incorporated in, and shall be considered to be a part of, the Sampson Mountain Wilderness.

(F) Certain land comprising approximately 4,446 acres, as generally depicted as the “Big Laurel Branch Addition” on the Map and which shall be incorporated in, and shall be considered to be a part of, the Big Laurel Branch Wilderness.

(G) Certain land comprising approximately 1,836 acres, as generally depicted as the “Joyce Kilmer-Slickrock Addition” on the Map and which shall be incorporated in, and shall be considered to be a part of, the Joyce Kilmer-Slickrock Wilderness.

(2) MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file maps and legal descriptions of the wilderness areas designated by paragraph (1) with the appropriate committees of Congress.

(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The maps and legal descriptions filed under subparagraph (A) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Chief of the Forest Service and the office of the Supervisor of the Cherokee National Forest.

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

(3) ADMINISTRATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Federal land designated as wilderness by paragraph (1) shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), except that any reference in that Act to the effective date of that Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) FISH AND WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT.—In accordance with section 4(d)(7) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(7)), nothing in this section affects the jurisdiction of the State with respect to fish and wildlife management, including the regulation of hunting, fishing, and trapping, in the wilderness areas designated by paragraph (1).

SEC. 8628. ADDITIONS TO ROUGH MOUNTAIN AND RICH HOLE WILDERNESSES.

(a) ROUGH MOUNTAIN ADDITION.—Section 1 of Public Law 100-326 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 102 Stat. 584; 114 Stat. 2057; 123 Stat. 1002) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(21) ROUGH MOUNTAIN ADDITION.—Certain land in the George Washington National Forest comprising approximately 1,000 acres, as generally depicted as the ‘Rough Mountain Addition’ on the map entitled ‘GEORGE WASHINGTON NATIONAL FOREST – South half – Alternative I – Selected Alternative Management Prescriptions – Land and Resources Management Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement’ and dated March 4, 2014, which is incorporated in the Rough Mountain Wilderness Area designated by paragraph (1).”

(b) RICH HOLE ADDITION.—

(1) POTENTIAL WILDERNESS DESIGNATION.—In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), certain land in the George Washington National Forest comprising approximately 4,600 acres, as generally depicted as the “Rich Hole Addition” on the map entitled “GEORGE WASH-

INGTON NATIONAL FOREST – South half – Alternative I – Selected Alternative Management Prescriptions – Land and Resources Management Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement” and dated March 4, 2014, is designated as a potential wilderness area for incorporation in the Rich Hole Wilderness Area designated by section 1(2) of Public Law 100-326 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 102 Stat. 584; 114 Stat. 2057; 123 Stat. 1002).

(2) WILDERNESS DESIGNATION.—The potential wilderness area designated by paragraph (1) shall be designated as wilderness and incorporated in the Rich Hole Wilderness Area designated by section 1(2) of Public Law 100-326 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 102 Stat. 584; 114 Stat. 2057; 123 Stat. 1002) on the earlier of—

(A) the date on which the Secretary publishes in the Federal Register notice that the activities permitted under paragraph (4) have been completed; or

(B) the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) MANAGEMENT.—Except as provided in paragraph (4), the Secretary shall manage the potential wilderness area designated by paragraph (1) in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.).

(4) WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—To enhance natural ecosystems within the potential wilderness area designated by paragraph (1) by implementing certain activities to improve water quality and aquatic passage, as set forth in the Forest Service document entitled “Decision Notice for the Lower Cowpasture Restoration and Management Project” and dated December 2015, the Secretary may use motorized equipment and mechanized transport in the potential wilderness area until the date on which the potential wilderness area is incorporated into the Rich Hole Wilderness Area under paragraph (2).

(B) REQUIREMENT.—In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Secretary, to the maximum extent practicable, shall use the minimum tool or administrative practice necessary to carry out that subparagraph with the least amount of adverse impact on wilderness character and resources.

SEC. 8629. KISATCHEE NATIONAL FOREST LAND CONVEYANCE.

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds that it is in the public interest to authorize the conveyance of certain Federal land in the Kisatchie National Forest in the State of Louisiana for market value consideration.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COLLINS CAMP PROPERTIES.—The term “Collins Camp Properties” means Collins Camp Properties, Inc., a corporation incorporated under the laws of the State.

(2) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of Louisiana.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF CONVEYANCES, KISATCHEE NATIONAL FOREST, LOUISIANA.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights and paragraph (2), the Secretary may convey the Federal land described in subparagraph (B) by quitclaim deed at public or private sale, including competitive sale by auction, bid, or other methods.

(B) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The Federal land referred to in subparagraph (A) consists of—

(i) all Federal land within sec. 9, T. 10 N., R. 5 W., Winn Parish, Louisiana; and

(ii) a 2.16-acre parcel of Federal land located in the SW¼ of sec. 4, T. 10 N., R. 5 W., Winn Parish, Louisiana, as depicted on a certificate of survey dated March 7, 2007, by Glen L. Cannon, P.L.S. 4436.

(2) FIRST RIGHT OF PURCHASE.—Subject to valid existing rights and subsection (e), during the 1-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, on the provision of

consideration by the Collins Camp Properties to the Secretary, the Secretary shall convey, by quitclaim deed, to Collins Camp Properties all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to—

(A) the not more than 47.92 acres of Federal land comprising the Collins Campsites within sec. 9, T. 10 N., R. 5 W., in Winn Parish, Louisiana, as generally depicted on a certificate of survey dated February 28, 2007, by Glen L. Cannon, P.L.S. 4436; and

(B) the parcel of Federal land described in paragraph (1)(B)(ii).

(3) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may—

(A) configure the Federal land to be conveyed under this section—

(i) to maximize the marketability of the conveyance; or

(ii) to achieve management objectives; and

(B) establish any terms and conditions for the conveyances under this section that the Secretary determines to be in the public interest.

(4) CONSIDERATION.—Consideration for a conveyance of Federal land under this section shall be—

(A) in the form of cash; and

(B) in an amount equal to the market value of the Federal land being conveyed, as determined under paragraph (5).

(5) MARKET VALUE.—The market value of the Federal land conveyed under this section shall be determined—

(A) in the case of Federal land conveyed under paragraph (2), by an appraisal that is—

(i) conducted in accordance with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions; and

(ii) approved by the Secretary; or

(B) if conveyed by a method other than the methods described in paragraph (2), by competitive sale.

(6) HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In any conveyance of Federal land under this section, the Secretary shall meet disclosure requirements for hazardous substances, but shall otherwise not be required to remediate or abate the substances.

(B) EFFECT.—Except as provided in subparagraph (A), nothing in this subsection affects the application of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) to the conveyances of Federal land.

(d) PROCEEDS FROM THE SALE OF LAND.—The Secretary shall deposit the proceeds of a conveyance of Federal land under subsection (c) in the fund established under Public Law 90-171 (commonly known as the “Sisk Act”) (16 U.S.C. 484a).

(e) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) COSTS.—As a condition of a conveyance of Federal land to Collins Camp Properties under subsection (c), the Secretary shall require Collins Camp Properties to pay at closing—

(A) reasonable appraisal costs; and

(B) the cost of any administrative and environmental analyses required by law (including regulations).

(2) PERMITS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An offer by Collins Camp Properties for the acquisition of the Federal land under subsection (c) shall be accompanied by a written statement from each holder of a Forest Service special use authorization with respect to the Federal land that specifies that the holder agrees to relinquish the special use authorization on the conveyance of the Federal land to Collins Camp Properties.

(B) SPECIAL USE AUTHORIZATIONS.—If any holder of a special use authorization described in subparagraph (A) fails to provide a written authorization in accordance with

that subparagraph, the Secretary shall require, as a condition of the conveyance, that Collins Camp Properties administer the special use authorization according to the terms of the special use authorization until the date on which the special use authorization expires.

SEC. 8630. PURCHASE OF NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE PROPERTY, RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds as follows:

(1) Since 1935, the United States has owned a parcel of land in Riverside, California, consisting of approximately 8.75 acres, more specifically described in subsection (b)(1) (in this section referred to as the “property”).

(2) The property is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture and has been variously used for research and plant materials purposes.

(3) Since 1998, the property has been administered by the Natural Resources Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture.

(4) Since 2002, the property has been co-managed under a cooperative agreement between the Natural Resources Conservation Service and the Riverside Corona Resource Conservation District, which is a legal subdivision of the State of California under section 9003 of the California Public Resources Code.

(5) The Conservation District wishes to purchase the property and use it for conservation, environmental, and related educational purposes.

(6) As provided in subsection (b), the purchase of the property by the Conservation District would promote the conservation education and related activities of the Conservation District and result in savings to the Federal Government.

(b) LAND PURCHASE, NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE PROPERTY, RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—

(1) PURCHASE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall sell and quitclaim to the Riverside Corona Resource Conservation District (in this section referred to as the “Conservation District”) all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, including improvements thereon, that is located at 4500 Glenwood Drive in Riverside, California, consists of approximately 8.75 acres, and is administered by the Natural Resources Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture. As necessary or desirable to facilitate the purchase of the property under this subsection, the Secretary or the Conservation District may survey all or portions of the property.

(2) CONSIDERATION.—As consideration for the purchase of the property under this subsection, the Conservation District shall pay to the Secretary an amount equal to the appraised value of the property.

(3) PROHIBITION ON RESERVATION OF INTEREST.—The Secretary shall not reserve any future interest in the property to be conveyed under this subsection, except such interest as may be acceptable to the Conservation District.

(4) HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES.—Notwithstanding section 120(h) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(h)) or the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.), in the case of the property purchased by the Conservation District under this subsection, the Secretary shall be only required to meet the disclosure requirements for hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants, but shall otherwise not be required to remediate or abate any such releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants, including petroleum and petroleum derivatives.

(5) COOPERATIVE AUTHORITY.—

(A) LEASES, CONTRACTS, AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS AUTHORIZED.—In conjunction with, or in addition to, the purchase of the property by the Conservation District under this subsection, the Secretary may enter into leases, contracts and cooperative agreements with the Conservation District.

(B) SOLE SOURCE.—Notwithstanding sections 3105, 3301, and 3303 to 3305 of title 41, United States Code, or any other provision of law, the Secretary may lease real property from the Conservation District on a non-competitive basis.

(C) NON-EXCLUSIVE AUTHORITY.—The authority provided by this subsection is in addition to any other authority of the Secretary.

SEC. 8631. COLLABORATIVE FOREST LANDSCAPE RESTORATION PROGRAM.

(a) REAUTHORIZATION.—Section 4003(f)(6) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (16 U.S.C. 7303(f)(6)) is amended by striking “\$40,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2019” and inserting “\$80,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023”.

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 4003(h) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (16 U.S.C. 7303(h)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively;

(4) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate;”;

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives.”.

SEC. 8632. UTILITY INFRASTRUCTURE RIGHTS-OF-WAY VEGETATION MANAGEMENT PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LAND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “National Forest System land” means land within 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)).

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term “National Forest System land” does not include—

(i) a National Grassland; or

(ii) a land utilization project on land designated as a National Grassland and administered pursuant to sections 31, 32, and 33 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U.S.C. 1010, 1011, 1012).

(2) PASSING WILDFIRE.—The term “passing wildfire” means a wildfire that originates outside of a right-of-way.

(3) PILOT PROGRAM.—The term “pilot program” means the pilot program established by the Secretary under subsection (b).

(4) RIGHT-OF-WAY.—The term “right-of-way” means a special use authorization issued by the Forest Service allowing the placement of utility infrastructure.

(5) UTILITY INFRASTRUCTURE.—The term “utility infrastructure” means electric transmission lines, natural gas infrastructure, or related structures.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—To encourage owners or operators of rights-of-way on National Forest System land to partner with the Forest Service to voluntarily conduct vegetation management projects on a proactive basis to better protect utility infrastructure from potential passing wildfires, the Secretary may establish a limited, voluntary pilot program, in the manner described in this section, to conduct vegetation management projects on National Forest System land adjacent to or near those rights-of-way.

(c) ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A participant in the pilot program shall be the owner or operator of a right-of-way on National Forest System land.

(2) SELECTION PRIORITY.—In selecting participants for the pilot program, the Secretary shall give priority to an owner or operator of a right-of-way that has worked with Forest Service fire scientists and used technologies, such as light detection and ranging surveys, to improve utility infrastructure protection prescriptions.

(d) VEGETATION MANAGEMENT PROJECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A vegetation management project conducted under the pilot program shall involve only limited and selective vegetation management activities that—

(A) shall create the least disturbance reasonably necessary to protect utility infrastructure from passing wildfires based on applicable models, including Forest Service fuel models;

(B) may include thinning, fuel reduction, creation and treatment of shaded fuel breaks, and other appropriate measures;

(C) shall only be conducted on National Forest System land—

(i) adjacent to the right-of-way of a participant; or

(ii) within 75 feet of the right-of-way of a participant; and

(D) shall not be conducted on—

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

(ii) a designated wilderness study area; or

(iii) an inventoried roadless area.

(2) APPROVAL.—Each vegetation management project described in paragraph (1) (including each vegetation management activity described in subparagraphs (A) through (D) of that paragraph) shall be subject to approval by the Forest Service in accordance with this section.

(e) PROJECT COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a participant in the pilot program shall be responsible for all costs, as determined by the Secretary, incurred in participating in the pilot program.

(2) FEDERAL FUNDING.—The Secretary may contribute funds for a vegetation management project conducted under the pilot program if the Secretary determines that the contribution is in the public interest.

(f) LIABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Participation in the pilot program shall not affect any legal obligations or liability standards that—

(A) arise under the right-of-way for activities in the right-of-way; or

(B) apply to fires resulting from causes other than activities conducted pursuant to an approved vegetation management project conducted under the pilot program.

(2) PROJECT WORK.—A participant in the pilot program shall not be liable to the United States for damage proximately caused by an activity conducted pursuant to an approved vegetation management project conducted under the pilot program, unless—

(A) the activity was carried out in a manner that was grossly negligent or that violated criminal law; or

(B) the damage was caused by the failure of the participant to comply with specific safety requirements expressly imposed by the Forest Service as a condition of participation in the pilot program.

(g) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall use the authority of the Secretary under other laws (including regulations) to carry out the pilot program.

(2) MODIFICATION OF REGULATIONS.—In order to implement the pilot program in an

efficient and expeditious manner, the Secretary may waive or modify specific provisions of the Federal Acquisition Regulation, including waivers or modifications to allow for the formation of contracts or agreements on a noncompetitive basis.

(h) TREATMENT OF PROCEEDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may—

(1) retain any funds provided to the Forest Service by a participant in the pilot program; and

(2) use funds retained under paragraph (1), in such amounts as may be appropriated, to carry out the pilot program.

(i) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than December 31, 2020, and 2 years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit a report describing the status of the pilot program and vegetation management projects conducted under the pilot program to—

(1) the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives.

(j) DURATION.—The authority to carry out the pilot program, including any vegetation management project conducted under the pilot program, expires on October 1, 2023.

SEC. 8633. OKHISSA LAKE RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT LAND CONVEYANCE.

(a) DEFINITION OF ALLIANCE.—In this section, the term “Alliance” means the Scenic Rivers Development Alliance.

(b) REQUEST.—Subject to the requirements of this section, if the Alliance submits a written request for conveyance by not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act and the Secretary determines that it is in the public interest to convey the National Forest System Land described in subsection (c), the Secretary shall convey to the Alliance all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the National Forest System land described in subsection (c) by quitclaim deed through a public or private sale, including a competitive sale by auction or bid.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LAND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the National Forest System land referred to in subsection (b) is the approximately 150 acres of real property located in sec. 6, T. 5 N. R. 4 E., Franklin County, Mississippi, and further described as—

(A) the portion of the NW¹/₄ NW¹/₄ lying south of the south boundary of Berrytown Road;

(B) the portion of the W¹/₂ NE¹/₄ NW¹/₄ lying south of the south boundary of Berrytown Road;

(C) the portion of the SW¹/₄ NW¹/₄ lying east of the east boundary of U.S. Highway 98;

(D) the W¹/₂ SE¹/₄ NW¹/₄;

(E) the portion of the NW¹/₄ SW¹/₄ lying east of the east boundary of U.S. Highway 98;

(F) the portion of the NE¹/₄ SW¹/₄ commencing at the southwest corner of the NE¹/₄ SW¹/₄, said point being the point of beginning, thence running east 330 feet along the south boundary of the NE¹/₄ SW¹/₄ to a point in Lake Okhissa, thence running northeasterly to a point in Lake Okhissa on the east boundary of the NE¹/₄ SW¹/₄ 330 feet south of the northeast corner thereof, thence running north 330 feet along the east boundary of the NE¹/₄ SW¹/₄ to the northeast corner thereof, thence running west along the north boundary of the NE¹/₄ SW¹/₄ to the NW corner thereof; thence running south along the west boundary of the NE¹/₄ SW¹/₄ to the point of beginning; and

(G) the portion of the SE¹/₄ SE¹/₄ NW¹/₄ commencing at the southeast corner of the SE¹/₄ NW¹/₄, said point being the point of beginning, and running northwesterly to the northwest corner of the SE¹/₄ SE¹/₄ NW¹/₄,

thence running south along the west boundary of the SE¹/₄ SE¹/₄ NW¹/₄ to the southwest corner thereof, thence running east along the south boundary of the SE¹/₄ SE¹/₄ NW¹/₄ to the point of beginning.

(2) SURVEY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the National Forest System land to be conveyed under this section shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary.

(d) CONSIDERATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The consideration for the conveyance of any National Forest System land under this section shall be—

(A) provided in the form of cash; and

(B) in an amount equal to the fair market value of the National Forest System land being conveyed, as determined under paragraph (2).

(2) FAIR MARKET VALUE DETERMINATION.—The fair market value of the National Forest System land conveyed under this section shall be determined—

(A) in the case of a method of conveyance described in subsection (b), by an appraisal that is—

(i) conducted in accordance with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions; and

(ii) approved by the Secretary; or

(B) in the case of a conveyance by a method other than a method described in subsection (b), by competitive sale.

(e) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The conveyance under this section shall be subject to—

(1) valid existing rights; and

(2) such other terms and conditions as the Secretary considers to be appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(f) PROCEEDS FROM SALE.—The Secretary shall deposit the proceeds of the conveyance of any National Forest System land under this section in the fund established under Public Law 90-171 (commonly known as the “Sisk Act”) (16 U.S.C. 484a).

(g) COSTS.—As a condition for the conveyance under this section, the Secretary shall require the Alliance to pay at closing—

(1) any reasonable appraisal costs; and

(2) the costs of any administrative or environmental analysis required by applicable law (including regulations).

SEC. 8634. PRAIRIE DOGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the grasslands plan guidance of the Forest Service relating to prairie dogs, the Chief of the Forest Service shall base policies of the Forest Service on sound ecological and livestock management principles.

(b) GRAZING ALLOTMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Chief of the Forest Service shall complete a report on the percentage of prairie dogs occupying each total grazing allotment acreage.

(2) ACTION REQUIRED.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the report under paragraph (1) is completed and subject to paragraph (3), the Chief of the Forest Service shall take appropriate action based on the results of that report.

(3) REQUIREMENT.—This section, including any actions taken under paragraph (2), shall apply only to grazing allotments where prairie dogs are present as of the date of enactment of this Act.

PART III—TIMBER INNOVATION

SEC. 8641. DEFINITIONS.

In this part:

(1) INNOVATIVE WOOD PRODUCT.—The term “innovative wood product” means a type of building component or system that uses large panelized wood construction, including mass timber.

(2) MASS TIMBER.—The term “mass timber” includes—

(A) cross-laminated timber;

(B) nail laminated timber;

(C) glue laminated timber;

(D) laminated strand lumber; and

(E) laminated veneer lumber.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary, acting through the Research and Development deputy area and the State and Private Forestry deputy area of the Forest Service.

(4) TALL WOOD BUILDING.—The term “tall wood building” means a building designed to be—

(A) constructed with mass timber; and

(B) more than 85 feet in height.

SEC. 8642. CLARIFICATION OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR WOOD BUILDING CONSTRUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct performance-driven research and development, education, and technical assistance for the purpose of facilitating the use of innovative wood products in wood building construction in the United States.

(b) ACTIVITIES.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) after receipt of input and guidance from, and collaboration with, the wood products industry, conservation organizations, and institutions of higher education, conduct research and development, education, and technical assistance at the Forest Products Laboratory or through the State and Private Forestry deputy area that meets measurable performance goals for the achievement of the priorities described in subsection (c); and

(2) after coordination and collaboration with the wood products industry and conservation organizations, make competitive grants to institutions of higher education to conduct research and development, education, and technical assistance that meets measurable performance goals for the achievement of the priorities described in subsection (c).

(c) PRIORITIES.—The research and development, education, and technical assistance conducted under subsection (a) shall give priority to—

(1) ways to improve the commercialization of innovative wood products;

(2) analyzing the safety of tall wood building materials;

(3) calculations by the Forest Products Laboratory of the lifecycle environmental footprint, from extraction of raw materials through the manufacturing process, of tall wood building construction;

(4) analyzing methods to reduce the lifecycle environmental footprint of tall wood building construction;

(5) analyzing the potential implications of the use of innovative wood products in building construction on wildlife; and

(6) 1 or more other research areas identified by the Secretary, in consultation with conservation organizations, institutions of higher education, and the wood products industry.

(d) TIMEFRAME.—To the maximum extent practicable, the measurable performance goals for the research and development, education, and technical assistance conducted under subsection (a) shall be achievable within a 5-year timeframe.

SEC. 8643. WOOD INNOVATION GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term “eligible entity” means—

(A) an individual;

(B) a public or private entity (including a center of excellence that consists of 1 or more partnerships between forestry, engineering, architecture, or business schools at 1 or more institutions of higher education); or

(C) a State, local, or Tribal government.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service.

(b) GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in carrying out the wood innovation grant program of the Secretary described in the notice of the Secretary entitled “Request for Proposals: 2016 Wood Innovations Funding Opportunity” (80 Fed. Reg. 63498 (October 20, 2015)), may make a wood innovation grant to 1 or more eligible entities each year for the purpose of advancing the use of innovative wood products.

(2) PROPOSALS.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection, an eligible entity shall submit to the Secretary a proposal at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

(c) INCENTIVIZING USE OF EXISTING MILLING CAPACITY.—In selecting among proposals of eligible entities under subsection (b)(2), the Secretary shall give priority to proposals that include the use or retrofitting (or both) of existing sawmill facilities located in counties in which the average annual unemployment rate exceeded the national average unemployment rate by more than 1 percent in the previous calendar year.

(d) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—As a condition of receiving a grant under subsection (b), an eligible entity shall provide funds equal to the amount received by the eligible entity under the grant, to be derived from non-Federal sources.

TITLE IX—ENERGY

SEC. 9101. DEFINITIONS.

Section 9001 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8101) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking “agricultural materials” and inserting “agricultural materials, renewable chemicals.”;

(2) in paragraph (7)(A), by striking “into biofuels and biobased products” and inserting the following: “or an intermediate ingredient or feedstock of renewable biomass into any 1 or more, or a combination, of—

“(i) biofuels;

“(ii) renewable chemicals; or

“(iii) biobased products”; and

(3) in paragraph (16)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “(B)” and inserting “(C)”; and

(ii) by striking “that—” in the matter preceding clause (i) and all that follows through the period at the end of clause (ii) and inserting “that produces usable energy from a renewable energy source.”;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ‘renewable energy system’ includes—

“(i) distribution components necessary to move energy produced by a system described in subparagraph (A) to the initial point of sale; and

“(ii) other components and ancillary infrastructure of a system described in subparagraph (A), such as a storage system.”.

SEC. 9102. BIOBASED MARKETS PROGRAM.

Section 9002 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8102) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)(A)(i)(III), by inserting “, acting through the rural development mission area (referred to in this section as the ‘Secretary’)” before the period at the end;

(2) in subsection (b)(2)(A), by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) RENEWABLE CHEMICALS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of

this clause, the Secretary shall update the criteria issued under clause (i) to provide criteria for determining which renewable chemicals may qualify to receive the label under paragraph (1).”;

(3) in subsection (f), by striking the subsection designation and all that follows through “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(f) MANUFACTURERS OF RENEWABLE CHEMICALS AND BIOBASED PRODUCTS.—

“(1) NAICS CODES.—The Secretary and the Secretary of Commerce shall jointly develop North American Industry Classification System codes for—

“(A) renewable chemicals manufacturers; and

“(B) biobased products manufacturers.

“(2) NATIONAL TESTING CENTER REGISTRY.—The Secretary”;

(4) by redesignating subsections (h) through (j) as subsections (k) through (m), respectively;

(5) by inserting after subsection (g) the following:

“(h) EDUCATION AND OUTREACH.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, shall provide to appropriate stakeholders education and outreach relating to—

“(1) the Federal procurement of biobased products under subsection (a); and

“(2) the voluntary labeling program under subsection (b).

“(i) STREAMLINING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall establish guidelines for an integrated process under which biobased products may be, in 1 expedited approval process—

“(A) determined to be eligible for a Federal procurement preference under subsection (a); and

“(B) approved to use the ‘USDA Certified Biobased Product’ label under subsection (b).

“(2) INITIATION.—The Secretary shall ensure that a review of a biobased product under the integrated qualification process established pursuant to paragraph (1) may be initiated on receipt of a recommendation or petition from a manufacturer, vendor, or other interested party.

“(3) PRODUCT DESIGNATIONS.—The Secretary may issue a product designation pursuant to subsection (a)(3)(B), or approve the use of the ‘USDA Certified Biobased Product’ label under subsection (b), through streamlined procedures, which shall not be subject to chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code.

“(j) REQUIREMENT OF PROCURING AGENCIES.—A procuring agency (as defined in subsection (a)(1)) shall not establish regulations, guidance, or criteria regarding the procurement of biobased products, pursuant to this section or any other law, that impose limitations on that procurement that are more restrictive than the limitations established by the Secretary under the regulations to implement this section.”; and

(6) in subsection (1) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “\$2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” and inserting “\$3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023”.

SEC. 9103. BIOREFINERY ASSISTANCE.

Section 9003 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8103) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “produces an advanced biofuel; and” and inserting the following: “produces any 1 or more, or a combination, of—

“(i) an advanced biofuel;

“(ii) a renewable chemical; or

“(iii) a biobased product; and”;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “‘produces an advanced biofuel.’” and inserting the following: “‘produces any 1 or more, or a combination, of—

“(i) an advanced biofuel;

“(ii) a renewable chemical; or

“(iii) a biobased product.”; and

(2) in subsection (g)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) \$100,000,000 for fiscal year 2019; and

“(iv) \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2020.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 9104. REPOWERING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 9004 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8104) is repealed.

SEC. 9105. BIOENERGY PROGRAM FOR ADVANCED BIOFUEL.

Section 9005(g) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8105(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (D), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) \$15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “\$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” and inserting “\$15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023”.

SEC. 9106. BIODIESEL FUEL EDUCATION PROGRAM.

Section 9006(d)(2) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8106(d)(2)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 9107. RURAL ENERGY FOR AMERICA PROGRAM.

Section 9007 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8107) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e), by striking “(g)” each place it appears and inserting “(f)”;

(2) by striking subsection (f);

(3) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (f); and

(4) in subsection (f) (as so redesignated), in paragraph (3), by striking “\$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” and inserting “\$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023”.

SEC. 9108. RURAL ENERGY SELF-SUFFICIENCY INITIATIVE.

Section 9009 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8109) is repealed.

SEC. 9109. FEEDSTOCK FLEXIBILITY PROGRAM FOR BIOENERGY PRODUCERS.

Section 9010(b) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8110(b)) is amended, in paragraphs (1)(A) and (2)(A), by striking “2018” each place it appears and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 9110. BIOMASS CROP ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 9011 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8111) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(6)—

(A) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in clause (ii)(II), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in clause (iii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) algae.”; and

(B) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by striking clause (iv); and
 (ii) by redesignating clauses (v) through (vii) as clauses (iv) through (vi), respectively;

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by inserting “(including eligible material harvested for the purpose of hazardous woody fuel reduction)” after “material”; and

(3) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “Of the funds” and inserting the following:

“(A) MANDATORY FUNDING.—Of the funds”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A) (as so designated), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”; and
 (iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking the paragraph designation and heading and all that follows through “Effective” in subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(3) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Effective”;

and

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B).

SEC. 9111. BIOGAS RESEARCH AND ADOPTION OF BIOGAS SYSTEMS.

Title IX of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after section 9011 (7 U.S.C. 8111) the following:

“SEC. 9012. BIOGAS RESEARCH AND ADOPTION OF BIOGAS SYSTEMS.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ANAEROBIC DIGESTION.—The term ‘anaerobic digestion’ means a biological process or series of biological processes—

“(A) through which microorganisms break down biodegradable material in the absence of oxygen; and

“(B) the end products of which are biogas and digested materials.

“(2) BIOGAS.—The term ‘biogas’ means a mixture of primarily methane and carbon dioxide produced by the bacterial decomposition of organic materials in the absence of oxygen.

“(3) BIOGAS PROCESSING.—The term ‘biogas processing’ means the process by which water, carbon dioxide, and other trace compounds are removed from biogas, as determined by the end user.

“(4) BIOGAS SYSTEM.—The term ‘biogas system’ means a system—

“(A) with the potential to capture and use biogas, including biogas from organic waste, including animal manure, food waste, waste from landfills, and wastewater; and

“(B) that includes—

“(i) the infrastructure necessary to manage the organic waste referred to in subparagraph (A);

“(ii) the equipment necessary to generate—

“(I) electricity, heat, or fuel; and

“(II) biogas system co-products; and

“(iii) the equipment necessary for biogas processing.

“(5) BIOGAS SYSTEM CO-PRODUCT.—The term ‘biogas system co-product’ means a non-energy biogas system product produced from digested material, including soil amendments, fertilizers, compost, animal bedding, and feedstock for plastics and chemicals.

“(6) DIGESTED MATERIAL.—The term ‘digested material’ means solid or liquid digested material—

“(A) produced by digesters; and

“(B) that contains nutrients and organic carbon.

“(b) INTERAGENCY BIOGAS OPPORTUNITIES TASK FORCE.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Agri-

culture Improvement Act of 2018, the Secretary, acting jointly with the Secretary of Energy and the Administrator, shall establish an Interagency Biogas Opportunities Task Force (referred to in this subsection as the ‘Task Force’) that shall coordinate policies, programs, and research to accelerate—

“(A) biogas research; and

“(B) investment in cost-effective biogas systems.

“(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The Task Force shall be composed of—

“(A) the head of each Federal office responsible for biogas research or biogas system financing (or a designee), including a representative from the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Energy, and the Environmental Protection Agency;

“(B) 1 or more representatives of State or local governments, as determined by the Secretary, the Secretary of Energy, and the Administrator;

“(C) 1 or more nongovernmental or industry stakeholders, including 1 or more stakeholders from relevant industries, as determined by the Secretary, the Secretary of Energy, and the Administrator; and

“(D) 1 or more community stakeholders.

“(3) DUTIES OF THE TASK FORCE.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Task Force shall—

“(A) evaluate and improve the coordination of loan and grant programs of the Federal agencies represented on the Task Force—

“(i) to broaden the financing options available for biogas systems; and

“(ii) to enhance opportunities for private financing of biogas systems;

“(B) review Federal procurement guidelines to ensure that products of biogas systems are eligible for and promoted by applicable procurement programs of the Federal Government;

“(C) in coordination with the Secretary of Commerce, evaluate the development of North American Industry Classification System and North American Product Classification System codes for biogas and biogas system products;

“(D) review opportunities and develop strategies to overcome barriers to integrating biogas into electricity and renewable natural gas markets;

“(E) develop tools to broaden the market for nonenergy biogas system products, including by developing best management practices for—

“(i) the use and land application of digestate to maximize recovery of waste resources and minimize environmental and public health risks; and

“(ii) the use of carbon dioxide from biogas processing;

“(F) provide information on the ability of biogas system products to participate in markets that provide environmental benefits;

“(G) identify and investigate research gaps in biogas and anaerobic digestion technology, including research gaps in environmental benefits, market assessment, and performance standards;

“(H) assess the most cost-effective voluntary investments in biogas to reduce waste and methane emissions; and

“(I) identify and advance additional priorities, as determined by the Task Force.

“(4) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the establishment of the Task Force, the Task Force shall submit to Congress a report that—

“(A) describes the steps taken by the Task Force to carry out the duties of the Task Force under paragraph (3); and

“(B) identifies and prioritizes policies and technology opportunities—

“(i) to expand the biogas industry;

“(ii) to eliminate barriers to investment in biogas systems in the landfill, livestock, wastewater, and other relevant sectors; and

“(iii) to enhance opportunities for private and public sector partnerships to finance biogas systems.

“(c) ADVANCEMENT OF BIOGAS RESEARCH.—

“(1) STUDY ON BIOGAS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Energy and the Administrator, shall enter into an agreement with the National Renewable Energy Laboratory to conduct a study relating to biogas.

“(B) STUDY.—Under the agreement described in subparagraph (A), the study conducted by the National Renewable Energy Laboratory shall include an analysis of—

“(i) barriers to injecting biogas into existing natural gas pipelines;

“(ii) methods for optimizing biogas systems, including methods to obtain the highest energy output from biogas, including through the use of co-digestion;

“(iii) opportunities for, and barriers to, the productive use of biogas system co-products, carbon dioxide from biogas processing, and recovered nutrients;

“(iv) the optimal configuration of local, State, or regional infrastructure for the production of electricity, heat, or fuel from biogas, including infrastructure for the aggregation, cleaning, and pipeline injection of biogas; and

“(v) any other subject relating to biogas, as determined by the Interagency Biogas Opportunities Task Force established under subsection (b)(1).

“(C) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under this paragraph.

“(2) COLLECTION OF DATA FOR BIOGAS MARKETS.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Energy and the Administrator, shall identify, collect, and analyze environmental, technical, and economic performance data relating to biogas systems, including the production of energy of biogas systems, co-products, greenhouse gas and other emissions, water quality benefits, and other data necessary to develop markets for biogas and biogas system co-products.”.

SEC. 9112. COMMUNITY WOOD ENERGY PROGRAM.

Section 9013(e) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8113(e)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 9113. CARBON UTILIZATION EDUCATION PROGRAM.

Title IX of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8101 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 9014. CARBON UTILIZATION EDUCATION PROGRAM.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) CARBON DIOXIDE.—The term ‘carbon dioxide’ means carbon dioxide that is produced as a byproduct of the production of a biobased product.

“(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term ‘eligible entity’ means an entity that—

“(A) is—

“(i) an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from taxation under 501(a) of that Code; or

“(ii) an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)));

“(B) has demonstrated knowledge about—

“(i) sequestration and utilization of carbon dioxide; or

“(ii) aggregation of organic waste from multiple sources into a single biogas system; and

“(C) has a demonstrated ability to conduct educational and technical support programs.

“(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, shall make competitive grants to eligible entities—

“(1) to provide education to the public about the economic and emissions benefits of permanent sequestration or utilization of carbon dioxide; or

“(2) to provide education to biogas producers about opportunities for aggregation of organic waste from multiple sources into a single biogas system.

“(c) FUNDING.—

“(1) MANDATORY FUNDING.—Of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary shall use for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023—

“(A) \$1,000,000 to carry out subsection (b)(1); and

“(B) \$1,000,000 to carry out subsection (b)(2).

“(2) DISCRETIONARY FUNDING.—There are authorized to be appropriated for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023—

“(A) \$1,000,000 to carry out subsection (b)(1); and

“(B) \$1,000,000 to carry out subsection (b)(2).”

TITLE X—HORTICULTURE

SEC. 10101. SPECIALTY CROPS MARKET NEWS ALLOCATION.

Section 10107(b) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 1622b(b)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 10102. LOCAL AGRICULTURE MARKET PROGRAM.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to combine the purposes and coordinate the functions, as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, of—

(1) the Farmers’ Market and Local Food Promotion Program established under section 6 of the Farmer-to-Consumer Direct Marketing Act of 1976 (7 U.S.C. 3005); and

(2) the value-added agricultural product market development grants under section 231(b) of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (7 U.S.C. 1632a(b)).

(b) LOCAL AGRICULTURE MARKET PROGRAM.—Subtitle A of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 210A. LOCAL AGRICULTURE MARKET PROGRAM.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) BEGINNING FARMER OR RANCHER.—The term ‘beginning farmer or rancher’ has the meaning given the term in section 343(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1991(a)).

“(2) DIRECT PRODUCER-TO-CONSUMER MARKETING.—The term ‘direct producer-to-consumer marketing’ has the meaning given the term ‘direct marketing from farmers to consumers’ in section 3 of the Farmer-to-Consumer Direct Marketing Act of 1976 (7 U.S.C. 3002).

“(3) ELIGIBLE ACTIVITY.—The term ‘eligible activity’ means an activity described in subsection (d)(2) that is carried out using a grant provided under subsection (d)(1).

“(4) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term ‘eligible entity’ means—

“(A) a producer;

“(B) a producer network or association;

“(C) a farmer or rancher cooperative;

“(D) an agricultural business entity or majority-controlled producer-based business venture;

“(E) a food council;

“(F) a local or Tribal government;

“(G) a nonprofit corporation;

“(H) an economic development corporation;

“(I) a public benefit corporation;

“(J) a community supported agriculture network or association; and

“(K) a regional farmers’ market authority.

“(5) ELIGIBLE PARTNER.—The term ‘eligible partner’ means—

“(A) a State agency or regional authority;

“(B) a philanthropic organization;

“(C) a private corporation;

“(D) an institution of higher education;

“(E) a commercial, Federal, or Farm Credit System lending institution; and

“(F) another entity, as determined by the Secretary.

“(6) FAMILY FARM.—The term ‘family farm’ has the meaning given the term in section 231(a) of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (7 U.S.C. 1632a(a)).

“(7) FOOD COUNCIL.—The term ‘food council’ means a food policy council or food and farm system network, as determined by the Secretary, that—

“(A) represents—

“(i) multiple organizations involved in the production, processing, and consumption of food; and

“(ii) local, Tribal, and State governments; and

“(B) addresses food and farm-related issues and needs within city, county, State, Tribal region, multicounty region, or other region designated by the food council or food system network.

“(8) MAJORITY-CONTROLLED PRODUCER-BASED BUSINESS VENTURE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘majority-controlled producer-based business venture’ means a venture greater than 50 percent of the ownership and control of which is held by—

“(i) 1 or more producers; or

“(ii) 1 or more entities, 100 percent of the ownership and control of which is held by 1 or more producers.

“(B) ENTITY DESCRIBED.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ‘entity’ means—

“(i) a partnership;

“(ii) a limited liability corporation;

“(iii) a limited liability partnership; and

“(iv) a corporation.

“(9) MID-TIER VALUE CHAIN.—The term ‘mid-tier value chain’ means a local or regional supply network that links independent producers with businesses and cooperatives that market value-added agricultural products in a manner that—

“(A) targets and strengthens the profitability and competitiveness of small and medium-sized farms and ranches that are structured as a family farm; and

“(B) obtains agreement from an eligible agricultural producer group, farmer or rancher cooperative, or majority-controlled producer-based business venture that is engaged in the value chain on a marketing strategy.

“(10) PARTNERSHIP.—The term ‘partnership’ means a partnership entered into under an agreement between—

“(A) 1 or more eligible partners; and

“(B) 1 or more eligible entities.

“(11) PROGRAM.—The term ‘Program’ means the Local Agriculture Market Program established under subsection (b).

“(12) REGIONAL FOOD CHAIN COORDINATION.—The term ‘regional food chain coordination’ means coordination and collaboration along the supply chain to increase connections between producers and markets.

“(13) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Agriculture.

“(14) SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED FARMER OR RANCHER.—The term ‘socially disadvantaged farmer or rancher’ has the meaning given the term in section 355(e) of the Consolidated

Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2003(e)).

“(15) VALUE-ADDED AGRICULTURAL PRODUCT.—The term ‘value-added agricultural product’ means any agricultural commodity or product that—

“(A)(i) has undergone a change in physical state;

“(ii) was produced in a manner that enhances the value of the agricultural commodity or product, as demonstrated through a business plan that shows the enhanced value, as determined by the Secretary;

“(iii) is physically segregated in a manner that results in the enhancement of the value of the agricultural commodity or product;

“(iv) is a source of farm- or ranch-based renewable energy, including E-85 fuel; or

“(v) is aggregated and marketed as a locally produced agricultural food product; and

“(B) as a result of the change in physical state or the manner in which the agricultural commodity or product was produced, marketed, or segregated—

“(i) the customer base for the agricultural commodity or product is expanded; and

“(ii) a greater portion of the revenue derived from the marketing, processing, or physical segregation of the agricultural commodity or product is available to the producer of the commodity or product.

“(16) VETERAN FARMER OR RANCHER.—The term ‘veteran farmer or rancher’ has the meaning given the term in section 2501(a) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(a)).

“(b) ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSE.—The Secretary shall establish a program, to be known as the ‘Local Agriculture Market Program’, that—

“(1) supports the development, coordination, and expansion of—

“(A) direct producer-to-consumer marketing;

“(B) local and regional food markets and enterprises; and

“(C) value-added agricultural products;

“(2) connects and cultivates regional food economies through public-private partnerships;

“(3) supports the development of business plans, feasibility studies, and strategies for local and regional marketing opportunities;

“(4) strengthens capacity and regional food system development through community collaboration and expansion of mid-tier value chains;

“(5) improves income and economic opportunities for producers and food businesses through job creation and improved regional food system infrastructure; and

“(6) simplifies the application processes and the reporting processes for the Program.

“(c) REGIONAL PARTNERSHIPS.—

“(1) GRANTS TO SUPPORT PARTNERSHIPS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service, in accordance with the purposes of the Program described in subsection (b), shall provide grants to support partnerships to plan and develop a local or regional food system.

“(B) GEOGRAPHICAL DIVERSITY.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall ensure geographical diversity in selecting partnerships to receive grants under subparagraph (A).

“(2) AUTHORITIES OF PARTNERSHIPS.—A partnership receiving a grant under paragraph (1) may—

“(A) determine the scope of the regional food system to be developed, including goals, outreach objectives, and eligible activities to be carried out;

“(B) determine the local, regional, State, multi-State, or other geographic area covered;

“(C) create and conduct a feasibility study, implementation plan, and assessment of eligible activities under the partnership agreement;

“(D) conduct outreach and education to other eligible entities and eligible partners for potential participation in the partnership agreement and eligible activities;

“(E) describe measures to be taken through the partnership agreement to obtain funding for the eligible activities to be carried out under the partnership agreement;

“(F) at the request of a producer or eligible entity desiring to participate in eligible activities under the partnership agreement, act on behalf of the producer or eligible entity in applying for a grant under subsection (d);

“(G) monitor, evaluate, and periodically report to the Secretary on progress made toward achieving the objectives of eligible activities under the partnership agreement; or

“(H) at the conclusion of the partnership agreement, submit to the Secretary a report describing—

“(i) the results and effects of the partnership agreement; and

“(ii) funds provided under paragraph (3).

“(3) CONTRIBUTION.—A partnership receiving a grant under paragraph (1) shall provide funding in an amount equal to not less than 25 percent of the total amount of the Federal portion of the grant.

“(4) APPLICATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant under paragraph (1), a partnership shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary considers necessary to evaluate and select applications.

“(B) COMPETITIVE PROCESS.—The Secretary—

“(i) shall conduct a competitive process to select applications submitted under subparagraph (A);

“(ii) may assess and rank applications with similar purposes as a group; and

“(iii) shall make public the criteria to be used in evaluating applications prior to accepting applications.

“(C) PRIORITY TO CERTAIN APPLICATIONS.—The Secretary may give priority to applications submitted under subparagraph (A) that—

“(i)(I) leverage significant non-Federal financial and technical resources; and

“(II) coordinate with other local, State, Tribal, or national efforts; and

“(ii) cover an area that includes distressed low-income rural or urban communities, including areas with persistent poverty.

“(D) PRODUCER OR FOOD BUSINESS BENEFITS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), an application submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include a description of the direct or indirect producer or food business benefits intended by the eligible entity to result from the proposed project within a reasonable period of time after the receipt of a grant.

“(ii) EXCEPTION.—Clause (i) shall not apply to a planning or feasibility project.

“(5) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—On request of an eligible entity, an eligible partner, or a partnership, the Secretary may provide technical assistance in carrying out a partnership agreement.

“(d) DEVELOPMENT GRANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Under the Program, the Secretary may provide grants to eligible entities to carry out, in accordance with purposes of the Program described in subsection (b), activities described in paragraph (2).

“(2) ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.—An eligible entity may use a grant provided under paragraph (1)—

“(A) to support and promote—

“(i) domestic direct producer-to-consumer marketing;

“(ii) farmers' markets;

“(iii) roadside stands;

“(iv) agritourism activities,

“(v) community-supported agriculture programs; or

“(vi) online sales;

“(B) to support local and regional food business enterprises that engage as intermediaries in indirect producer-to-consumer marketing;

“(C) to support the processing, aggregation, distribution, and storage of local and regional food products that are marketed locally or regionally;

“(D) to encourage the development of new food products and value-added agricultural products;

“(E) to assist with business development and feasibility studies;

“(F) to develop marketing strategies for producers of local food products and value-added agricultural products in new and existing markets;

“(G) to facilitate regional food chain coordination and mid-tier value chain development;

“(H) to promote new business opportunities and marketing strategies to reduce on-farm food waste;

“(I) to respond to changing technology needs in direct producer-to-consumer marketing; or

“(J) to cover expenses relating to costs incurred in—

“(i) obtaining food safety certification; and

“(ii) making changes and upgrades to practices and equipment to improve food safety.

“(3) CRITERIA AND GUIDELINES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish criteria and guidelines for the submission, evaluation, and funding of proposed projects under paragraph (1) as the Secretary determines are appropriate.

“(B) PRODUCER OR FOOD BUSINESS BENEFITS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), an application submitted for a grant under paragraph (1) shall include a description of the direct or indirect producer or food business benefits intended by the eligible entity to result from the proposed project within a reasonable period of time after the receipt of the grant.

“(ii) EXCEPTION.—Clause (i) shall not apply to a planning or feasibility project.

“(4) AMOUNT.—Unless otherwise determined by the Secretary, the amount of a grant under this subsection shall be not more than \$500,000.

“(5) DEVELOPMENT GRANTS AVAILABLE TO PRODUCERS.—In the case of a grant provided under paragraph (1) to an eligible entity described in any of subparagraphs (A) through (D) of subsection (a)(4), the following shall apply:

“(A) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary shall carry out this subsection through the Administrator of the Rural Business-Cooperative Service, in coordination with the Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service.

“(B) PRIORITIES.—The Secretary shall give priority to applications—

“(i) in the case of an application submitted by a producer, that are submitted by, or serve—

“(I) beginning farmers or ranchers;

“(II) socially disadvantaged farmers or ranchers;

“(III) operators of small or medium sized farms or ranches that are structured as family farms; or

“(IV) veteran farmers or ranchers; and

“(ii) in the case of an application submitted by an eligible entity described in any of subparagraphs (B) through (D) of sub-

section (a)(4), that provide the greatest contribution to creating or increasing marketing opportunities for producers described in subclauses (I) through (IV) of clause (i).

“(C) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), an eligible entity may not use a grant for the purchase or construction of a building, general purpose equipment, or structure.

“(ii) EXCEPTION.—An eligible entity may use not more than \$6,500 of the amount of a grant for an eligible activity described in paragraph (2)(J) to purchase or upgrade equipment to improve food safety.

“(D) MATCHING FUNDS.—An eligible entity receiving a grant shall provide matching funds in the form of cash or an in-kind contribution in an amount that is equal to 50 percent of the total amount of the grant.

“(6) DEVELOPMENT GRANTS FOR OTHER ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—In the case of a grant provided under paragraph (1) to an eligible entity described in any of subparagraphs (E) through (K) of subsection (a)(4), the following shall apply:

“(A) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary shall carry out this subsection through the Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service, in coordination with the Administrator of the Rural Business-Cooperative Service.

“(B) PRIORITIES.—The Secretary shall give priority to applications that—

“(i) benefit underserved communities, including communities that are located in areas of concentrated poverty with limited access to fresh locally or regionally grown food; or

“(ii) are used to carry out eligible activities under a partnership agreement under subsection (c).

“(C) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), an eligible entity may not use a grant for the purchase or construction of a building, general purpose equipment, or structure.

“(ii) EXCEPTION.—An eligible entity may use not more than \$6,500 of the amount of a grant for an eligible activity described in paragraph (2)(J) to purchase or upgrade equipment to improve food safety.

“(D) MATCHING FUNDS.—An eligible entity receiving a grant shall provide matching funds in the form of cash or an in-kind contribution in an amount that is equal to 25 percent of the total amount of the Federal portion of the grant.

“(e) SIMPLIFICATION OF APPLICATION AND REPORTING PROCESSES.—

“(1) APPLICATIONS.—The Secretary shall establish a simplified application form for eligible entities that—

“(A) request less than \$50,000 under subsection (d); or

“(B) apply for grants under subsection (d) through partnership agreements under subsection (c).

“(2) REPORTING.—The Secretary shall—

“(A) streamline and simplify the reporting process for eligible entities; and

“(B) obtain from eligible entities and maintain such information as the Secretary determines is necessary to administer and evaluate the Program.

“(f) COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE.—In carrying out the Program, the Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service or the Administrator of the Rural Business Cooperative Service, may coordinate with a cooperative extension service to provide Program technical assistance and outreach to eligible entities and eligible partners.

“(g) INTERDEPARTMENTAL COORDINATION.—In carrying out the Program, to the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall ensure coordination among Federal agencies.

“(h) EVALUATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Using amounts made available under subsection (i)(3)(E), the Secretary shall conduct an evaluation of the Program that—

“(A) measures the economic impact of the Program on new and existing market outcomes;

“(B) measures the effectiveness of the Program in improving and expanding—

“(i) the regional food economy through public and private partnerships;

“(ii) the production of value-added agricultural products;

“(iii) producer-to-consumer marketing, including direct producer-to-consumer marketing;

“(iv) local and regional food systems, including regional food chain coordination and business development;

“(v) new business opportunities and marketing strategies to reduce on-farm food waste;

“(vi) the use of new technologies in producer-to-consumer marketing, including direct producer-to-consumer marketing; and

“(vii) the workforce and capacity of regional food systems; and

“(C) provides a description of—

“(i) each partnership agreement; and

“(ii) each grant provided under subsection (d).

“(2) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report describing the evaluation conducted under paragraph (1), including a thorough analysis of the outcomes of the evaluation.

“(i) FUNDING.—

“(1) MANDATORY FUNDING.—Of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary shall use to carry out this section \$60,000,000 for fiscal year 2019 and each fiscal year thereafter, to remain available until expended.

“(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2019 and each fiscal year thereafter, to remain available until expended.

“(3) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—

“(A) REGIONAL PARTNERSHIPS.—Of the funds made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year, 10 percent shall be used to provide grants to support partnerships under subsection (c).

“(B) DEVELOPMENT GRANTS FOR PRODUCERS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), of the funds made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year, 35 percent shall be used for grants under subsection (d)(5).

“(ii) RESERVATION OF FUNDS.—

“(I) MAJORITY-CONTROLLED PRODUCER-BASED BUSINESS VENTURES.—The total amount of grants under subsection (d)(5) provided to majority-controlled producer-based business ventures for a fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the amount allocated under clause (i).

“(II) BEGINNING, VETERAN, AND SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED FARMERS AND RANCHERS.—Of the funds made available for grants under subsection (d)(5), 10 percent shall be reserved for grants provided to beginning, veteran, and socially disadvantaged farmers or ranchers.

“(III) MID-TIER VALUE CHAINS.—Of the funds made available for grants under subsection (d)(5), 10 percent shall be reserved for grants to develop mid-tier value chains.

“(IV) FOOD SAFETY ASSISTANCE.—Of the funds made available for grants under subsection (d)(5), not more than 25 percent shall be reserved for grants for eligible activities described in subsection (d)(2)(J).

“(C) DEVELOPMENT GRANTS FOR OTHER ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—Of the funds made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year, 47 percent shall be used for grants under subsection (d)(6).

“(D) UNOBLIGATED FUNDS.—Any funds under subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) that are not obligated for the uses described in that subparagraph, as applicable, by September 30 of the fiscal year for which the funds were made available—

“(i) shall be available to the agency carrying out the Program with the unobligated funds to carry out any function of the Program, as determined by the Secretary; and

“(ii) may carry over to the next fiscal year.

“(E) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Not greater than 8 percent of amounts made available to provide grants under subsections (c) and (d)(6) for a fiscal year may be used for administrative expenses.”

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) AGRICULTURAL MARKETING RESOURCE CENTER PILOT PROJECT.—Section 231 of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (7 U.S.C. 1632a) is amended—

(A) by striking the section heading and inserting “AGRICULTURAL MARKETING RESOURCE CENTER PILOT PROJECT.”;

(B) by striking subsections (a), (b), (d), and (e);

(C) in subsection (c)—

(i) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subsections (a) and (b), respectively, and indenting appropriately; and

(ii) by striking the subsection designation and heading;

(D) in subsection (a) (as so redesignated)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “Notwithstanding” and all that follows through “paragraph (2)” and inserting the following: “The Secretary shall not use more than 2.5 percent of the funds made available to carry out the Local Agriculture Market Program established under section 210A of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to establish a pilot project (to be known as the ‘Agricultural Marketing Resource Center’) at an eligible institution described in subsection (b)’; and

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively, and indenting appropriately; and

(E) in subsection (b) (as so redesignated)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (C) as paragraphs (1) through (3), respectively, and indenting appropriately; and

(ii) in paragraph (1) (as so redesignated), by striking “paragraph (1)(A)” and inserting “subsection (a)(1)”.

(2) AGRICULTURE INNOVATION CENTER DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—Section 6402(f) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 1632b(f)) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “section 231(d) of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (7 U.S.C. 1621 note; Public Law 106-224)” and inserting “section 210A(d)(2) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946”.

(3) LOCAL FOOD PRODUCTION AND PROGRAM EVALUATION.—Section 10016(b)(3)(B) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 2204h(b)(2)(B)) is amended by striking “Farmers’ Market and Local Food Promotion Program established under section 6 of the Farmer-to-Consumer Direct Marketing Act of 1976 (7 U.S.C. 3005)” and inserting “Local Agriculture Market Program established under section 210A of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946”.

(4) PROGRAM METRICS.—Section 6209(a) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 2207b(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) section 210A of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946;”.

(5) FARMER-TO-CONSUMER DIRECT MARKETING ACT OF 1976.—

(A) Section 4 of the Farmer-to-Consumer Direct Marketing Act of 1976 (7 U.S.C. 3003) is amended—

(i) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.”.

(B) Sections 6, 7, and 8 of the Farmer-to-Consumer Direct Marketing Act of 1976 (7 U.S.C. 3005, 3006; 90 Stat. 1983) are repealed.

SEC. 10103. ORGANIC PRODUCTION AND MARKET DATA INITIATIVES.

Section 7407(d) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 5925c(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “THROUGH FISCAL YEAR 2012”; and

(B) by striking “\$5,000,000, to remain available until expended.” and inserting the following: “, to remain available until expended—

“(A) \$5,000,000 for each of the periods of fiscal years 2008 through 2012 and 2014 through 2018; and

“(B) \$5,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”;

(2) by striking paragraph (2);

(3) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2); and

(4) in paragraph (2) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking “paragraphs (1) and (2)” and inserting “paragraph (1)”; and

(B) by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 10104. ORGANIC CERTIFICATION.

(a) EXCLUSIONS FROM CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue regulations to limit the type of organic operations that are excluded from certification under section 205.101 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations, and from certification under any other related sections under part 205 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2103 of the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6502) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking “The term” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) FOREIGN OPERATIONS.—When used in the context of a certifying agent operating in a foreign country, the term ‘certifying agent’ includes a certifying agent—

“(i) accredited in accordance with section 2106(b)(1); or

“(ii) accredited by a foreign government that acted under an equivalency arrangement negotiated between the United States and the foreign government.”;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (13) through (21) as paragraphs (14) through (22), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (12) the following:

“(13) NATIONAL ORGANIC PROGRAM IMPORT CERTIFICATE.—The term ‘national organic program import certificate’ means a form developed for purposes of the program under this title—

“(A) to provide documentation sufficient to verify that an agricultural product imported for sale in the United States satisfies the requirement under section 2106(b)(1); and

“(B) which shall include, at a minimum, information sufficient to indicate, with respect to the agricultural product—

- “(i) the origin;
- “(ii) the destination;
- “(iii) the certifying agent issuing the national organic program import certificate;
- “(iv) the harmonized tariff code, if a harmonized tariff code exists for the agricultural product;
- “(v) the total weight; and
- “(vi) the organic standard to which the agricultural product is certified.”.

(c) DOCUMENTATION AND TRACEABILITY ENHANCEMENT; DATA COLLECTION.—Section 2106(b) of the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6505(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Imported” and inserting the following:

“(1) ACCREDITATION OF FOREIGN ORGANIC CERTIFICATION PROGRAM.—Imported”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) IMPORT CERTIFICATION.—

“(A) IMPORT CERTIFICATES.—For an agricultural product being imported into the United States to be represented as organically produced, the Secretary shall require the agricultural product to be accompanied by a complete and valid national organic program import certificate, which shall be available as an electronic record.

“(B) TRACKING SYSTEM.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a system to track national organic program import certificates.

“(ii) INTEGRATION.—In establishing the system under clause (i), the Secretary may integrate the system into any existing information tracking systems for imports of agricultural products.

“(3) MODERNIZATION OF TRADE TRACKING AND DATA COLLECTION SYSTEMS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall modernize international trade tracking and data collection systems of the national organic program established under this title.

“(B) ACTIVITIES.—In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall modernize trade and transaction certificates to ensure full traceability to the port of entry without unduly hindering trade, such as through an electronic trade document exchange system.

“(4) REPORTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—On an annual basis, the Secretary shall submit to Congress and make publically available on the website of the Department of Agriculture a report providing detailed quantitative data on imports of organically produced agricultural products accepted into the United States during the year covered by the report.

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The data described in subparagraph (A) shall be broken down by agricultural product type, quantity, value, and month.

“(C) EXCEPTION.—Any data that is specific enough to be protected as confidential business information shall not be provided in the report under subparagraph (A).”.

(d) ACCREDITATION PROGRAM.—Section 2115 of the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6514) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d);

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) OVERSIGHT OF SATELLITE OFFICES AND FOREIGN OPERATIONS.—As part of the accreditation of certifying agents under this section, the Secretary shall oversee any certifying agent operating in a foreign country.”; and

(3) in subsection (d) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking “section shall” and inserting the following: “section—

“(1) subject to paragraph (2), shall”; and

(B) in paragraph (1) (as so designated)—

(i) by striking “of”; and

(ii) by striking “Secretary, and may” and inserting the following: “Secretary;

“(2) in the case of a certifying agent operating in a foreign country, shall be for a period of time that is consistent with the certification of a domestic certifying agent, as determined appropriate by the Secretary; and

“(3) may”.

(e) NATIONAL ORGANIC STANDARDS BOARD.—Section 2119(i) of the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6518(i)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Two-thirds” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.— $\frac{2}{3}$ ”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) NATIONAL LIST.—Any vote on a motion proposing to amend the national list shall be considered to be a decisive vote that requires $\frac{2}{3}$ of the votes cast at a meeting of the Board at which a quorum is present to prevail.”.

(f) INVESTIGATIONS.—Section 2120(b) of the Organic Foods Production Act (7 U.S.C. 6519(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) INFORMATION SHARING DURING ACTIVE INVESTIGATION.—In carrying out this title, all parties conducting an active investigation under this subsection (including certifying agents, State organic certification programs, and the national organic program) shall share confidential business information with Federal and State government officers and employees and certifying agents involved in the investigation as necessary to fully investigate and enforce potential violations of this title.

“(4) EXPEDITED PROCEDURES FOR FOREIGN OPERATIONS.—

“(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish expedited investigative procedures under this subsection to review the accreditation of a certifying agent operating in a foreign country under any of the circumstances described in subparagraph (B).

“(B) EXPEDITED PROCEDURES.—The Secretary shall promptly carry out expedited investigative procedures established under subparagraph (A) to review the accreditation of a certifying agent operating in a foreign country if—

“(i) the accreditation of the certifying agent is revoked by a foreign government—

“(I) operating an organic certification program described in section 2106(b)(1); or

“(II) that acted under an equivalency arrangement negotiated between the United States and the foreign government; or

“(ii) the Secretary determines that there is a sudden and substantial increase in the rate and quantity of imports of an individual organically produced agricultural product from the foreign country, in which case the expedited investigative procedures shall be carried out with respect to each certifying agent of that agricultural product in that foreign country.”.

(g) DATA ORGANIZATION AND ACCESS.—Section 2122 of the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6521) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) DATA RELATING TO IMPORTS OF ORGANICALLY PRODUCED AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS.—

“(1) ACCESS TO DATA DOCUMENTATION SYSTEMS.—The head of each Federal agency that administers a cross-border documentation system shall provide to the head of each other Federal agency that administers such a system access to available data from the system, including—

“(A) the Automated Commercial Environment system of U.S. Customs and Border Protection; and

“(B) the Phytosanitary Certificate Issuance and Tracking System of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

“(2) DATA COLLECTION AND ORGANIZATION SYSTEM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a new system or modify an existing data collection and organization system to collect and organize in a single system quantitative data on imports of each organically produced agricultural product accepted into the United States.

“(B) ACCESS.—The single system under subparagraph (A) shall be accessible by any agency with the authority to engage in—

“(i) inspection of imports of agricultural products;

“(ii) trade data collection and organization; or

“(iii) enforcement of trade requirements for organically produced agricultural products.”.

(h) ORGANIC AGRICULTURAL PRODUCT IMPORTS INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP.—The Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 is amended by inserting after section 2122 (7 U.S.C. 6521) the following:

“SEC. 2122A. ORGANIC AGRICULTURAL PRODUCT IMPORTS INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall jointly establish a working group to facilitate coordination and information sharing between the Department of Agriculture and U.S. Customs and Border Protection relating to imports of organically produced agricultural products (referred to in this section as the “working group”).

“(2) MEMBERS.—The working group—

“(A) shall include—

“(i) the Secretary (or a designee); and

“(ii) the Secretary of Homeland Security (or a designee); and

“(B) shall not include any non-Federal officer or employee.

“(3) DUTIES.—The working group shall facilitate coordination and information sharing between the Department of Agriculture and U.S. Customs and Border Protection for the purposes of—

“(A) identifying imports of organically produced agricultural products;

“(B) verifying the authenticity of organically produced agricultural product import documentation, such as national organic program import certificates;

“(C) ensuring imported agricultural products represented as organically produced meet the requirements under this title;

“(D) collecting and organizing quantitative data on imports of organically produced agricultural products; and

“(E) reporting to Congress on—

“(i) enforcement activity carried out by the Department of Agriculture or U.S. Customs and Border Protection in the United States or abroad; and

“(ii) barriers to preventing agricultural products fraudulently represented as organically produced from entry into the United States.

“(4) DESIGNATED EMPLOYEES AND OFFICIALS.—An employee or official designated to carry out the duties of the Secretary or the Secretary of Homeland Security on the working group under subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (2) shall be an employee or official compensated at a rate of pay not less than the minimum annual rate of basic pay for GS-12 under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

“(b) REPORTS.—On an annual basis, the working group shall submit to Congress and make publically available on the websites of the Department of Agriculture and U.S. Customs and Border Protection the following reports:

“(1) ORGANIC TRADE ENFORCEMENT INTERAGENCY COORDINATION REPORT.—A report—

“(A) identifying existing barriers to cooperation between the agencies involved in agricultural product import inspection, trade data collection and organization, and organically produced agricultural product trade enforcement, including—

“(i) U.S. Customs and Border Protection; and
“(ii) the Agricultural Marketing Service;

“(iii) the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service;

“(B) assessing progress toward integrating organic trade enforcement into import inspection procedures of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, including an assessment of—

“(i) the status of the development of systems for—

“(I) tracking the fumigation of imports of organically produced agricultural products into the United States; and

“(II) electronically verifying national organic program import certificate authenticity; and

“(ii) training of U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel on—

“(I) the use of the systems described in clause (i); and

“(II) requirements and protocols under this title;

“(C) establishing outcome-based goals for ensuring imports of agricultural products represented as organically produced meet the requirements under this title;

“(D) recommending steps to improve the documentation and traceability of imported organically produced agricultural products;

“(E) recommending and describing steps toward the goals of—

“(i) achieving complete compliance with the requirements of this title for all agricultural products imported into the United States and represented as organically produced; and

“(ii) ensuring accurate labeling and marketing of imported agricultural products represented as organically produced by the exporter;

“(F) providing a timeline for implementing the steps described in subparagraph (E);

“(G) identifying additional resources needed to achieve any unmet goals; and

“(H) describing staffing needs at U.S. Customs and Border Protection and the Department of Agriculture to achieve the goals for ensuring organic integrity described in the report.

“(2) REPORT ON ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS TAKEN ON ORGANIC IMPORTS.—A report—

“(A) providing detailed quantitative data (broken down by commodity type, quantity, value, month, and origin) on imports of agricultural products represented as organically produced found to be fraudulent or lacking any documentation required under this title at the port of entry during the report year;

“(B) providing data on domestic enforcement actions taken on imported agricultural products represented as organically produced, including—

“(i) the number and type of actions taken by United States officials at ports of entry in response to violations of this title; and

“(ii) the total quantity and value of the agricultural products that were the subject of the actions, broken down by product variety and country of origin;

“(C) providing data on fumigation of agricultural products represented as organically produced at ports of entry and notifications of fumigation actions to shipment owners, broken down by product variety and country of origin; and

“(D) providing information on enforcement activities under this title involving overseas investigations and compliance actions taken within that year, including—

“(i) the number of investigations by country; and

“(ii) a descriptive summary of compliance actions taken by certifying agents in each country.”.

(I) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 2123 of the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6522) is amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and inserting “FUNDING”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking paragraphs (1) through (7) and inserting the following:

“(1) \$15,000,000 for fiscal year 2018;

“(2) \$16,500,000 for fiscal year 2019;

“(3) \$18,000,000 for fiscal year 2020;

“(4) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2021;

“(5) \$22,000,000 for fiscal year 2022; and

“(6) \$24,000,000 for fiscal year 2023.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) MODERNIZATION OF TRADE TRACKING AND DATA COLLECTION SYSTEMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary shall use to carry out section 2106(b)(3) \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2019, to remain available until expended.

“(2) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT.—The amount made available under paragraph (1) shall be in addition to any other amounts made available to carry out section 2106(b)(3).”.

(j) TRADE SAVINGS PROVISION.—The amendments made by subsections (c), (d), and (f) shall be carried out in a manner consistent with United States obligations under international agreements.

SEC. 10105. NATIONAL ORGANIC CERTIFICATION COST-SHARE PROGRAM.

(a) ELIMINATION OF DIRECTED DELEGATION.—Section 10606(a) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 6523(a)) is amended by striking “(acting through the Agricultural Marketing Service)”.

(b) FUNDING.—Section 10606 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 6523) is amended by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

“(d) MANDATORY FUNDING.—Of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary shall make available to carry out this section \$11,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, to remain available until expended.”.

SEC. 10106. FOOD SAFETY EDUCATION INITIATIVES.

Section 10105(c) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 7655a(c)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 10107. SPECIALTY CROP BLOCK GRANTS.

Section 101 of the Specialty Crops Competitiveness Act of 2004 (7 U.S.C. 1621 note; Public Law 108-465) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”;

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking “shall identify” and inserting the following: “shall—

“(1) identify”;

(B) in paragraph (1) (as so designated), by striking “plan and indicate” and inserting the following: “plan;

“(2) indicate”;

(C) in paragraph (2) (as so designated), by striking “crops.” and inserting “crops at the national, regional, and local levels.”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) include performance measures developed by the State department of agriculture, in consultation with specialty crop stakeholders, to be used as the primary means for performing an evaluation; and

“(4) provide best practices for methods used to enhance the competitiveness of specialty crops across multiple commodities, types of production, and geographic locations.”;

(3) in subsection (f)—

(A) in the second sentence, by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following: “(2) ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION.—The Secretary”;

(B) in the matter preceding paragraph (2) (as so designated), by striking “In reviewing” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In reviewing”; and

(C) in paragraph (1) (as so designated)—

(i) by striking “would carry” and inserting the following: “would—

“(A) carry”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A) (as so designated), by striking “(a).” and inserting the following: “(a); and

“(B) meet the requirements described in subsection (e).”;

(4) in subsection (h)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by inserting “AND EVALUATION” after “AUDIT”;

(B) in the second sentence, by striking “Not later than 30 days after the completion of the audit,” and inserting the following:

“(2) SUBMISSION OF AUDIT.—Not later than 30 days after the completion of the audit under paragraph (1)(A),”;

(C) in the matter preceding paragraph (2) (as so designated), by striking “For each” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For each”; and

(D) in paragraph (1) (as so designated)—

(i) by striking “conduct an audit” and inserting the following: “conduct—

“(A) an audit”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A) (as so designated), by striking “State.” and inserting the following: “State; and

“(B) an evaluation of performance measures developed under subsection (e)(3).”;

(5) in subsection (k)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “3” and inserting “4”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “8” and inserting “9”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) GUIDANCE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each year, prior to the submission of State plans under subsection (d), the Secretary shall provide guidance to States regarding best practices and national and regional priorities.

“(B) NATIONAL AND REGIONAL PRIORITIES.—National and regional priorities described in subparagraph (A) shall be—

“(i) based on formal stakeholder input; and

“(ii) considered by the Secretary as States develop State plans under subsection (d).

“(4) MULTISTATE PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding subsection (a) and paragraph (1), the Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service shall administer the funds of approved multistate projects under subsection (j).”;

(6) in subsection (1)(2)(E), by inserting “and each fiscal year thereafter” before the period at the end.

SEC. 10108. PLANT VARIETY PROTECTION.

Section 42(a) of the Plant Variety Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 2402(a)) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “or tuber propagated” and inserting “tuber propagated or asexually propagated”.

SEC. 10109. MULTIPLE CROP AND PESTICIDE USE SURVEY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Office of Pest Management Policy, shall conduct a multiple crop and pesticide use survey of farmers to collect data for risk assessment modeling and mitigation for an active ingredient.

(b) SUBMISSION.—The Secretary shall submit to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and make publicly available the survey described in subsection (a).

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to

carry out this section \$2,500,000, to remain available until expended.

(d) CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION.—Section 1770 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 2276) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—
(A) by striking “(a) In the case” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “subsection (d)(12)” and inserting “paragraph (12) or (13) of subsection (d)”; and

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking “(d) For purposes” and inserting the following:

“(d) PROVISIONS OF LAW REFERENCES.—For purposes”;

(B) in paragraph (11), by striking “or” at the end;

(C) in paragraph (12), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(13) section 10109 of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018.”.

SEC. 10110. CLARIFICATION OF USE OF FUNDS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

Section 11 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714i) is amended in the last sentence by inserting after “activities” the following: “but excluding any amounts used to provide technical assistance under title X of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 or an amendment made by that title.”.

SEC. 10111. HEMP PRODUCTION.

The Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“Subtitle G—Hemp Production

“SEC. 297A. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

“(1) HEMP.—The term ‘hemp’ means the plant *Cannabis sativa* L. and any part of that plant, including the seeds thereof and all derivatives, extracts, cannabinoids, isomers, acids, salts, and salts of isomers, whether growing or not, with a delta-9 tetrahydrocannabinol concentration of not more than 0.3 percent on a dry weight basis.

“(2) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term ‘Indian tribe’ has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

“(3) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Agriculture.

“(4) STATE.—The term ‘State’ means—

“(A) a State;

“(B) the District of Columbia;

“(C) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; and

“(D) any other territory or possession of the United States.

“(5) STATE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.—The term ‘State department of agriculture’ means the agency, commission, or department of a State government responsible for agriculture in the State.

“(6) TRIBAL GOVERNMENT.—The term ‘Tribal government’ means the governing body of an Indian tribe.

“SEC. 297B. STATE AND TRIBAL PLANS.

“(a) SUBMISSION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A State or Indian tribe desiring to have primary regulatory authority over the production of hemp in the State or territory of the Indian tribe shall submit to the Secretary, through the State department of agriculture (in consultation with the Governor and chief law enforcement officer of the State) or the Tribal government, as applicable, a plan under which the State or Indian tribe monitors and regulates that production as described in paragraph (2).

“(2) CONTENTS.—A State or Tribal plan referred to in paragraph (1)—

“(A) shall only be required to include—

“(i) a practice to maintain relevant information regarding land on which hemp is produced in the State or territory of the Indian tribe, including a legal description of the land, for a period of not less than 3 calendar years;

“(ii) a procedure for testing, using post-decarboxylation or other similarly reliable methods, delta-9 tetrahydrocannabinol concentration levels of hemp produced in the State or territory of the Indian tribe;

“(iii) a procedure for the effective disposal of products that are produced in violation of this subtitle;

“(iv) a procedure to comply with the enforcement procedures under subsection (d);

“(v) a procedure for conducting annual inspections of a random sample of hemp producers—

“(I) to verify that hemp is not produced in violation of this subtitle; and

“(II) in a manner that ensures that a hemp producer is subject to not more than 1 inspection each year; and

“(vi) a certification that the State or Indian tribe has the resources and personnel to carry out the practices and procedures described in clauses (i) through (v); and

“(B) may include any other practice or procedure established by a State or Indian tribe, as applicable, to the extent that the practice or procedure is consistent with this subtitle.

“(3) RELATION TO STATE AND TRIBAL LAW.—

“(A) NO PREEMPTION.—Nothing in this subsection preempts or limits any law of a State or Indian tribe regulating the production of hemp, to the extent that law is consistent with this subtitle.

“(B) REFERENCES IN PLANS.—A State or Tribal plan referred to in paragraph (1) may include a reference to a law of the State or Indian tribe regulating the production of hemp, to the extent that law is consistent with this subtitle.

“(b) APPROVAL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after receipt of a State or Tribal plan under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

“(A) approve the State or Tribal plan if the State or Tribal plan complies with subsection (a); or

“(B) disapprove the State or Tribal plan only if the State or Tribal plan does not comply with subsection (a).

“(2) AMENDED PLANS.—If the Secretary disapproves a State or Tribal plan under paragraph (1)(B), the State, through the State department of agriculture (in consultation with the Governor and chief law enforcement officer of the State) or the Tribal government, as applicable, may submit to the Secretary an amended State or Tribal plan that complies with subsection (a).

“(3) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary may consult with the Attorney General in carrying out this subsection.

“(c) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may provide technical assistance to a State or Indian tribe in the development of a State or Tribal plan under subsection (a).

“(d) VIOLATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A violation of a State or Tribal plan approved under subsection (b) shall be subject to enforcement solely in accordance with this subsection.

“(2) NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A hemp producer in a State or the territory of an Indian tribe for which a State or Tribal plan is approved under subsection (b) shall be subject to subparagraph (B) of this paragraph if the State department of agriculture or Tribal government, as applicable, determines that the hemp producer has negligently violated the State or Tribal plan, including by negligently—

“(i) failing to provide a legal description of land on which the producer produces hemp;

“(ii) failing to obtain a license or other required authorization from the State department of agriculture or Tribal government, as applicable; or

“(iii) producing *Cannabis sativa* L. with a delta-9 tetrahydrocannabinol concentration of more than 0.3 percent on a dry weight basis.

“(B) CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN.—A hemp producer described in subparagraph (A) shall comply with a plan established by the State department of agriculture or Tribal government, as applicable, to correct the negligent violation, including—

“(i) a reasonable date by which the hemp producer shall correct the negligent violation; and

“(ii) a requirement that the hemp producer shall periodically report to the State department of agriculture or Tribal government, as applicable, on the compliance of the hemp producer with the State or Tribal plan for a period of not less than the next 2 calendar years.

“(C) RESULT OF NEGLIGENT VIOLATION.—Except as provided in subparagraph (D), a hemp producer that negligently violates a State or Tribal plan under subparagraph (A) shall not as a result of that violation be subject to any criminal or civil enforcement action by the Federal Government or any State government, Tribal government, or local government other than the enforcement action authorized under subparagraph (B).

“(D) REPEAT VIOLATIONS.—A hemp producer that negligently violates a State or Tribal plan under subparagraph (A) 3 times in a 5-year period shall be ineligible to produce hemp for a period of 5 years beginning on the date of the third violation.

“(3) OTHER VIOLATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the State department of agriculture or Tribal government in a State or the territory of an Indian tribe for which a State or Tribal plan is approved under subsection (b), as applicable, determines that a hemp producer in the State or territory has violated the State or Tribal plan with a culpable mental state greater than negligence—

“(i) the State department of agriculture or Tribal government, as applicable, shall immediately report the hemp producer to—

“(I) the Attorney General; and

“(II) in the case of a State department of agriculture, the chief law enforcement officer of the State; and

“(ii) paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not apply to the violation.

“(B) FELONY.—Any person convicted of a felony relating to a controlled substance under State or Federal law shall be ineligible—

“(i) to participate in the program established under this section; and

“(ii) to produce hemp under any regulations or guidelines issued under section 297D(a).

“(C) FALSE STATEMENT.—Any person who materially falsifies any information contained in an application to participate in the program established under this section shall be ineligible to participate in that program.

“(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.

“(f) EFFECT.—Nothing in this section prohibits the production of hemp in a State or the territory of an Indian tribe for which a State or Tribal plan is not approved under this section in accordance with section 297C or other Federal laws (including regulations).

“SEC. 297C. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

“(a) DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE PLAN.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a State or Indian tribe for which a State or Tribal plan is not approved under section 297B, the production of hemp in that State or the territory of that Indian tribe shall be subject to a plan established by the Secretary to monitor and regulate that production in accordance with paragraph (2).

“(2) CONTENT.—A plan established by the Secretary under paragraph (1) shall include—

“(A) a practice to maintain relevant information regarding land on which hemp is produced in the State or territory of the Indian tribe, including a legal description of the land, for a period of not less than 3 calendar years;

“(B) a procedure for testing, using post-decarboxylation or other similarly reliable methods, delta-9 tetrahydrocannabinol concentration levels of hemp produced in the State or territory of the Indian tribe;

“(C) a procedure for the effective disposal of products that are produced in violation of this subtitle;

“(D) a procedure to comply with the enforcement procedures under subsection (c)(2);

“(E) a procedure for conducting annual inspections of a random sample of hemp producers—

“(i) to verify that hemp is not produced in violation of this subtitle; and

“(ii) in a manner that ensures that a hemp producer is subject to not more than 1 inspection each year; and

“(F) such other practices or procedures as the Secretary considers to be appropriate, to the extent that the practice or procedure is consistent with this subtitle.

“(b) LICENSING.—The Secretary shall establish a procedure to issue licenses to hemp producers in accordance with a plan established under subsection (a).

“(c) VIOLATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a State or Indian tribe for which a State or Tribal plan is not approved under section 297B, it shall be unlawful to produce hemp in that State or the territory of that Indian tribe without a license issued by the Secretary under subsection (b).

“(2) NEGLIGENT AND OTHER VIOLATIONS.—A violation of a plan established under subsection (a) shall be subject to enforcement in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 297B(d), except that the Secretary shall carry out that enforcement instead of a State department of agriculture or Tribal government.

“(3) REPORTING TO ATTORNEY GENERAL.—In the case of a State or Indian tribe covered by paragraph (1), the Secretary shall report the production of hemp without a license issued by the Secretary under subsection (b) to the Attorney General.

“SEC. 297D. AUTHORITY TO ISSUE REGULATIONS AND GUIDELINES; EFFECT ON OTHER LAW.

“(a) AUTHORITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall have sole authority to issue Federal regulations and guidelines that relate to the production of hemp, including Federal regulations and guidelines that relate to the implementation of sections 297B and 297C.

“(2) CONSULTATION WITH ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Secretary may consult with the Attorney General before issuing regulations and guidelines under paragraph (1).

“(b) EFFECT ON OTHER LAW.—Nothing in this subtitle shall affect or modify—

“(1) the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.); or

“(2) the authority of the Commissioner of Food and Drugs and the Secretary of Health and Human Services under that Act.”.

SEC. 10112. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this title authorizes interference with the interstate commerce of

hemp (as defined in section 297A of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, as added by section 10111).

TITLE XI—CROP INSURANCE

SEC. 11101. DEFINITIONS.

Section 502(b) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1502(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), and (11) as paragraphs (7), (8), (10), (11), (12), and (13) respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following:

“(6) COVER CROP TERMINATION.—The term ‘cover crop termination’ means a practice that historically and under reasonable circumstances results in the termination of the growth of a cover crop.”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (8) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(9) HEMP.—The term ‘hemp’ has the meaning given the term in section 297A of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946.”.

SEC. 11102. DATA COLLECTION.

Section 506(h)(2) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1506(h)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “The Corporation” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS SERVICE.—Data collected by the National Agricultural Statistics Service, whether published or unpublished, shall be—

“(i) provided in an aggregate form to the Corporation for the purpose of providing insurance under this subtitle; and

“(ii) kept confidential by the Corporation in the same manner and to the same extent as is required under—

“(I) section 1770 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 2276); and

“(II) the Confidential Information Protection and Statistical Efficiency Act of 2002 (44 U.S.C. 3501 note; Public Law 107-347).

“(C) NONINSURED CROP DISASTER ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—In collecting data under this subsection, the Secretary shall ensure that—

“(i) appropriate data are collected through the noninsured crop disaster assistance program established by section 196 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7333); and

“(ii) not less frequently than annually, the Farm Service Agency shares, and the Corporation considers, the data described in clause (i).”.

SEC. 11103. SHARING OF RECORDS.

Section 506(h)(3) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1506(h)(3)) is amended by inserting “applicants who have received payment under section 522(b)(2)(E),” after “divisions.”.

SEC. 11104. USE OF RESOURCES.

Section 507(f) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1507(f)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4) and inserting the following:

“(3) the Farm Service Agency, in assisting the Board in—

“(A) the determination of individual producer yields;

“(B) sharing information on beginning farmers and ranchers and veteran farmers and ranchers;

“(C) investigating potential waste, fraud, or abuse;

“(D) sharing information to support the transition of crops and counties from the noninsured crop disaster assistance program established by section 196 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7333) to insurance under this subtitle; and

“(E) serving as a local point of contact for the dissemination of information on risk

management options available to farmers and ranchers; and

“(4) other Federal agencies, in assisting the Board in any way the Board determines is necessary in carrying out this subtitle.”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “(2) the” and inserting the following:

“(2) the”; and

(3) by striking “(f) The Board” in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and all that follows through the semicolon at the end of paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(f) USE OF RESOURCES, DATA, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES OF FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Board shall use, to the maximum extent practicable, the resources, data, boards, and the committees of—

“(1) the Natural Resources Conservation Service, in assisting the board in—

“(A) the classification of land as to risk and production capability;

“(B) the assessment of—

“(i) long-term trends in, and impacts from, weather variability; and

“(ii) opportunities to ameliorate the impacts described in clause (i); and

“(C) the consideration of acceptable conservation practices, including good farming practices with respect to conservation (such as cover crop termination).”.

SEC. 11105. SPECIALTY CROPS.

(a) SPECIALTY CROPS COORDINATOR.—Section 507(g) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1507(g)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) SPECIALTY CROP LIAISONS.—The Specialty Crops Coordinator shall—

“(A) designate a Specialty Crops Liaison in each regional field office; and

“(B) share the contact information of the Specialty Crops Liaisons with specialty crop producers.

“(5) WEBSITE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Specialty Crops Coordinator shall establish a website focused on the efforts of the Corporation to provide and expand crop insurance for specialty crop producers.

“(B) INCLUSIONS.—The website established under subparagraph (A) shall include—

“(i) an online mechanism to provide comments or feedback relating to specialty crops;

“(ii) a calendar of opportunities to provide comments or feedback at specialty crop events or in other public forums; and

“(iii) a plan, with projected completion dates, for examining—

“(I) potential new crops to be added to existing policies or plans of insurance for specialty crops;

“(II) opportunities to expand existing policies or plans of insurance for specialty crops to new areas; and

“(III) the potential for providing additional policies or plans of insurance for specialty crops, such as adding a revenue option or endorsement.”.

(b) ADDITION OF SPECIALTY CROPS AND OTHER VALUE-ADDED CROPS.—Section 508(a)(6) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(a)(6)) is amended—

(1) in the paragraph heading, by adding at the end the following: “(INCLUDING VALUE-ADDED CROPS)”;

(2) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) ANNUAL REVIEW.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, and annually thereafter, the manager of the Corporation shall prepare, to the maximum extent practicable, based on data shared from the noninsured crop disaster assistance program established by section 196 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7333), written agreements, or

other data, and present to the Board not less than 2 of each of the following:

“(i) Research and development for a policy or plan of insurance for a new crop.

“(ii) Expansion of an existing policy or plan of insurance to additional counties or States, including malting barley endorsements or contract options.

“(iii) Research and development for a new policy or plan of insurance, or endorsement, for crops with existing policies or plans of insurance, such as dollar plans.”;

(3) in subparagraph (B), in the subparagraph heading, by striking “ADDITION OF NEW CROPS” and inserting “REPORT”; and

(4) by striking subparagraphs (C) and (D).

SEC. 11106. INSURANCE PERIOD.

Section 508(a)(2) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(a)(2)) is amended by striking “and sweet potatoes” and inserting “sweet potatoes, and hemp”.

SEC. 11107. COVER CROPS.

Section 508(a) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(iii), by striking “practices” the first place it appears and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “practices.”;

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively;

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) VOLUNTARY GOOD FARMING PRACTICES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), the following voluntary practices shall be considered good farming practices under subparagraph (A)(iii):

“(I) A scientifically sound, sustainable, and organic farming practice, as determined by the Secretary.

“(II) A conservation activity or enhancement (including cover crops) that is approved by the Natural Resources Conservation Service or an agricultural expert, as determined by the Secretary.

“(ii) EXPECTED GROWTH.—A practice described in subclause (I) or (II) of clause (i) shall be considered a good farming practice only if under that practice the insured crop may be expected to make normal progress toward maturity under typical growing conditions, as determined by the Secretary.”; and

(D) in subparagraph (C) (as so redesignated), in the subparagraph heading, by inserting “DETERMINATION REVIEW” after “PRACTICES”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(1) COVER CROP TERMINATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Cover crop termination shall not affect the insurability of a subsequently planted insurable crop if the cover crop termination is carried out according to guidelines—

“(i) established by the Secretary; or

“(ii) approved by—

“(I) the Natural Resources Conservation Service; or

“(II) an agricultural expert, as determined by the Corporation.

“(B) SUMMER FALLOW.—In a county in which summer fallow is an insurable practice, a cover crop in that county that is terminated according to guidelines established by the Secretary shall be considered as summer fallow for the purpose of insurability.”.

SEC. 11108. UNDERSERVED PRODUCERS.

Section 508(a)(7) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(a)(7)) is amended—

(1) in the paragraph heading, by inserting “AND UNDERSERVED PRODUCERS” after “STATES”;

(2) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking the designation and heading and all that follows through “the term” and inserting the following:

“(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

“(i) ADEQUATELY SERVED.—The term”;

(B) in clause (i) (as so designated), by striking “participation rate” and inserting “participation rate, by crop.”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) UNDERSERVED PRODUCER.—The term ‘underserved producer’ means a beginning farmer or rancher, a veteran farmer or rancher, or a socially disadvantaged farmer or rancher.”;

(3) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking “The Board” and inserting the following:

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Board”;

(B) in clause (i) (as so designated), by striking “subtitle” and inserting “subtitle, including policies and plans of insurance for underserved producers.”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) TYPES OF PRODUCTION.—In conducting the review under clause (i), the Board shall examine the types of production common among underserved producers, such as diversified production for local markets.”; and

(4) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) REPORT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after completion of the review under subparagraph (B)(i), and not less frequently than once every 3 years thereafter, the Board shall make publically available and submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report describing the results of the review.

“(ii) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The report under clause (i) shall include recommendations to increase participation in States and among underserved producers that are not adequately served by the policies and plans of insurance, including any plans for administrative action or recommendations for Congressional action.”.

SEC. 11109. EXPANSION OF PERFORMANCE-BASED DISCOUNT.

Section 508(d)(3) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(d)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking “The Corporation” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(A) RISK-REDUCING PRACTICE DISCOUNT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Beginning with the 2020 reinsurance year, the Corporation may offer discounts under subparagraph (A) for practices that can be demonstrated to reduce risk relative to other practices.

“(ii) REVIEW.—In determining practices for which to offer discounts under clause (i), the Corporation shall—

“(I) for the 2020 reinsurance year, consider precision irrigation or fertilization, crop rotations, cover crops, and any other practices determined appropriate by the Corporation; and

“(II) on an annual basis, seek expert opinion and consider additional practices based on new evidence.”.

SEC. 11110. ENTERPRISE UNITS.

Section 508(e)(5) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(e)(5)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(E) ENTERPRISE UNITS ACROSS COUNTY LINES.—The Corporation may allow a producer to establish a single enterprise unit by combining an enterprise unit with—

“(i) 1 or more other enterprise units in 1 or more other counties; or

“(ii) all basic units and all optional units in 1 or more other counties.”.

SEC. 11111. PASTURE, RANGELAND, AND FORAGE POLICY FOR MEMBERS OF INDIAN TRIBES.

Section 508(e)(7) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(e)(7)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(D) PASTURE, RANGELAND, AND FORAGE POLICY FOR MEMBERS OF INDIAN TRIBES.—With respect to a policy or plan of insurance established under this subtitle for producers of livestock commodities the source of feedstock of which is pasture, rangeland, and forage, the premium subsidy for a member of an Indian tribe (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304)), as certified to the Secretary by the Chairperson of that Indian tribe (or a designee), shall be 90 percent for the first purchase of that policy or plan of insurance by that member of an Indian tribe.”.

SEC. 11112. SUBMISSION OF POLICIES AND MATERIALS TO BOARD.

Section 508(h) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(h)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B)—

(A) by redesignating clauses (i) through (iii) as subclauses (I) through (III), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(B) in the matter preceding subclause (I) (as so redesignated), by striking “The Corporation shall” and inserting the following:

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall”;

(C) in clause (i)(I) (as so redesignated), by inserting “subject to clause (ii),” before “will likely”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) WAIVER FOR HEMP.—The Corporation may waive the viability and marketability requirement under clause (i)(I) in the case of a policy or pilot program relating to the production of hemp.”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(C)—

(A) in clause (ii), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in clause (iii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) in the case of reviewing policies and other materials relating to the production of hemp, may waive the viability and marketability requirement under subparagraph (A)(ii)(I).”.

SEC. 11113. WHOLE FARM REVENUE AGENT INCENTIVES.

Section 508(k)(4) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(k)(4)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(G) WHOLE FARM REVENUE AGENT INCENTIVES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Beginning with the 2019 reinsurance year, in the case of an agent that sells a Whole Farm Revenue Policy, or a successor policy, the Corporation shall provide to the approved insurance provider, to pay to the agent, an additional reimbursement, determined in accordance with the following:

“(I) If the compensation of the agent authorized under the Standard Reinsurance Agreement for the policy is less than \$1,000, the reimbursement shall be an amount equal to the difference between—

“(aa) \$1,000; and

“(bb) the amount authorized under the Standard Reinsurance Agreement for the policy.

“(II) If the producer, or any entity in which the producer had an insurable interest, has never previously obtained coverage under a Whole Farm Revenue Policy, or a successor policy, in addition to any amount authorized under subclause (I), the reimbursement shall be \$300 for each Whole Farm Revenue Policy, or successor policy.

“(ii) LIMITATION ON USE.—Any additional reimbursement authorized under clause (i)

shall not be included for the purpose of establishing the limitation on the compensation for agents under the Standard Reinsurance Agreement.”.

SEC. 11114. CROP PRODUCTION ON NATIVE SOD.

Section 508(o) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(o)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—

“(i) AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 2014.—Native sod acreage that has been tilled for the production of an insurable crop during the period beginning on February 8, 2014, and ending on the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 shall be subject to 4 cumulative years of a reduction in benefits under this subtitle as described in this paragraph.

“(ii) SUBSEQUENT YEARS.—

“(I) NON-HAY AND NON-FORAGE CROPS.—As determined by the Secretary, native sod acreage that has been tilled for the production of an insurable crop other than a hay or forage crop after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 shall be subject to 4 cumulative years of a reduction in benefits under this subtitle as described in this paragraph.

“(II) HAY AND FORAGE CROPS.—During each crop year of planting, as determined by the Secretary, native sod acreage that has been tilled for the production of an insurable hay or forage crop after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 shall be subject to 4 cumulative years of a reduction in benefits under this subtitle as described in this paragraph.”.

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4);

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) NATIVE SOD CONVERSION CERTIFICATION.—

“(A) CERTIFICATION.—As a condition on the receipt of benefits under this subtitle, a producer that has tilled native sod acreage for the production of an insurable crop as described in paragraph (2)(A) shall certify to the Secretary that acreage using—

“(i) an acreage report form of the Farm Service Agency (FSA-578 or any successor form); and

“(ii) 1 or more maps.

“(B) CORRECTIONS.—Beginning on the date on which a producer submits a certification under subparagraph (A), as soon as practicable after the producer discovers a change in tilled native sod acreage described in that subparagraph, the producer shall submit to the Secretary any appropriate corrections to a form or map described in clause (i) or (ii) of that subparagraph.

“(C) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than January 1, 2019, and each January 1 thereafter through January 1, 2023, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the tilled native sod acreage that has been certified under subparagraph (A) in each county and State as of the date of submission of the report.”; and

(4) in paragraph (4) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking “This subsection” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), this subsection”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) ELECTION.—A governor of a State other than a State described in subparagraph (A) may elect to have this paragraph apply to the State.”.

SEC. 11115. USE OF NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS SERVICE DATA TO COMBAT WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE.

Section 515 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1515) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) using published aggregate data from the National Agricultural Statistics Service or any other data source to—

“(i) detect yield disparities or other data anomalies that indicate potential fraud; and

“(ii) target the relevant counties, crops, regions, companies, or agents associated with that potential fraud for audits and other enforcement actions.”; and

(2) in subsection (f)(2)(A), by striking “pursuant to” each place it appears and inserting “under”.

SEC. 11116. SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION TO CORPORATION.

Section 515(g) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1515(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following:

“(D) The actual production history to be used to establish insurable yields.”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “The information required by paragraph (1)” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The information required to be submitted under subparagraphs (A) through (C) of paragraph (1)”;

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) ACTUAL PRODUCTION HISTORY.—The information required to be submitted under paragraph (1)(D) with respect to an applicable policy or plan of insurance shall be submitted so as to ensure receipt by the Corporation not later than the Saturday of the week containing the calendar day that is 30 days after the applicable production reporting date for the crop to be insured.”.

SEC. 11117. ACREAGE REPORT STREAMLINING INITIATIVE.

Section 515(j)(1)(B)(ii) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1515(j)(1)(B)(ii)) is amended—

(1) by striking “As soon” and inserting the following:

“(I) IN GENERAL.—As soon”;

(2) in subclause (I) (as so designated), by striking “information” and inserting “information, electronically (including in the form of geospatial data) or conventionally.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(II) METHOD FOR DETERMINING COMMON INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than September 30, 2020, the Administrator of the Risk Management Agency and the Administrator of the Farm Service Agency shall implement a consistent method for determining crop acreage, acreage yields, farm acreage, property descriptions, and other common informational requirements, including measures of common land units.

“(III) ACCEPTANCE OF DATA.—The Corporation shall require each approved insurance provider to accept from a producer or an authorized agent of a producer reports of crop acreage, acreage yields, and other information electronically (including in the form of geospatial data) or conventionally, at the option of the producer or the agent of the producer, as applicable.”.

SEC. 11118. CONTINUING EDUCATION FOR LOSS ADJUSTERS AND AGENTS.

Section 515 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1515) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (k) as subsection (l); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (j) the following:

“(k) CONTINUING EDUCATION FOR LOSS ADJUSTERS AND AGENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall establish requirements for continuing education for loss adjusters and agents of approved insurance providers.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements for continuing education described in paragraph (1) shall ensure that loss adjusters and agents of approved insurance providers are familiar with appropriate conservation activities and agronomic practices that—

“(A) are common and appropriate to the area in which the insured crop being inspected is produced; and

“(B) include organic and sustainable practices.”.

SEC. 11119. FUNDING FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.

Section 515 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1515) is amended in subsection (l)(1)(A) (as redesignated by section 11118(1))—

(1) by striking clause (ii);

(2) in clause (i)—

(A) by striking “(i)(I) for” and inserting the following:

“(i) for”;

(B) by striking “and” at the end; and

(C) by redesignating subclause (II) as clause (ii);

(3) in clause (ii) (as so redesignated), by striking “or” at the end and inserting “and”; and

(4) by inserting after clause (ii) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(iii) for each of fiscal years 2019 and 2020, \$1,000,000.”.

SEC. 11120. AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY.

Section 518 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1518) is amended by inserting “hemp,” before “aquacultural species”.

SEC. 11121. REIMBURSEMENT OF RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND MAINTENANCE COSTS.

Section 522(b) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1522(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following:

“(K) WAIVER FOR HEMP.—The Board may waive the viability and marketability requirements under this paragraph in the case of research and development relating to a policy to insure the production of hemp.”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking “The Corporation” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Corporation”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) WAIVER FOR HEMP.—The Corporation may waive the marketability requirement under subparagraph (A) in the case of research and development relating to a policy to insure the production of hemp.”.

SEC. 11122. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY.

Section 522(c) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1522(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (7) through (18) and (20) through (23);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (19) and (24) as paragraphs (7) and (8), respectively;

(3) in paragraph (7) (as so redesignated) (entitled “Whole farm diversified risk management insurance plan”), by adding at the end the following:

“(E) REVIEW OF MODIFICATIONS TO IMPROVE EFFECTIVENESS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, the Corporation shall—

“(I) hold stakeholder meetings to solicit producer and agent feedback;

“(II) review procedures and paperwork requirements on agents and producers; and

“(III) modify procedures and requirements, as appropriate, to decrease burdens and increase flexibility and effectiveness.

“(ii) FACTORS.—In carrying out subclauses (II) and (III) of clause (i), the Corporation shall consider—

“(I) removing caps on nursery and livestock production;

“(II) allowing a waiver to expand operations, especially for small and beginning farmers;

“(III) minimizing paperwork for producers and agents;

“(IV) implementing an option for producers with less than \$1,000,000 in gross revenue that requires significantly less paperwork and recordkeeping;

“(V) developing and using alternative records such as time-stamped photographs or technology applications to document planting and production history;

“(VI) treating the different growth stages of aquaculture species as separate crops to recognize the difference in perils at different phases of growth;

“(VII) moderating the impacts of disaster years on historic revenue, such as—

“(aa) using an average of the historic and projected revenue;

“(bb) counting indemnities as historic revenue for loss years; or

“(cc) using an assigned yield floor similar to a T-yield, as determined by the Secretary; and

“(VIII) improving agent training and outreach to underserved regions and sectors such as small dairy farms.”; and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (8) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(9) IRRIGATED GRAIN SORGHUM CROP INSURANCE POLICY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall carry out research and development, or offer to enter into 1 or more contracts with 1 or more qualified persons to carry out research and development—

“(i) regarding improvements to 1 or more policies to insure irrigated grain sorghum; and

“(ii) regarding alternative methods for producers with not more than 4 years of production history to insure irrigated grain sorghum.

“(B) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, the Corporation shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes—

“(i) the results of the research and development conducted under subparagraph (A); and

“(ii) any recommendations with respect to those results.

“(10) LIMITED IRRIGATION PRACTICES.—

“(A) AUTHORITY.—The Corporation shall—

“(i) expand the availability of the limited irrigation insurance program to not fewer than 2 neighboring and similarly situated States (such as the States of Colorado and Nebraska), as determined by the Secretary;

“(ii) carry out research, or offer to enter into 1 or more contracts with 1 or more qualified persons to carry out research, on the marketability of the existing limited irrigation insurance program; and

“(iii) make recommendations on how to improve participation in that program.

“(B) RESEARCH.—In carrying out research under subparagraph (A), a qualified person shall—

“(i) collaborate with researchers on the subjects of—

“(I) reduced irrigation practices or limited irrigation practices; and

“(II) expected yield reductions following the application of reduced irrigation;

“(ii) collaborate with State and Federal officials responsible for the collection of water and the regulation of water use for the purpose of irrigation;

“(iii) provide recommendations to encourage producers to carry out limited irrigation practices or reduced irrigation and water conservation practices; and

“(iv) develop web-based applications that will streamline access to coverage for producers electing to conserve water use on irrigated crops.

“(C) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, the Corporation shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes—

“(i) the results of the research carried out under subparagraphs (A) and (B);

“(ii) any recommendations to encourage producers to carry out limited irrigation practices or reduced irrigation and water conservation practices; and

“(iii) the actions taken by the Corporation to carry out the recommendations described in clause (ii).

“(11) QUALITY LOSS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall carry out research and development, or offer to enter into 1 or more contracts with 1 or more qualified persons to carry out research and development, regarding the establishment of each of the following alternative methods of adjusting for quality losses:

“(i) A method that does not impact the average production history of a producer.

“(ii) A method that is optional for a producer to elect to use.

“(iii) A method that provides that, in circumstances in which a producer has suffered a quality loss to the insured crop of the producer that is insufficient to trigger an indemnity payment, the producer may elect to exclude that quality loss from the actual production history of the producer.

“(iv) 1 or more methods that combine 2 or more of the methods described in clauses (i) through (iii).

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—Notwithstanding subsections (g) and (m) of section 508, any method developed under subparagraph (A) that is used by the Corporation shall be—

“(i) optional for a producer to use; and

“(ii) offered at an actuarially sound premium rate.

“(C) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, the Corporation shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the results of the research and development carried out under subparagraph (A).

“(12) CITRUS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall carry out research and development, or offer to enter into 1 or more contracts with 1 or more qualified persons to carry out research and development, regarding the insurance of citrus fruit commodities and commodity types, including research and development of—

“(i) improvements to 1 or more existing policies, including the whole-farm revenue protection pilot policy;

“(ii) alternative methods of insuring revenue for citrus fruit commodities and commodity types; and

“(iii) the development of new, or expansion of existing, revenue policies for citrus fruit commodities and commodity types.

“(B) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, the Corporation shall

submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes—

“(i) the results of the research and development carried out under subparagraph (A); and

“(ii) any recommendations with respect to those results.

“(13) GREENHOUSE POLICY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—

“(i) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—The Corporation shall carry out research and development, or offer to enter into 1 or more contracts with 1 or more qualified persons to carry out research and development, regarding a policy to insure in a controlled environment such as a greenhouse—

“(I) the production of floriculture, nursery, and bedding plants;

“(II) the establishment of cuttings or tissue culture in a growing medium; or

“(III) other similar production, as determined by the Secretary.

“(ii) AVAILABILITY OF POLICY OR PLAN OF INSURANCE.—Notwithstanding the last sentence of section 508(a)(1), and section 508(a)(2), the Corporation shall make a policy or plan of insurance described in clause (i) available if the requirements of section 508(h) are met.

“(B) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT DESCRIBED.—Research and development described in subparagraph (A)(i) shall evaluate the effectiveness of policies and plans of insurance for the production of plants in a controlled environment, including policies and plans of insurance that—

“(i) are based on the risk of—

“(I) plant diseases introduced from the environment;

“(II) contaminated cuttings, seedlings, or tissue culture; or

“(III) Federal or State quarantine or destruction orders associated with the contaminated items described in subclause (II);

“(ii) consider other causes of loss applicable to a controlled environment, such as a loss of electricity due to weather;

“(iii) consider appropriate best practices to minimize the risk of loss;

“(iv) consider whether to provide coverage for various types of plants under 1 policy or plan of insurance or to provide coverage for 1 species or type of plant per policy or plan of insurance;

“(v) have streamlined reporting and paperwork requirements that take into account short propagation schedules, variable crop years, and the variety of plants that may be produced in a single facility; and

“(vi) provide protection for revenue losses.

“(C) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, the Corporation shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that—

“(i) describes the results of the research and development conducted under subparagraphs (A)(i) and (B); and

“(ii) any recommendations with respect to those results.

“(14) HOPS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall carry out research and development, or offer to enter into 1 or more contracts with 1 or more qualified persons to carry out research and development, regarding a policy to insure the production of hops or revenue derived from the production of hops.

“(B) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, the Corporation shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of

the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes—

“(i) the results of the research and development conducted under subparagraph (A); and
“(ii) any recommendations with respect to those results.

“(15) LOCAL FOODS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—

“(i) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—The Corporation shall carry out research and development, or offer to enter into 1 or more contracts with 1 or more qualified persons to carry out research and development, regarding a policy to insure production—

“(I) of floriculture, fruits, vegetables, poultry, livestock, or the products of floriculture, fruits, vegetables, poultry, or livestock; and

“(II) that is targeted toward local consumers and markets.

“(ii) AVAILABILITY OF POLICY OR PLAN OF INSURANCE.—Notwithstanding the last sentence of section 508(a)(1), and section 508(a)(2), the Corporation shall make a policy or plan of insurance described in clause (i) available if the requirements of section 508(h) are met.

“(B) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT DESCRIBED.—Research and development described in subparagraph (A)(i) shall evaluate the effectiveness of policies and plans of insurance for production targeted toward local consumers and markets, including policies and plans of insurance that—

“(i) consider small-scale production in various areas, including urban, suburban, and rural areas;

“(ii) consider a variety of marketing strategies, including—

“(I) direct-to-consumer marketing;

“(II) farmers markets;

“(III) farm-to-institution marketing; and

“(IV) marketing through community-supported agriculture;

“(iii) allow for production in soil and in alternative systems such as vertical systems, greenhouses, rooftops, or hydroponic systems;

“(iv) consider the price premium when accounting for production or revenue losses;

“(v) consider whether to provide coverage—

“(I) for various types of production under 1 policy or plan of insurance; and

“(II) for 1 species or type of plant per policy or plan of insurance; and

“(vi) have streamlined reporting and paperwork requirements.

“(C) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, the Corporation shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that—

“(i) examines whether a version of existing policies such as the whole-farm revenue protection insurance plan may be tailored to provide improved coverage for producers of local foods;

“(ii) describes the results of the research and development conducted under subparagraphs (A) and (B); and

“(iii) includes any recommendations with respect to those results.

“(16) INSURABLE IRRIGATION PRACTICES FOR RICE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall carry out research and development, or offer to enter into 1 or more contracts with 1 or more qualified persons to carry out research and development, to include new and innovative irrigation practices under the current rice policy or the development of a distinct plan of insurance or policy endorsement rated for rice produced using—

“(i) alternate wetting and drying practices (also referred to as ‘intermittent flooding’); and

“(ii) furrow irrigation practices.

“(B) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, the Corporation shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes—

“(i) the results of the research and development carried out under paragraph (1); and

“(ii) any recommendations with respect to those results.

“(17) HIGH-RISK, HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE BATTURE LAND POLICY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—

“(i) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—The Corporation shall carry out research and development, or offer to enter into 1 or more contracts with 1 or more qualified persons to carry out research and development, regarding a policy to insure producers of corn, cotton, and soybeans—

“(I) with operations on highly productive batture land within the Lower Mississippi River Valley below Mississippi River mile 368.44;

“(II) that have a history of production of not less than 5 years; and

“(III) that have been impacted by more frequent flooding over the past 10 years due to sedimentation and federally constructed engineering improvements.

“(ii) AVAILABILITY OF POLICY OR PLAN OF INSURANCE.—Notwithstanding the last sentence of section 508(a)(1), and section 508(a)(2), the Corporation shall make a policy or plan of insurance described in clause (i) available if the requirements of section 508(h) are met.

“(B) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT DESCRIBED.—Research and development described in subparagraph (A)(i) shall evaluate the feasibility of less cost-prohibitive policies and plans of insurance for batture-land producers in high risk areas, including policies and plans of insurance that—

“(i) consider premium rate adjustments;

“(ii) consider automatic yield exclusion for consecutive-year losses; and

“(iii) allow for flexibility of final plant dates and prevent plant regulations.

“(C) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, the Corporation shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that—

“(i) examines whether a version of existing policies may be tailored to provide improved coverage for batture-land producers;

“(ii) describes the results of the research and development conducted under subparagraphs (A) and (B); and

“(iii) includes any recommendations with respect to those results.”

SEC. 11123. EDUCATION ASSISTANCE.

Section 524(a)(3)(A) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1524(a)(3)(A)) is amended by inserting “conservation activities,” after “benchmarking.”

SEC. 11124. CROPLAND REPORT ANNUAL UPDATES.

Section 11014(c)(2) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-79; 128 Stat. 963) is amended in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

TITLE XII—MISCELLANEOUS

Subtitle A—Livestock

SEC. 12101. SHEEP PRODUCTION AND MARKETING GRANT PROGRAM.

Section 209 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1627a) is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

“(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section \$1,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”

SEC. 12102. NATIONAL ANIMAL HEALTH LABORATORY NETWORK.

Section 10409A(d) of the Animal Health Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 8308a(d)) is amended by striking “\$15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” and inserting “\$30,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023”.

SEC. 12103. NATIONAL ANIMAL DISEASE PREPAREDNESS, RESPONSE, AND RECOVERY PROGRAM; NATIONAL ANIMAL VACCINE AND VETERINARY COUNTERMEASURES BANK.

The Animal Health Protection Act is amended by inserting after section 10409A (7 U.S.C. 8308a) the following:

“SEC. 10409B. NATIONAL ANIMAL DISEASE PREPAREDNESS, RESPONSE, AND RECOVERY PROGRAM; NATIONAL ANIMAL VACCINE AND VETERINARY COUNTERMEASURES BANK.

“(a) NATIONAL ANIMAL DISEASE PREPAREDNESS, RESPONSE, AND RECOVERY PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To prevent the introduction into or the dissemination within the United States of any pest or disease of animals affecting the economic interests of the livestock and related industries of the United States (including the maintenance and expansion of export market potential), the Secretary shall establish a program to be known as the ‘National Animal Disease Preparedness, Response, and Recovery Program’ (referred to in this subsection as the ‘Program’).

“(2) ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.—Under the Program, the Secretary shall support activities to prevent, detect, and rapidly respond to animal pests and diseases, including—

“(A) enhancing animal pest and disease analysis and surveillance;

“(B) expanding education and outreach;

“(C) targeting domestic inspection activities at vulnerable points in the safeguarding continuum;

“(D) enhancing and strengthening threat identification and technology;

“(E) improving biosecurity;

“(F) enhancing emergency preparedness and response capabilities, including training additional emergency response personnel;

“(G) conducting technology development to enhance electronic sharing of animal health data for risk analysis between State and Federal animal health officials;

“(H) enhancing the development and effectiveness of animal health technologies to treat and prevent disease, including veterinary biologics, veterinary diagnostics, animal drugs for minor use and minor species, animal medical devices, and emerging veterinary countermeasures; and

“(I) such other activities as determined appropriate by the Secretary, in consultation with entities described in paragraph (3)(B).

“(3) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the Program, the Secretary shall offer to enter into cooperative agreements or other legal instruments with entities described in subparagraph (B) to carry out activities described in paragraph (2).

“(B) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—The Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement or

other legal instrument under subparagraph (A) with 1 or more of the following entities:

- “(i) A State department of agriculture.
- “(ii) The State veterinarian or chief animal health official of a State.
- “(iii) A land-grant college or university (as defined in section 1404 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103)).
- “(iv) A NLGCA Institution (as defined in section 1404 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103)).
- “(v) A college of veterinary medicine.
- “(vi) A State or national livestock producer organization with a direct and significant economic interest in livestock production.
- “(vii) A State, national, allied, or regional veterinary organization or specialty board recognized by the American Veterinary Medical Association.
- “(viii) An Indian tribe.
- “(ix) A State emergency management agency.
- “(x) A Federal agency.

“(C) SPECIAL FUNDING CONSIDERATIONS.—In entering into cooperative agreements or other legal instruments under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall give priority to—

- “(i) a State department of agriculture;
- “(ii) the State veterinarian or chief animal health official of a State; and
- “(iii) an eligible entity that shall carry out Program activities in a State or region in which—

“(I) an animal disease or pest is a Federal concern, as determined by the Secretary; or

“(II) there is potential for the spread of an animal disease or pest, as determined by the Secretary, taking into consideration—

- “(aa) the agricultural industries in that State or region;
- “(bb) factors contributing to animal disease or pests in that State or region, such as climate, natural resources, geography, native or exotic wildlife species, and other disease vectors; and
- “(cc) the movement of animals in that State or region.

“(D) APPLICATIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—An entity described in subparagraph (B) desiring to enter into a cooperative agreement or other legal instrument under subparagraph (A) shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

“(ii) NOTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall notify an entity that submits an application under clause (i) of—

“(I) the requirements to be imposed on the entity for auditing of, and reporting on, the use of any funds provided by the Secretary under the cooperative agreement or other legal instrument; and

“(II) the criteria to be used to ensure activities supported under the cooperative agreement or other legal instrument are based on sound scientific data or thorough risk assessments.

“(E) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(i) SUBAGREEMENTS.—Nothing in this section prevents an entity from using funds received under a cooperative agreement or other legal instrument under subparagraph (A) to enter into a subagreement with another organization or a political subdivision of a State that has legal responsibilities relating to animal disease prevention, surveillance, or rapid response.

“(ii) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—In determining whether to enter into a cooperative agreement or other legal instrument with an entity under subparagraph (A), the Secretary—

“(I) may consider the ability of the entity to provide non-Federal funds to carry out

the cooperative agreement or other legal instrument; but

“(II) shall not require the provision of non-Federal funds by an entity as a condition to enter into a cooperative agreement or other legal instrument.

“(iii) ADMINISTRATION.—Of amounts made available to carry out the Program, not more than 10 percent may be retained by an entity that receives funds under a cooperative agreement or other legal instrument under subparagraph (A), including a subagreement under clause (i), to pay administrative costs incurred by the entity in carrying out the cooperative agreement or other legal instrument.

“(4) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall consult with entities described in paragraph (3)(B) in establishing priorities under the Program.

“(5) FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to any consultation by the Secretary with an entity described in paragraph (3)(B) under the Program.

“(6) REPORTS.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which an entity completes an activity prescribed and funded by a cooperative agreement or other legal instrument under paragraph (3)(A), the entity shall submit to the Secretary a report that describes the purposes and results of the activity.

“(b) NATIONAL ANIMAL VACCINE AND VETERINARY COUNTERMEASURES BANK.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a National Animal Vaccine and Veterinary Countermeasures Bank to benefit the domestic interests of the United States.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Under the National Animal Vaccine and Veterinary Countermeasures Bank, the Secretary shall—

“(A) leverage, as appropriate, the mechanisms and infrastructure that have been developed for the management, storage, and distribution of the National Veterinary Stockpile; and

“(B) maintain a sufficient quantity of animal vaccine, antiviral, therapeutic products, diagnostic products, and veterinary countermeasures—

“(i) to appropriately respond to the most damaging animal diseases affecting human health or the economy; and

“(ii) that will be capable of rapid deployment in the event of an outbreak of an animal disease described in clause (i).

“(3) FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE PRIORITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out paragraph (2), the Secretary shall give priority to the maintenance of a sufficient quantity of foot-and-mouth disease vaccine, as determined by the Secretary, and accompanying diagnostic products, covering, to the maximum extent practicable, an appropriate representation of foot-and-mouth disease serotypes and strains for which appropriate vaccine products are available.

“(B) CONTRACTS.—The Secretary may offer to enter into 1 or more contracts with 1 or more entities that produce foot-and-mouth disease vaccine—

“(i) to maintain a bank of viral antigen concentrate or vaccine products for, to the maximum extent practicable, an appropriate representation of foot-and-mouth disease serotypes (as determined by the Secretary) for which antigen concentrate is available; and

“(ii) to maintain surge production capacity to produce, as quickly as practicable, foot-and-mouth disease vaccine to address a foot-and-mouth disease outbreak.

“(C) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(1) FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION.—Of amounts made available to carry out this section, not greater than 4 percent may be retained by the Secretary to pay administra-

tive costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out this section.

“(2) BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES.—None of the amounts made available to carry out this section shall be used for—

“(A) the construction of a new building or facility;

“(B) the acquisition or expansion of an existing building or facility;

“(C) site grading and improvement; or

“(D) architect fees.

“(3) PROCEEDS.—The proceeds from the sale of any vaccine or antigen by the National Animal Vaccine and Veterinary Countermeasures Bank shall—

“(A) be deposited in the Treasury;

“(B) be credited to an account for the operation of the National Animal Vaccine and Veterinary Countermeasures Bank;

“(C) be available for expenditure without further appropriation; and

“(D) remain available until expended.

“(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section, to remain available until expended.”

SEC. 12104. STUDY ON LIVESTOCK DEALER STATUTORY TRUST.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of establishing a livestock dealer statutory trust.

(b) CONTENTS.—The study conducted under subsection (a) shall—

(1) analyze how the establishment of a livestock dealer statutory trust would affect buyer and seller behavior in markets for livestock (as defined in section 2(a) of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 (7 U.S.C. 182));

(2) consider what potential effects a livestock dealer statutory trust would have on credit availability, including impacts on lenders and lending behavior and other industry participants;

(3) examine unique circumstances common to livestock dealers and how those circumstances could impact the functionality of a livestock dealer statutory trust;

(4) study the feasibility of the industry-wide adoption of electronic funds transfer or another expeditious method of payment to provide sellers of livestock protection from nonsufficient funds payments;

(5) assess the effectiveness of statutory trusts in other segments of agriculture and whether similar effects could be experienced under a livestock dealer statutory trust; and

(6) consider the effects of exempting dealers with average annual purchases under a de minimis threshold from being subject to the livestock dealer statutory trust.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 540 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report describing the findings of the study conducted under subsection (a).

SEC. 12105. DEFINITION OF LIVESTOCK.

Section 602(2) of the Emergency Livestock Feed Assistance Act of 1988 (7 U.S.C. 1471(2)) is amended in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking “fish” and all that follows through “that—” and inserting “llamas, alpacas, live fish, crawfish, and other animals that—”.

Subtitle B—Agriculture and Food Defense

SEC. 12201. REPEAL OF OFFICE OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

Section 14111 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8911) is repealed.

SEC. 12202. OFFICE OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

Subtitle A of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C.

6911 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 221. OFFICE OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

“(a) **DEFINITION OF AGRICULTURE AND FOOD DEFENSE.**—In this section, the term ‘agriculture and food defense’ means any action to prevent, protect against, mitigate the effects of, respond to, or recover from a naturally occurring, unintentional, or intentional threat to the agriculture and food system.

“(b) **AUTHORIZATION.**—The Secretary shall establish in the Department the Office of Homeland Security.

“(c) **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.**—The Office of Homeland Security shall be headed by an Executive Director, who shall be known as the ‘Executive Director of Homeland Security’.

“(d) **DUTIES.**—The Executive Director of Homeland Security shall—

“(1) serve as the principal advisor to the Secretary on homeland security, including emergency management and agriculture and food defense;

“(2) coordinate activities of the Department, including policies, processes, budget needs, and oversight relating to homeland security, including emergency management and agriculture and food defense;

“(3) act as the primary liaison on behalf of the Department with other Federal departments and agencies in activities relating to homeland security, including emergency management and agriculture and food defense, and provide for interagency coordination and data sharing;

“(4)(A) coordinate in the Department the gathering of information relevant to early warning and awareness of threats and risks to the food and agriculture critical infrastructure sector; and

“(B) share that information with, and provide assistance with interpretation and risk characterization of that information to, the intelligence community (as defined in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003)), law enforcement agencies, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and State fusion centers (as defined in section 210A(j) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 124h(j)));

“(5) liaison with the Director of National Intelligence to assist in the development of periodic assessments and intelligence estimates, or other intelligence products, that support the defense of the food and agriculture critical infrastructure sector;

“(6) coordinate the conduct, evaluation, and improvement of exercises to identify and eliminate gaps in preparedness and response;

“(7) produce a Department-wide centralized strategic coordination plan to provide a high-level perspective of the operations of the Department relating to homeland security, including emergency management and agriculture and food defense; and

“(8) carry out other appropriate duties, as determined by the Secretary.

“(e) **AGRICULTURE AND FOOD THREAT AWARENESS PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.**—

“(1) **INTERAGENCY EXCHANGE PROGRAM.**—The Secretary, in partnership with the intelligence community (as defined in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003)) and fusion centers (as defined in section 210A(j) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 124h(j))) that have analysis and intelligence capabilities relating to the defense of the food and agriculture critical infrastructure sector, shall establish and carry out an interagency exchange program of personnel and information to improve communication and analysis for the defense of the food and agriculture critical infrastructure sector.

“(2) **COLLABORATION WITH FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL AUTHORITIES.**—To carry out the

program established under paragraph (1), the Secretary may—

“(A) enter into 1 or more cooperative agreements or contracts with Federal, State, or local authorities that have analysis and intelligence capabilities and expertise relating to the defense of the food and agriculture critical infrastructure sector; and

“(B) carry out any other activity under any other authority of the Secretary that is appropriate to engage the authorities described in subparagraph (A) for the defense of the food and agriculture critical infrastructure sector, as determined by the Secretary.”

SEC. 12203. AGRICULTURE AND FOOD DEFENSE.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **ANIMAL.**—The term “animal” has the meaning given the term in section 10403 of the Animal Health Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 8302).

(2) **DISEASE OR PEST OF CONCERN.**—The term “disease or pest of concern” means a plant or animal disease or pest that—

(A) is—

(i) a transboundary disease; or

(ii) an established disease; and

(B) is likely to pose a significant risk to the food and agriculture critical infrastructure sector that warrants efforts at prevention, protection, mitigation, response, and recovery.

(3) **ESTABLISHED DISEASE.**—The term “established disease” means a plant or animal disease or pest that—

(A)(i) if it becomes established, poses an imminent threat to agriculture in the United States; or

(ii) has become established, as defined by the Secretary, within the United States; and

(B) requires management.

(4) **HIGH-CONSEQUENCE PLANT TRANSBOUNDARY DISEASE.**—The term “high-consequence plant transboundary disease” means a transboundary disease that is—

(A)(i) a plant disease; or

(ii) a plant pest; and

(B) of high consequence, as determined by the Secretary.

(5) **PEST.**—The term “pest”—

(A) with respect to a plant, has the meaning given the term “plant pest” in section 403 of the Plant Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 7702); and

(B) with respect to an animal, has the meaning given the term in section 10403 of the Animal Health Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 8302).

(6) **PLANT.**—The term “plant” has the meaning given the term in section 403 of the Plant Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 7702).

(7) **PLANT HEALTH MANAGEMENT STRATEGY.**—The term “plant health management strategy” means a strategy to timely control and eradicate a plant disease or plant pest outbreak, including through mitigation (such as chemical control), surveillance, the use of diagnostic products and procedures, and the use of existing resistant seed stock.

(8) **TRANSBOUNDARY DISEASE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “transboundary disease” means a plant or animal disease or pest that is within 1 or more countries outside of the United States.

(B) **INCLUSION.**—The term “transboundary disease” includes a plant or animal disease or pest described in subparagraph (A) that—

(i) has emerged within the United States; or

(ii) has been introduced within the United States.

(9) **VETERINARY COUNTERMEASURE.**—The term “veterinary countermeasure” means the use of any animal vaccine, antiviral, therapeutic product, or diagnostic product to respond to the most damaging animal diseases to animal and human health and the economy.

(b) **DISEASE OR PEST OF CONCERN RESPONSE PLANNING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall—

(A) establish a list of diseases or pests of concern by—

(i) developing a process to solicit and receive expert opinion and evidence relating to the diseases and pests of concern entered on the list; and

(ii) reviewing all available evidence relating to the diseases and pests of concern entered on the list, including classified information; and

(B) periodically update the list established under subparagraph (A).

(2) **RESPONSE PLANS.**—

(A) **COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGIC RESPONSE PLAN OR PLANS.**—The Secretary shall develop, in collaboration with appropriate Federal, State, regional, and local officials, a comprehensive strategic response plan or plans, as appropriate, for the diseases or pests of concern that are entered on the list established under paragraph (1).

(B) **STATE OR REGION RESPONSE PLAN OR PLANS.**—The Secretary shall provide information to a State or regional authority to assist in developing a comprehensive strategic response plan or plans for that State or region that shall—

(i) include—

(I) a concept of operations for each disease or pest of concern; or

(II) a platform concept of operations for responses to similar diseases or pests, as determined by the Secretary;

(ii) describe the appropriate interactions among, and roles of—

(I) Federal, State, Tribal, and units of local government; and

(II) plant or animal industry partners;

(iii) include a decision matrix that shall, as appropriate, include—

(I) information and timing requirements necessary for the use of veterinary countermeasures;

(II) plant health management strategies;

(III) deployment of other key materials and resources; and

(IV) parameters for transitioning from outbreak response to disease management;

(iv) identify key response performance metrics to establish—

(I) benchmarking;

(II) progressive exercise evaluation; and

(III) continuing improvement of a response plan, including by providing for—

(aa) ongoing exercise evaluations to improve a response plan over time; and

(bb) strategic information to guide investment in any appropriate research to mitigate the risk of a disease or pest of concern; and

(v) be updated periodically, as determined to be appropriate by the Secretary, including in response to—

(I) an exercise evaluation; or

(II) new risk information becoming available regarding a disease or pest of concern.

(3) **COORDINATION OF PLANS.**—Pursuant to section 221(d)(6) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994, the Secretary shall, as appropriate, assist in coordinating with other appropriate Federal, State, regional, or local officials in the exercising of the plans developed under paragraph (2).

(c) **NATIONAL PLANT DIAGNOSTIC NETWORK.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall establish in the Department of Agriculture a National Plant Diagnostic Network to monitor and surveil through diagnostics threats to plant health from diseases or pests of concern in the United States.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The National Plant Diagnostic Network established under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) provide for increased awareness, surveillance, early identification, rapid communication, warning, and diagnosis of a threat to plant health from a disease or pest of concern to protect natural and agricultural plant resources;

(B) coordinate and collaborate with agencies of the Department of Agriculture and State agencies and authorities involved in plant health;

(C) establish diagnostic laboratory standards;

(D) establish regional hubs throughout the United States that provide expertise, leadership, and support to diagnostic labs relating to the agricultural crops and plants in the covered regions of those hubs; and

(E) establish a national repository for records of endemic or emergent diseases and pests of concern.

(3) HEAD OF NETWORK.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the National Institute of Food and Agriculture shall serve as the head of the National Plant Diagnostic Network.

(B) DUTIES.—The head of the National Plant Diagnostic Network shall—

(i) coordinate and collaborate with land-grant colleges and universities (as defined in section 1404 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103)) in carrying out the requirements under paragraph (2), including through cooperative agreements described in paragraph (4);

(ii) partner with the Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service for assistance with plant health regulation and inspection; and

(iii) coordinate with other Federal agencies, as appropriate, in carrying out activities relating to the National Plant Diagnostic Network, including the sharing of bio-surveillance information.

(4) COLLABORATION WITH LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.—The Secretary shall seek to establish cooperative agreements with land-grant colleges and universities (as defined in section 1404 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103)) that have the appropriate level of skill, experience, and competence with plant diseases or pests of concern.

(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to the amount authorized to carry out this subtitle under section 12205, there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection \$15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.

(d) NATIONAL PLANT DISEASE RECOVERY SYSTEM.—

(1) RECOVERY SYSTEM.—The Secretary shall establish in the Department of Agriculture a National Plant Disease Recovery System to engage in strategic long-range planning to recover from high-consequence plant transboundary diseases.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The National Plant Disease Recovery System established under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) coordinate with disease or pest of concern concept of operations response plans;

(B) make long-range plans for the initiation of future research projects relating to high-consequence plant transboundary diseases;

(C) establish research plans for long-term recovery;

(D) plan for the identification and use of specific genotypes, cultivars, breeding lines, and other disease-resistant materials necessary for crop stabilization or improvement; and

(E) establish a watch list of high-consequence plant transboundary diseases for the purpose of making long-range plans under subparagraph (B).

SEC. 12204. BIOLOGICAL AGENTS AND TOXINS LIST.

Section 212(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Agricultural Bioterrorism Protection Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8401(a)(1)(B)(i)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (III), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) by redesignating subclause (IV) as subclause (V); and

(3) by inserting after subclause (III) the following:

“(IV)(aa) whether placing an agent or toxin on the list under subparagraph (A) would have a substantial negative impact on the research and development of solutions for the animal or plant disease caused by the agent or toxin; and

“(bb) whether that negative impact would substantially outweigh the risk posed by the agent or toxin to animal or plant health if it is not placed on the list; and”.

SEC. 12205. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

In addition to other amounts made available under this subtitle, there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subtitle \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.

Subtitle C—Historically Underserved Producers

SEC. 12301. FARMING OPPORTUNITIES TRAINING AND OUTREACH.

(a) REPEAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 7405 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 3319f) is repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 226B(e)(2)(B) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6934(e)(2)(B)) is amended by striking “the beginning farmer and rancher development program established under section 7405 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 3319f).” and inserting “the beginning farmer and rancher development grant program established under subsection (d) of section 2501 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279).”.

(B) Section 251(f)(1)(D) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6971(f)(1)(D)) is amended by striking clause (iv) and inserting the following:

“(iv) The beginning farmer and rancher development grant program established under subsection (d) of section 2501 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279).”.

(C) Section 7506(e) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 7614c(e)) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (2)(C)—

(I) by striking clause (v);

(II) by redesignating clauses (i) through (iv) as clauses (ii) through (v), respectively;

(III) by inserting before clause (ii) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(i) each grant awarded under subsection (d) of section 2501 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279).”;

(IV) in clause (ii) (as so redesignated), by striking “450i(b)(2);” and inserting “3157(b)(2);”;

(V) in clause (iv) (as so redesignated), by adding “and” at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (4)—

(I) by striking subparagraph (E);

(II) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (D) as subparagraphs (B) through (E), respectively;

(III) by inserting before subparagraph (B) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(A) subsection (d) of section 2501 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279).”;

(IV) in subparagraph (B) (as so redesignated), by striking “450i(b);” and inserting “3157(b);”;

(V) in subparagraph (D) (as so redesignated), by adding “or” at the end; and

(VI) in subparagraph (E) (as so redesignated), by striking “; or” and inserting a period.

(b) OUTREACH AND EDUCATION FOR SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED FARMERS AND RANCHERS, VETERAN FARMERS AND RANCHERS, AND BEGINNING FARMERS AND RANCHERS.—Section 2501 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279) is amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and inserting “**FARMING OPPORTUNITIES TRAINING AND OUTREACH**”;

(2) by redesignating subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (g), (h), and (i) as subsections (c), (j), (o), (k), (a), (l), (m), and (n), respectively, and moving the subsections so as to appear in alphabetical order;

(3) by moving paragraph (5) of subsection (a) (as so redesignated) so as to appear at the end of subsection (c) (as so redesignated);

(4) in subsection (a) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking the subsection designation and heading and inserting the following:

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:”;

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), and (6) as paragraphs (6), (5), (1), (3), and (4), respectively, and moving the paragraphs so as to appear in numerical order;

(C) in paragraphs (1), (5), and (6) (as so redesignated), by striking “As used in this section, the” each place it appears and inserting “The”; and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (1) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(2) BEGINNING FARMER OR RANCHER.—The term ‘beginning farmer or rancher’ means a person that—

“(A)(i) has not operated a farm or ranch; or

“(ii) has operated a farm or ranch for not more than 10 years; and

“(B) meets such other criteria as the Secretary may establish.”;

(5) by inserting after subsection (a) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(b) FARMING OPPORTUNITIES TRAINING AND OUTREACH.—The Secretary shall carry out this section to encourage and assist socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers, veteran farmers and ranchers, and beginning farmers and ranchers in the ownership and operation of farms and ranches through—

“(1) education and training; and

“(2) equitable participation in all agricultural programs of the Department.”;

(6) in subsection (c) (as so redesignated) and as amended by paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking paragraph (4);

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (5) as paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (1), respectively, and moving the paragraphs so as to appear in numerical order;

(C) in paragraph (1) (as so redesignated)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “The term” and inserting “In this subsection, the term”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “subsection (a)” and inserting “this subsection”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (F), by striking “450b)” and inserting “5304)”;

(D) in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (2) (as so redesignated), by striking “agricultural” and inserting “agricultural, forestry, and related”;

(E) in paragraph (3) (as so redesignated), by striking “(1)” in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) and inserting “(2)”;

(F) in paragraph (4) (as so redesignated)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking the subparagraph heading and inserting “OUTREACH AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—”;

(II) by striking “(2)” and inserting “(3)”; and

(III) by inserting “to socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers and veteran farmers and ranchers” after “assistance”;

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “(1)” and inserting “(2)”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (D), by adding at the end the following:

“(v) The number of farms or ranches started, maintained, or improved as a result of funds made available under the program.

“(vi) Actions taken by the Secretary in partnership with eligible entities to enhance participation in agricultural programs by veteran farmers or ranchers and socially disadvantaged farmers or ranchers.

“(vii) The effectiveness of the actions described in clause (vi).”; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) MAXIMUM TERM AND AMOUNT OF GRANT, CONTRACT, OR AGREEMENT.—A grant, contract, or agreement entered into under subparagraph (A) shall be—

“(i) for a term of not longer than 3 years; and

“(ii) in an amount that is not more than \$250,000 for each year of the grant, contract, or agreement.

“(F) PRIORITY.—In making grants and entering into contracts and other agreements under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall give priority to nongovernmental and community-based organizations with an expertise in working with socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers or veteran farmers and ranchers.

“(G) REGIONAL BALANCE.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall ensure the geographical diversity of eligible entities to which grants are made and contracts and other agreements are entered into under subparagraph (A).

“(H) PROHIBITION.—A grant, contract, or other agreement under subparagraph (A) may not be used for the planning, repair, rehabilitation, acquisition, or construction of a building or facility.

“(I) PEER REVIEW.—The Secretary shall establish a fair and efficient external peer review process that—

“(i) the Secretary shall use in making grants and entering into contracts and other agreements under subparagraph (A); and

“(ii) shall include a broad representation of peers of the eligible entity.

“(J) INPUT FROM ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—The Secretary shall seek input from eligible entities providing technical assistance under this subsection not less than once each year to ensure that the program is responsive to the eligible entities providing that technical assistance.”;

(7) by inserting after subsection (c) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(d) BEGINNING FARMER AND RANCHER DEVELOPMENT GRANT PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the National Institute of Food and Agriculture, shall make competitive grants to support new and established local and regional training, education, outreach, and technical assistance initiatives for beginning farmers and ranchers.

“(2) INCLUDED PROGRAMS AND SERVICES.—Initiatives described in paragraph (1) may include programs or services, as appropriate, relating to—

“(A) basic livestock, forest management, and crop farming practices;

“(B) innovative farm, ranch, and private, nonindustrial forest land transfer and succession strategies;

“(C) entrepreneurship and business training;

“(D) financial and risk management training, including the acquisition and management of agricultural credit;

“(E) natural resource management and planning;

“(F) diversification and marketing strategies;

“(G) curriculum development;

“(H) mentoring, apprenticeships, and internships;

“(I) resources and referral;

“(J) farm financial benchmarking;

“(K) assisting beginning farmers and ranchers in acquiring land from retiring farmers and ranchers;

“(L) agricultural rehabilitation and vocational training for veteran farmers and ranchers;

“(M) farm safety and awareness;

“(N) food safety and recordkeeping; and

“(O) other similar subject areas of use to beginning farmers and ranchers.

“(3) ELIGIBILITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection, the recipient of the grant shall be a collaborative State, Tribal, local, or regionally-based network or partnership of public or private entities.

“(B) INCLUSIONS.—A recipient of a grant described in subparagraph (A) may include—

“(i) a State cooperative extension service;

“(ii) a Federal, State, municipal, or Tribal agency;

“(iii) a community-based or nongovernmental organization;

“(iv) a college or university (including an institution awarding an associate’s degree) or foundation maintained by a college or university; or

“(v) any other appropriate partner, as determined by the Secretary.

“(4) TERMS OF GRANTS.—A grant under this subsection shall—

“(A) be for a term of not longer than 3 years; and

“(B) provide not more than \$250,000 for each year.

“(5) EVALUATION CRITERIA.—In making grants under this subsection, the Secretary shall evaluate, with respect to applications for the grants—

“(A) relevancy;

“(B) technical merit;

“(C) achievability;

“(D) the expertise and track record of 1 or more applicants;

“(E) the consultation of beginning farmers and ranchers in design, implementation, and decisionmaking relating to an initiative described in paragraph (1);

“(F) the adequacy of plans for—

“(i) a participatory evaluation process;

“(ii) outcome-based reporting; and

“(iii) the communication of findings and results beyond the immediate target audience; and

“(G) other appropriate factors, as determined by the Secretary.

“(6) REGIONAL BALANCE.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall ensure the geographical diversity of recipients of grants under this subsection.

“(7) PRIORITY.—In making grants under this subsection, the Secretary shall give priority to partnerships and collaborations that are led by or include nongovernmental, community-based organizations and school-based educational organizations with expertise in new agricultural producer training and outreach.

“(8) PROHIBITION.—A grant made under this subsection may not be used for the planning, repair, rehabilitation, acquisition, or construction of a building or facility.

“(9) COORDINATION PERMITTED.—A recipient of a grant under this subsection may coordinate with a recipient of a grant under section 1680 in addressing the needs of veteran farmers and ranchers with disabilities.

“(10) CONSECUTIVE AWARDS.—A grant under this subsection may be made to a recipient for consecutive years.

“(11) PEER REVIEW.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a fair and efficient external peer review process, which the Secretary shall use in making grants under this subsection.

“(B) REQUIREMENT.—The peer review process under subparagraph (A) shall include a review panel composed of a broad representation of peers of the applicant for the grant that are not applying for a grant under this subsection.

“(12) PARTICIPATION BY OTHER FARMERS AND RANCHERS.—Nothing in this subsection prohibits the Secretary from allowing a farmer or rancher who is not a beginning farmer or rancher (including an owner or operator that has ended, or expects to end within 5 years, active labor in a farming or ranching operation as a producer) from participating in a program or service under this subsection, to the extent that the Secretary determines that such participation—

“(A) is appropriate; and

“(B) will not detract from the primary purpose of increasing opportunities for beginning farmers and ranchers.

“(e) APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.—In making grants and entering into contracts and other agreements, as applicable, under subsections (c) and (d), the Secretary shall make available a simplified application process for an application for a grant that requests less than \$50,000.”;

(8) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

“(g) EDUCATION TEAMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish beginning farmer and rancher education teams to develop curricula and conduct educational programs and workshops for beginning farmers and ranchers in diverse geographical areas of the United States.

“(2) CURRICULUM.—In promoting the development of curricula under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, include modules tailored to specific audiences of beginning farmers and ranchers, based on crop diversity or regional diversity.

“(3) COMPOSITION.—In establishing an education team under paragraph (1) for a specific program or workshop, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable—

“(A) obtain the short-term services of specialists with knowledge and expertise in programs serving beginning farmers and ranchers; and

“(B) use officers and employees of the Department with direct experience in programs of the Department that may be taught as part of the curriculum for the program or workshop.

“(4) COOPERATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall cooperate, to the maximum extent practicable, with—

“(i) State cooperative extension services;

“(ii) Federal, State, and Tribal agencies;

“(iii) community-based and nongovernmental organizations;

“(iv) colleges and universities (including an institution awarding an associate’s degree) or foundations maintained by a college or university; and

“(v) other appropriate partners, as determined by the Secretary.

“(B) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—Notwithstanding chapter 63 of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement to reflect the terms of any cooperation under subparagraph (A).

“(h) CURRICULUM AND TRAINING CLEARINGHOUSE.—The Secretary shall establish an online clearinghouse that makes available to

beginning farmers and ranchers education curricula and training materials and programs, which may include online courses for direct use by beginning farmers and ranchers.

“(i) **STAKEHOLDER INPUT.**—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall seek stakeholder input from—

“(1) beginning farmers and ranchers;

“(2) socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers;

“(3) veteran farmers and ranchers;

“(4) national, State, Tribal, and local organizations and other persons with expertise in operating programs for—

“(A) beginning farmers and ranchers;

“(B) socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers; or

“(C) veteran farmers and ranchers;

“(5) the Advisory Committee on Beginning Farmers and Ranchers established under section 5(b) of the Agricultural Credit Improvement Act of 1992 (7 U.S.C. 1929 note; Public Law 102-554);

“(6) the Advisory Committee on Minority Farmers established under section 14008 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2279 note; Public Law 110-246); and

“(7) the Tribal Advisory Committee established under subsection (b) of section 309 of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6921).”;

(9) in paragraph (3) of subsection (k) (as so redesignated), by inserting “and not later than March 1, 2020,” after “1991.”; and

(10) by adding at the end the following:

“(p) **FUNDING.**—

“(1) **MANDATORY FUNDING.**—Of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary shall use to carry out this section \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2018 and each fiscal year thereafter.

“(2) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$50,000,000 for each fiscal year 2018 through 2023.

“(3) **RESERVATION OF FUNDS.**—Of the amounts made available to carry out this section—

“(A) 50 percent shall be used to carry out subsection (c); and

“(B) 50 percent shall be used to carry out subsection (d).

“(4) **ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not less than 5 percent of the amounts made available to carry out subsections (d) and (n) for a fiscal year shall be used to support programs and services that address the needs of—

“(i) limited resource beginning farmers and ranchers, as defined by the Secretary;

“(ii) socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers that are beginning farmers and ranchers; and

“(iii) farmworkers desiring to become farmers or ranchers.

“(B) **VETERAN FARMERS AND RANCHERS.**—Not less than 5 percent of the amounts made available to carry out subsections (d), (g), and (h) for a fiscal year shall be used to support programs and services that address the needs of veteran farmers and ranchers.

“(5) **INTERAGENCY FUNDING.**—Any agency of the Department may participate in any grant, contract, or agreement entered into under this section by contributing funds, if the contributing agency determines that the objectives of the grant, contract, or agreement will further the authorized programs of the contributing agency.

“(6) **ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**—Not more than 5 percent of the amounts made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year may be used for expenses relating to the administration of this section.

“(7) **LIMITATION ON INDIRECT COSTS.**—A recipient of a grant or a party to a contract or

other agreement under subsection (c) or (d) may not use more than 10 percent of the funds received for the indirect costs of carrying out a grant.”.

SEC. 12302. URBAN AGRICULTURE.

(a) **DEFINITION OF DIRECTOR.**—In this section, the term “Director” means the Director of the Office of Urban Agriculture and Innovative Production established under section 222(a)(1) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (as added by subsection (b)).

(b) **OFFICE OF URBAN AGRICULTURE AND INNOVATIVE PRODUCTION.**—Subtitle A of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6911 et seq.) (as amended by section 12202) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 222. OFFICE OF URBAN AGRICULTURE AND INNOVATIVE PRODUCTION.

“(a) **OFFICE.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall establish in the Department an Office of Urban Agriculture and Innovative Production.

“(2) **DIRECTOR.**—The Secretary shall appoint a senior official to serve as the Director of the Office of Urban Agriculture and Innovative Production (referred to in this section as the ‘Director’).

“(3) **MISSION.**—The mission of the Office of Urban Agriculture and Innovative Production shall be to encourage and promote urban, indoor, and other emerging agricultural practices, including—

“(A) community gardens and farms located in urban areas, suburbs, and urban clusters;

“(B) rooftop farms, outdoor vertical production, and green walls;

“(C) indoor farms, greenhouses, and high-tech vertical technology farms;

“(D) hydroponic, aeroponic, and aquaponic farm facilities; and

“(E) other innovations in agricultural production, as determined by the Secretary.

“(4) **RESPONSIBILITIES.**—The Director shall be responsible for engaging in activities to carry out the mission described in paragraph (3), including by—

“(A) managing and facilitating programs, including for community gardens, urban farms, rooftop agriculture, and indoor vertical production;

“(B) coordinating with the agencies and officials of the Department;

“(C) advising the Secretary on issues relating to the mission of the Office of Urban Agriculture and Innovative Production;

“(D) ensuring that the programs of the Department are updated to address urban, indoor, and other emerging agricultural production practices, in coordination with the officials in the Department responsible for those programs;

“(E) engaging in external relations with stakeholders and coordinating external partnerships to share best practices, provide mentorship, and offer technical assistance;

“(F) facilitating interagency program coordination and developing interagency tools for the promotion of existing programs and resources;

“(G) creating resources that identify common State and municipal best practices for navigating local policies;

“(H) reviewing and improving farm enterprise development programs that provide information about financial literacy, business planning, and food safety record keeping;

“(I) coordinating networks of community gardens and facilitating connections to local food banks, in partnership with the Food and Nutrition Service; and

“(J) collaborating with other Federal agencies that use agricultural practices on-site for food production or infrastructure.

“(b) **URBAN AGRICULTURE AND INNOVATIVE PRODUCTION ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall establish an Urban Agriculture and Innovative Production Advisory Committee (referred to in this subsection as the ‘Committee’) to advise the Secretary on—

“(A) the development of policies relating to urban, indoor, and other emerging agricultural production practices; and

“(B) any other aspects of the implementation of this section.

“(2) **MEMBERSHIP.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Committee shall be composed of 15 members, of whom—

“(i) 5 shall be individuals who are agricultural producers, of whom—

“(I) not fewer than 2 individuals shall be agricultural producers located in an urban area or urban cluster; and

“(II) not fewer than 2 individuals shall be farmers that use innovative technology, including indoor farming and rooftop agriculture;

“(ii) 2 shall be representatives from an institution of higher education or extension program;

“(iii) 1 shall be an individual who represents a nonprofit organization, which may include a public health, environmental, or community organization;

“(iv) 1 shall be an individual who represents business and economic development, which may include a business development entity, a chamber of commerce, a city government, or a planning organization;

“(v) 1 shall be an individual with supply chain experience, which may include a food aggregator, wholesale food distributor, food hub, or an individual who has direct-to-consumer market experience;

“(vi) 1 shall be an individual from a financing entity; and

“(vii) 4 shall be individuals with related experience or expertise in urban, indoor, and other emerging agriculture production practices, as determined by the Secretary.

“(B) **INITIAL APPOINTMENTS.**—The Secretary shall appoint the members of the Committee not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section.

“(3) **PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT; VACANCIES.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), a member of the Committee shall be appointed for a term of 3 years.

“(B) **INITIAL APPOINTMENTS.**—Of the members first appointed to the Committee—

“(i) 5 of the members, as determined by the Secretary, shall be appointed for a term of 3 years;

“(ii) 5 of the members, as determined by the Secretary, shall be appointed for a term of 2 years; and

“(iii) 5 of the members, as determined by the Secretary, shall be appointed for a term of 1 year.

“(C) **VACANCIES.**—Any vacancy in the Committee—

“(i) shall not affect the powers of the Committee; and

“(ii) shall be filled as soon as practicable in the same manner as the original appointment.

“(D) **CONSECUTIVE TERMS.**—An initial appointee of the committee may serve an additional consecutive term if the member is reappointed by the Secretary.

“(4) **MEETINGS.**—

“(A) **FREQUENCY.**—The Committee shall meet not fewer than 3 times per year.

“(B) **INITIAL MEETING.**—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the members are appointed under paragraph (2)(B), the Committee shall hold the first meeting of the Committee.

“(5) **DUTIES.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Committee shall—

“(i) develop recommendations—

“(I) to further the mission of the Office of Urban Agriculture and Innovative Production described in subsection (a)(3);

“(II) regarding the establishment of urban agriculture policy priorities and goals within the Department;

“(ii) advise the Director on policies and initiatives administered by the Office of Urban Agriculture and Innovative Production;

“(iii) evaluate and review ongoing research and extension activities relating to urban, indoor, and other innovative agricultural practices;

“(iv) identify new and existing barriers to successful urban, indoor, and other emerging agricultural production practices; and

“(v) provide additional assistance and advice to the Director as appropriate.

“(B) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, and each year thereafter, the Committee shall submit to the Secretary, the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report describing the recommendations developed under subparagraph (A)(i).

“(6) PERSONNEL MATTERS.—

“(A) COMPENSATION.—A member of the Committee shall serve without compensation.

“(B) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—A member of the Committee shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

“(7) TERMINATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Committee shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date on which the members are appointed under paragraph (2)(B).

“(B) EXTENSIONS.—Before the date on which the Committee terminates, the Secretary may renew the Committee for 1 or more 2-year periods.”.

(c) FARM NUMBERS.—The Secretary shall provide for the assignment of a farm number (as defined in section 718.2 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act)) for rooftop farms, indoor farms, and other urban farms, as determined by the Secretary.

(d) GRANT AUTHORITY.—

(1) DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—In this subsection, the term “eligible entity” means—

(A) a community organization;

(B) a nonprofit organization;

(C) a unit of local government;

(D) a Tribal government;

(E) any school that serves any of grades kindergarten through grade 12; and

(F) an institution of higher education.

(2) GRANTS.—The Director may award competitive grants to eligible entities to support the development of urban agriculture and innovative production.

(3) FUNDING PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this subsection, priority shall be given to an eligible entity that uses and provides an evaluation of a grant received under this subsection—

(A) to plan and construct gardens or nonprofit farms;

(B) to operate community gardens or nonprofit farms that—

(i) produce food for donation;

(ii) have a demonstrated environmental benefit and educational component; and

(iii) are part of community efforts to address local food security needs;

(C) to educate a community on—

(i) issues relating to food systems, including connections between rural farmers and urban communities;

(ii) nutrition;

(iii) environmental impacts, including pollinator health, soil fertility, composting, heat islands, and storm water runoff; and

(iv) agricultural production, including pest and disease management; and

(D) to provide multiple small dollar equity investments to help offset start-up costs relating to new production, land access, and equipment for new and beginning farmers who—

(i) develop a 3-year business plan;

(ii) live in the community in which they plan to farm; and

(iii) provide a match to the start-up investment in the form of cash or an in-kind contribution.

(e) PILOT PROJECTS.—

(1) URBAN AND SUBURBAN COUNTY COMMITTEES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish a pilot program for not fewer than 5 years that establishes 10 county committees in accordance with section 8(b)(5)(B)(ii)(II) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)(5)(B)) to operate in counties located in urban or suburban areas with a high concentration of urban or suburban farms.

(B) EFFECT.—Nothing in this paragraph requires or precludes the establishment of a Farm Service Agency office in a county in which a county committee is established under subparagraph (A).

(C) REPORT.—For fiscal year 2019 and each fiscal year thereafter through fiscal year 2023, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report describing a summary of—

(i) the status of the pilot program under subparagraph (A);

(ii) meetings and other activities of the committees established under that subparagraph; and

(iii) the types and volume of assistance and services provided to farmers in counties in which county committees are established under that subparagraph.

(2) INCREASING COMMUNITY COMPOST AND REDUCING FOOD WASTE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Director (referred to in this paragraph as the “Secretary”), shall carry out pilot projects under which the Secretary shall offer to enter into cooperative agreements with local or municipal governments in not fewer than 10 States to develop and test strategies for planning and implementing municipal compost plans and food waste reduction plans.

(B) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES AND PURPOSES OF PILOT PROJECTS.—Under a cooperative agreement entered into under this paragraph, the Secretary shall provide assistance to municipalities, counties, local governments, or city planners, as appropriate, to carry out planning and implementing activities that will—

(i) generate compost;

(ii) increase access to compost for agricultural producers;

(iii) reduce reliance on, and limit the use of, fertilizer;

(iv) improve soil quality;

(v) encourage waste management and permaculture business development;

(vi) increase rainwater absorption;

(vii) reduce municipal food waste; and

(viii) divert food waste from landfills.

(C) EVALUATION AND RANKING OF APPLICATIONS.—

(i) CRITERIA.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish criteria for the selection of pilot projects under this paragraph.

(ii) PRIORITY.—In selecting a pilot project under this paragraph, the Secretary shall give priority to an application for a pilot project that—

(I) anticipates or demonstrates economic benefits;

(II) incorporates plans to make compost easily accessible to agricultural producers, including community gardeners;

(III) integrates other food waste strategies, including food recovery efforts; and

(IV) provides for collaboration with multiple partners.

(D) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—The recipient of assistance for a pilot project under this paragraph shall provide funds, in-kind contributions, or a combination of both from sources other than funds provided through the grant in an amount equal to not less than 25 percent of the amount of the grant.

(E) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall conduct an evaluation of the pilot projects funded under this paragraph to assess different solutions for increasing access to compost and reducing municipal food waste, including an evaluation of—

(i) the amount of Federal funds used for each project; and

(ii) a measurement of the outcomes of each project.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section and the amendments made by this section \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 2019 and each fiscal year thereafter.

SEC. 12303. OFFICE OF ADVOCACY AND OUTREACH.

Section 226B(f)(3)(B) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6934(f)(3)(B)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 12304. TRIBAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

Section 309 of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6921) is amended—

(1) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) TRIBAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term ‘Indian tribe’ has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

“(B) RELEVANT COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ‘relevant Committees of Congress’ means—

“(i) the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives;

“(ii) the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate; and

“(iii) the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate.

“(C) TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.—The term ‘tribal organization’ has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

“(2) ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMITTEE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish an advisory committee, to be known as the ‘Tribal Advisory Committee’ (referred to in this subsection as the ‘Committee’) to provide advice and guidance to the Secretary on matters relating to Tribal and Indian affairs.

“(B) FACILITATION.—The Committee shall facilitate, but not supplant, government-to-government consultation between the Department of Agriculture (referred to in this subsection as the ‘Department’) and Indian tribes.

“(3) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(A) COMPOSITION.—The Council shall be composed of 9 members, of whom—

“(i) 7 shall be appointed by the Secretary;

“(ii) 1 shall be appointed by the chairperson of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate; and

“(iii) 1 shall be appointed by the ranking Member of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate.

“(B) NOMINATIONS.—The Secretary shall accept nominations for members of the Council from—

“(i) an Indian tribe;

“(ii) a tribal organization; and

“(iii) a national or regional organization with expertise in issues relating to the duties of the Committee described in paragraph (4).

“(C) DIVERSITY.—To the maximum extent feasible, the Secretary shall ensure that the members of the Committee represent a diverse set of expertise on issues relating to geographic regions, Indian tribes, and the agricultural industry.

“(D) LIMITATION.—No member of the Committee shall be an officer or employee of the Federal government.

“(E) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT; VACANCIES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Each member of the Committee—

“(I) subject to clause (ii), shall be appointed to a 3-year term; and

“(II) may be reappointed to not more than 3 consecutive terms.

“(ii) INITIAL STAGGERING.—The first 7 appointments made by the Secretary under paragraph (3)(A)(i) shall be for a 2-year term.

“(iii) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Council shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment not more than 90 days after the date on which the position becomes vacant.

“(F) MEETINGS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Council shall meet in person not less than twice each year.

“(ii) OFFICE OF TRIBAL RELATIONS REPRESENTATIVE.—Not fewer than 1 representative from the Office of Tribal Relations of the Department shall be present at each meeting of the Committee.

“(iii) DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR REPRESENTATIVE.—The Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior (or a designee) shall be present at each meeting of the Committee.

“(iv) NONVOTING REPRESENTATIVES.—The individuals described in clauses (ii) and (iii) shall be nonvoting representatives.

“(4) DUTIES OF COMMITTEE.—The Committee shall—

“(A) identify evolving issues of relevance to Indian tribes relating to programs of the Department;

“(B) communicate to the Secretary the issues identified under subparagraph (A);

“(C) submit to the Secretary recommendations for and solutions to—

“(i) the issues identified under subparagraph (A);

“(ii) issues raised at the Tribal, regional, or national level; and

“(iii) issues relating to any Tribal consultation carried out by the Department;

“(D) discuss issues and proposals for changes to the regulations, policies, and procedures of the Department that impact Indian tribes;

“(E) identify priorities and provide advice on appropriate strategies for Tribal consultation on issues at the Tribal, regional, or national level regarding the Department;

“(F) ensure that pertinent issues of the Department are brought to the attention of an Indian tribe in a timely manner so that timely feedback from an Indian tribe can be obtained; and

“(G) identify and propose solutions to any interdepartmental barrier between the Department and other Federal agencies.

“(5) REPORTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not less frequently than once each year, the Committee shall submit to the Secretary and the relevant Committees of Congress a report that describes—

“(i) the activities of the Committee during the previous year; and

“(ii) recommendations for legislative or administrative action for the following year.

“(B) RESPONSE FROM SECRETARY.—Not more than 45 days after the date on which the Secretary receives a report under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall submit a written response to that report to—

“(i) the Committee; and

“(ii) the relevant Committees of Congress.

“(6) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—Members of the Committee shall be compensated at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which the member is engaged in the performance of the duties of the Committee.

“(7) FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT EXEMPTION.—Section 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Committee.”

SEC. 12305. EXPERIENCED SERVICES PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1252 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3851) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “**AGRICULTURE CONSERVATION**”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the first sentence—

(i) by striking “a conservation” and inserting “an”;

(ii) by striking “(in this section referred to as the ‘ACES Program’)” and inserting “(referred to in this section as the ‘program’)”; and

(iii) by striking “provide technical” and inserting the following: “provide—

“(1) technical”; and

(B) in paragraph (1) (as so designated)—

(i) by striking “Secretary. Such technical services may include” and inserting “Secretary, including”;

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) technical, professional, and administrative services to support the research, education, and economics mission area of the Department of Agriculture (including the Agricultural Research Service, the Economic Research Service, the National Agricultural Library, the National Agricultural Statistics Service, the Office of the Chief Scientist, and the National Institute of Food and Agriculture), including—

“(A) supporting agricultural research and information;

“(B) advancing scientific knowledge relating to agriculture;

“(C) enhancing access to agricultural information;

“(D) providing statistical information and research results to farmers, ranchers, agribusiness, and public officials; and

“(E) assisting research, education, and extension programs in land-grant colleges and universities (as defined in section 1404 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103)).”

(3) by striking “ACES” each place it appears;

(4) by striking “technical services” each place it appears (other than in subsection (a)) and inserting “technical, professional, or administrative services, as applicable,”; and

(5) in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) by striking the paragraph heading and inserting “**CONSERVATION TECHNICAL SERVICES**.”; and

(B) by inserting “with respect to subsection (a)(1),” before “the Secretary”.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 is amended by moving section 1252 (16 U.S.C. 3851) (as amended by subsection (a)) and section 1253 (as added by section 2409) to appear after section 1251 (as added by section 2429).

SEC. 12306. YOUTH OUTREACH AND BEGINNING FARMER COORDINATION.

Subtitle D of title VII of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (as amended by section 12301(a)(1)) is amended by inserting after section 7404 (7 U.S.C. 3101 note; Public Law 107-171) the following:

“SEC. 7405. YOUTH OUTREACH AND BEGINNING FARMER COORDINATION.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) BEGINNING FARMER OR RANCHER.—The term ‘beginning farmer or rancher’ means a person that—

“(A)(i) has not operated a farm or ranch; or

“(ii) has operated a farm or ranch for not more than 10 years; and

“(B) meets such other criteria as the Secretary may establish.

“(2) NATIONAL COORDINATOR.—The term ‘National Coordinator’ means the National Beginning Farmer and Rancher Coordinator established under subsection (b)(1).

“(3) STATE COORDINATOR.—The term ‘State coordinator’ means a State beginning farmer and rancher coordinator designated under subsection (c)(1)(A).

“(4) STATE OFFICE.—The term ‘State office’ means—

“(A) a State office of—

“(i) the Farm Service Agency;

“(ii) the Natural Resources Conservation Service;

“(iii) the Rural Business-Cooperative Service; or

“(iv) the Rural Utilities Service; or

“(B) a regional office of the Risk Management Agency.

“(b) NATIONAL BEGINNING FARMER AND RANCHER COORDINATOR.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish in the Department the position of National Beginning Farmer and Rancher Coordinator.

“(2) DUTIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The National Coordinator shall—

“(i) advise the Secretary and coordinate activities of the Department on programs, policies, and issues relating to beginning farmers and ranchers; and

“(ii) in consultation with the applicable State food and agriculture council, determine whether to approve a plan submitted by a State coordinator under subsection (c)(3)(B).

“(B) DISCRETIONARY DUTIES.—Additional duties of the National Coordinator may include—

“(i) developing and implementing new strategies—

“(I) for outreach to beginning farmers and ranchers; and

“(II) to assist beginning farmers and ranchers with connecting to owners or operators that have ended, or expect to end within 5 years, actively owning or operating a farm or ranch; and

“(ii) facilitating interagency and interdepartmental collaboration on issues relating to beginning farmers and ranchers.

“(3) REPORTS.—Not less frequently than once each year, the National Coordinator shall distribute within the Department and make publicly available a report describing the status of steps taken to carry out the duties described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2).

“(4) CONTRACTS AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—In carrying out the duties under

paragraph (2), the National Coordinator may enter into a contract or cooperative agreement with an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001)), cooperative extension services (as defined in section 1404 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103)), or a nonprofit organization—

“(A) to conduct research on the profitability of new farms in operation for not less than 5 years in a region;

“(B) to develop educational materials;

“(C) to conduct workshops, courses, training, or certified vocational training; or

“(D) to conduct mentoring activities.

“(c) STATE BEGINNING FARMER AND RANCHER COORDINATORS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) DESIGNATION.—The National Coordinator, in consultation with State food and agriculture councils and directors of State offices, shall designate in each State a State beginning farmer and rancher coordinator from among employees of State offices.

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—To be designated as a State coordinator, an employee shall—

“(i) be familiar with issues relating to beginning farmers and ranchers; and

“(ii) have the ability to interface with other Federal departments and agencies.

“(2) TRAINING.—The Secretary shall develop a training plan to provide to each State coordinator knowledge of programs and services available from the Department for beginning farmers and ranchers, taking into consideration the needs of all production types and sizes of agricultural operations.

“(3) DUTIES.—A State coordinator shall—

“(A) coordinate technical assistance at the State level to assist beginning farmers and ranchers in accessing programs of the Department;

“(B) develop and submit to the National Coordinator for approval under subsection (b)(2)(A)(ii) a State plan to improve the coordination, delivery, and efficacy of programs of the Department to beginning farmers and ranchers, taking into consideration the needs of all types of production methods and sizes of agricultural operation, at each county and area office in the State;

“(C) oversee implementation of an approved State plan described in subparagraph (B);

“(D) work with outreach coordinators in the State offices to ensure appropriate information about technical assistance is available at outreach events and activities; and

“(E) coordinate partnerships and joint outreach efforts with other organizations and government agencies serving beginning farmers and ranchers.

“(d) AGRICULTURAL YOUTH COORDINATOR.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish in the Department the position of Agricultural Youth Coordinator.

“(2) DUTIES.—The Agricultural Youth Coordinator shall—

“(A) promote the role of school-based agricultural education and youth-serving agricultural organizations in motivating and preparing young people to pursue careers in the agriculture, food, and natural resources systems;

“(B) coordinate outreach to programs and agencies within the Department—

“(i) to work with schools and youth-serving organizations to develop joint programs and initiatives, such as internships; and

“(ii) to provide resources and input to schools and youth-serving organizations regarding motivating and preparing young people to pursue careers in the agriculture, food, and natural resources systems;

“(C) raise awareness among youth about the importance of agriculture in a diversity of fields and disciplines;

“(D) provide information to persons involved in youth, food, and agriculture organizations about the availability of, and eligibility requirements for, agricultural programs, with particular emphasis on—

“(i) beginning farmer and rancher programs;

“(ii) agriculture education;

“(iii) nutrition education;

“(iv) science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education; and

“(v) other food and agriculture programs for youth;

“(E) serve as a resource for youth involved in food and agriculture applying for participation in agricultural programs;

“(F) conduct outreach to youth agriculture organizations; and

“(G) advocate on behalf of youth involved in food and agriculture and youth organizations in interactions with employees of the Department.

“(3) CONTRACTS AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—For purposes of carrying out the duties described in paragraph (2), the Agricultural Youth Coordinator—

“(A) shall consult with land-grant colleges and universities and cooperative extension services (as those terms are defined in section 1404 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103)); and

“(B) may enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with the research centers of the Agricultural Research Service, institutions of higher education (as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001)), or nonprofit organizations for—

“(i) the development of educational materials;

“(ii) the conduct of workshops, courses, and certified vocational training;

“(iii) the conduct of mentoring activities; or

“(iv) the provision of internship opportunities.”

SEC. 12307. AVAILABILITY OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE PROGRAMS FOR VETERAN FARMERS AND RANCHERS.

(a) DEFINITION OF VETERAN FARMER OR RANCHER.—Paragraph (7) of subsection (a) (as redesignated by section 12301(b)(3)) of section 2501 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) is a veteran (as defined in section 101 of that title) who has first obtained status as a veteran (as so defined) during the most recent 10-year period.”

(b) FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE.—

(1) DEFINITION OF VETERAN FARMER OR RANCHER.—Section 502(b) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1502(b)) (as amended by section 11101) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(14) VETERAN FARMER OR RANCHER.—The term ‘veteran farmer or rancher’ means a farmer or rancher who—

“(A) has served in the Armed Forces (as defined in section 101 of title 38, United States Code); and

“(B)(i) has not operated a farm or ranch;

“(ii) has operated a farm or ranch for not more than 5 years; or

“(iii) is a veteran (as defined in section 101 of that title) who has first obtained status as a veteran (as so defined) during the most recent 5-year period.”

(2) CROP INSURANCE.—Section 508 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(5)(E)—

(i) by striking “The Corporation” and inserting the following:

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation”; and

(ii) in clause (i) (as so designated), by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “, and veteran farmers or ranchers.

“(ii) COORDINATION.—The Corporation shall coordinate with other agencies of the Department that provide programs or services to farmers and ranchers described in clause (i) to make available coverage under the waiver under that clause and to share eligibility information to reduce paperwork and avoid duplication.”;

(B) in subsection (e)(8)—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by inserting “AND VETERAN” after “BEGINNING”; and

(ii) by inserting “or veteran farmer or rancher” after “beginning farmer or rancher” each place it appears; and

(C) in subsection (g)—

(i) in paragraph (2)(B)(iii), in the matter preceding subclause (I), by inserting “or veteran farmer or rancher” after “beginning farmer or rancher” each place it appears; and

(ii) in paragraph (4)(B)(ii)(II), by inserting “and veteran farmers or ranchers” after “beginning farmers or ranchers”.

(3) EDUCATION AND RISK MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE.—Section 524(a)(4) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1524(a)(4)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (D)(ii), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) veteran farmers or ranchers.”

(c) DOWN PAYMENT LOAN PROGRAM.—Section 310E of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1935) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “qualified beginning farmers or ranchers and socially disadvantaged farmers or ranchers” and inserting “eligible farmers or ranchers”; and

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “recipients of the loans” and inserting “farmers or ranchers”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) encourage retiring farmers and ranchers to assist in the sale of their farms and ranches to eligible farmers or ranchers by providing seller financing.”; and

(C) in paragraph (4), by striking “for beginning farmers or ranchers or socially disadvantaged farmers or ranchers” and inserting the following: “for—

“(A) beginning farmers or ranchers;

“(B) socially disadvantaged farmers or ranchers, as defined in section 355(e); or

“(C) veteran farmers or ranchers, as defined in section 2501(a) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(a))”; and

(D) in paragraph (5), by striking “a qualified beginning farmer or rancher or socially disadvantaged farmer or rancher” and inserting “an eligible farmer or rancher”; and

(3) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

“(e) DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE FARMER OR RANCHER.—In this section, the term ‘eligible farmer or rancher’ means—

“(1) a qualified beginning farmer or rancher;

“(2) a socially disadvantaged farmer or rancher, as defined in section 355(e); and

“(3) a veteran farmer or rancher, as defined in section 2501(a) of the Food, Agriculture,

Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(a)).”

(d) INTEREST RATE REDUCTION PROGRAM.—Section 351(e)(2)(B) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1999(e)(2)(B)) is amended—

(1) in the subparagraph heading, by inserting “AND VETERAN” after “BEGINNING”;

(2) in clause (i), by inserting “or veteran farmers and ranchers (as defined in section 2501(a) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(a)))” before the period at the end; and

(3) in clause (ii), by striking “beginning”.

(e) NATIONAL FOOD SAFETY TRAINING, EDUCATION, EXTENSION, OUTREACH, AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—Section 405(c) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7625(c)) is amended by inserting “veteran farmers or ranchers (as defined in section 2501(a) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(a)))” after “socially disadvantaged farmers.”

(f) ADMINISTRATION AND OPERATION OF NON-INSURED CROP ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—Section 196 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7333) is amended—

(1) in subsection (k)(2), by inserting “, or a veteran farmer or rancher (as defined in section 2501(a) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(a)))” before the period at the end; and

(2) in subsection (l), in paragraph (3) (as redesignated by section 1601(7)(C))—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by inserting “VETERAN,” before “AND SOCIALLY”; and

(B) by inserting “and veteran farmers or ranchers (as defined in section 2501(a) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(a)))” before “in exchange”.

(g) FUNDING FOR TRANSITION OPTION FOR CERTAIN FARMERS OR RANCHERS.—Section 1241(a)(1)(B) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841(a)(1)(B)) is amended by striking “beginning farmers or ranchers and socially disadvantaged farmers or ranchers” and inserting “covered farmers or ranchers, as defined in section 1235(f)(1)”.

(h) SUPPLEMENTAL AGRICULTURAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE.—

(1) DEFINITION OF COVERED PRODUCER.—Section 1501(a) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9081(a)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (4) as paragraphs (2) through (5), respectively; and

(B) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(1) COVERED PRODUCER.—The term ‘covered producer’ means an eligible producer on a farm that is—

“(A) as determined by the Secretary—

“(i) a beginning farmer or rancher;

“(ii) a socially disadvantaged farmer or rancher; or

“(iii) a limited resource farmer or rancher; or

“(B) a veteran farmer or rancher, as defined in section 2501(a) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(a)).”

(2) EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE FOR LIVESTOCK, HONEY BEES, AND FARM-RAISED FISH.—Section 1501(d) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9081(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) PAYMENT RATE FOR COVERED PRODUCERS.—In the case of a covered producer that is eligible to receive assistance under this subsection, the Secretary shall provide reimbursement of 90 percent of the cost of losses described in paragraph (1) or (2).”

Subtitle D—Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 Amendments

SEC. 12401. OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS.

(a) ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF AGRICULTURE.—Section 218(a)(1) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6918(a)(1)) is amended by striking “Relations” and inserting “Relations and Intergovernmental Affairs”.

(b) SUCCESSION.—Any official who is serving as the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Congressional Relations on the date of enactment of this Act and who was appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall not be required to be reappointed as a result of the change made to the name of that position under the amendment made by subsection (a).

SEC. 12402. MILITARY VETERANS AGRICULTURAL LIAISON.

Section 219 of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6919) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) establish and periodically update the website described in subsection (d); and

“(6) in carrying out the duties described in paragraphs (1) through (5), consult with and provide technical assistance to any Federal agency, including the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Small Business Administration, and the Department of Labor.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) WEBSITE REQUIRED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The website required under subsection (b)(5) shall include the following:

“(A) Positions identified within the Department of Agriculture that are available to veterans for apprenticeships.

“(B) Apprenticeships, programs of training on the job, and programs of education that are approved for purposes of chapter 36 of title 38, United States Code.

“(C) Employment skills training programs for members of the Armed Forces carried out pursuant to section 1143(e) of title 10, United States Code.

“(D) Information designed to assist businesses, nonprofit entities, educational institutions, and farmers interested in developing apprenticeships, on-the-job training, educational, or entrepreneurial programs for veterans in navigating the process of having a program approved by a State approving agency for purposes of chapter 36 of title 38, United States Code, including—

“(i) contact information for relevant offices in the Department of Defense, Department of Veterans Affairs, Department of Labor, and Small Business Administration;

“(ii) basic requirements for approval by each State approving agency;

“(iii) recommendations with respect to training and coursework to be used during apprenticeships or on-the-job training that will enable a veteran to be eligible for agricultural programs; and

“(iv) examples of successful programs and curriculums that have been approved for purposes of chapter 36 of title 38, United States Code (with consent of the organization and without any personally identifiable information).

“(2) REVIEW OF WEBSITE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this paragraph, and once every 5 years thereafter, the

Secretary shall conduct a study to determine if the website required under subsection (b)(5) is effective in providing veterans the information required under paragraph (1).

“(B) INEFFECTIVE WEBSITE.—If the Secretary determines that the website is not effective under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall—

“(i) notify the agriculture and veterans committees described in subparagraph (C) of that determination; and

“(ii) not earlier than 180 days after the date on which the Secretary provides notice under clause (i), terminate the website.

“(C) AGRICULTURE AND VETERANS COMMITTEES.—The agriculture and veterans committees referred to in subparagraph (B)(i) are—

“(i) the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives;

“(ii) the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate;

“(iii) the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

“(iv) the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate.

“(e) CONSULTATION REQUIRED.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall consult with organizations that serve veterans.

“(f) REPORT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, and annually thereafter, the Military Veterans Agricultural Liaison shall submit a report on beginning farmer training for veterans and agricultural vocational and rehabilitation programs for veterans to—

“(A) the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives;

“(B) the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives;

“(C) the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate; and

“(D) the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate.

“(2) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include—

“(A) a summary of the measures taken to carry out subsections (b) and (c);

“(B) a description of the information provided to veterans under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b);

“(C) recommendations for best informing veterans of the programs described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b);

“(D) a summary of the contracts or cooperative agreements entered into under subsection (c);

“(E) a description of the programs implemented under subsection (c);

“(F) a summary of the employment outreach activities directed to veterans;

“(G) recommendations for how opportunities for veterans in agriculture should be developed or expanded;

“(H) a summary of veteran farm lending data and a summary of shortfalls, if any, identified by the Military Veterans Agricultural Liaison in collecting data with respect to veterans engaged in agriculture; and

“(I) recommendations, if any, on how to improve activities under subsection (b).

“(g) PUBLIC DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, and annually thereafter, the Military Veterans Agricultural Liaison shall make publicly available and share broadly, including by posting on the website of the Department—

“(A) the report of the Military Veterans Agricultural Liaison on beginning farmer training for veterans and agricultural vocational and rehabilitation programs; and

“(B) the information disseminated under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b).

“(2) FURTHER DISSEMINATION.—Not later than the day before the date on which the

Military Veterans Agricultural Liaison makes publicly available the information under paragraph (1), the Military Veterans Agricultural Liaison shall provide that information to the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Small Business Administration, and the Department of Labor.”.

SEC. 12403. CIVIL RIGHTS ANALYSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6911 et seq.) (as amended by section 12302(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 223. CIVIL RIGHTS ANALYSES.

“(a) DEFINITION OF CIVIL RIGHTS ANALYSIS.—In this section, the term ‘civil rights analysis’ means a review to analyze and identify actions, policies, and decisions under documents described in subsection (b) that may have an adverse or disproportionate impact on employees, contractors, or beneficiaries (including participants) of any program or activity of the Department based on the membership of the employees, contractors, or beneficiaries in a group that is protected under Federal law from discrimination in employment, contracting, or provision of a program or activity, as applicable.

“(b) ACTIONS, POLICIES, AND DECISIONS.—Before implementing any of the following action, policy, or decision documents, the Secretary shall conduct a civil rights analysis of the action, policy, or decision that is the subject of the document:

“(1) New, revised, or interim rules and notices to be published in the Federal Register or the Code of Federal Regulations.

“(2) Charters for advisory committees, councils, or boards managed by any agency of the Department on behalf of the Secretary.

“(3) Any regulations of the Department or new or revised agency-specific instructions, procedures, or other guidance published in an agency directives system.

“(4) Reductions-in-force or transfer of function proposals, including reorganization of the Department.

“(5) At the discretion of the Secretary, any other policy, program, or activity documents that have potentially adverse civil rights impacts.

“(c) EXPEDITED REVIEW.—The Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights may grant, on a case-by-case basis, an expedited civil rights analysis if the head of an agency within the Department provides a written justification for the expedited civil rights analysis.

“(d) WAIVER.—On petition by the head of any agency within the Department, the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights may grant, on a case-by-case basis, a waiver of the civil rights analysis if the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights determines that there is no foreseeable adverse or disproportionate impact described in subsection (a) of the proposed action, policy, or decision document described in subsection (b).”.

(b) STUDY; REPORT.—

(1) STUDY.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States (referred to in this section as the “Comptroller General”) shall conduct a study describing—

(A) the effectiveness of the Department of Agriculture in processing and resolving civil rights complaints;

(B) minority participation rates in farm programs, including a comparison of overall farmer and rancher participation with minority farmer and rancher participation by considering particular aspects of the programs of the Department of Agriculture for producers, such as ownership status, program participation, usage of permits, and waivers;

(C) the realignment the civil rights functions of the Department of Agriculture, as outlined in Secretarial Memorandum 1076-023 (March 9, 2018), including an analysis of whether that realignment has any negative implications on the civil rights functions of the Department;

(D) efforts of the Department of Agriculture to identify actions, programs, or activities of the Department of Agriculture that may adversely affect employees, contractors, or beneficiaries (including participants) of the action, program, or activity based on the membership of the employees, contractors, or beneficiaries in a group that is protected under Federal law from discrimination in employment, contracting, or provision of an action, program, or activity, as applicable; and

(E) efforts of the Department of Agriculture to strategically plan actions to decrease discrimination and civil rights complaints within the Department of Agriculture or in the carrying out of the programs and authorities of the Department of Agriculture.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of completion of the study under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall submit a report describing the results of the study to—

(A) the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

SEC. 12404. FARM SERVICE AGENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 226 of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6932) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “CONSOLIDATED FARM” and inserting “FARM”;

(2) in subsection (b), in the subsection heading, by striking “OF CONSOLIDATED FARM SERVICE AGENCY”; and

(3) by striking “Consolidated Farm” each place it appears and inserting “Farm”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 246 of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6962) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c), by striking “Consolidated Farm” each place it appears and inserting “Farm”; and

(B) in subsection (e)(2), by striking “Consolidated Farm” each place it appears and inserting “Farm”.

(2) Section 271(2)(A) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6991(2)(A)) is amended by striking “Consolidated Farm” each place it appears and inserting “Farm”.

(3) Section 275(b) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6995(b)) is amended by striking “Consolidated Farm” each place it appears and inserting “Farm”.

SEC. 12405. UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FOR FARM PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION.

(a) OFFICE OF RISK MANAGEMENT.—Section 226A(d)(1) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6933(d)(1)) is amended by striking “Under Secretary of Agriculture for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services” and inserting “Under Secretary of Agriculture for Farm Production and Conservation”.

(b) MULTIAGENCY TASK FORCE.—Section 242(b)(3) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6952(b)(3)) is amended by striking “Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services” and inserting “Under Secretary of Agriculture for Farm Production and Conservation”.

(c) FOOD AID CONSULTATIVE GROUP.—Section 205(b)(2) of the Food for Peace Act (7

U.S.C. 1725(b)(2)) is amended by striking “Under Secretary of Agriculture for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services” and inserting “Under Secretary of Agriculture for Trade and Foreign Agricultural Affairs”.

(d) INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON MINORITY CAREERS IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS.—Section 625(c)(1)(A) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1131c(c)(1)(A)) is amended by striking “Under Secretary” and all that follows through “designee” and inserting “Under Secretary of Agriculture for Trade and Foreign Agricultural Affairs, or the designee of that Under Secretary”.

SEC. 12406. UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT.

Section 231 of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6941) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “is authorized to” and inserting “shall”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “If the Secretary” and all that follows through “the Under Secretary” and inserting “The Under Secretary of Agriculture for Rural Development”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following: “(g) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—Section 296(b)(9) shall not apply to this section.”.

SEC. 12407. ADMINISTRATOR OF THE RURAL UTILITIES SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 232(b) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6942(b)) (as in effect on the day before the effective date of the amendments made by section 2(a)(2) of the Presidential Appointment Efficiency and Streamlining Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-166; 126 Stat. 1283, 1295)) is amended—

(i) by striking paragraph (2) (relating to succession); and

(ii) by redesignating paragraph (3) (relating to the Executive Schedule) as paragraph (2).

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subparagraph (A) take effect on the effective date described in section 6(a) of the Presidential Appointment Efficiency and Streamlining Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-166; 126 Stat. 1295).

(2) COMPENSATION.—Section 232(b) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6942(b)) (as amended by paragraph (1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) COMPENSATION.—The Administrator of the Rural Utilities Service shall receive basic pay at a rate not to exceed the maximum amount of compensation payable to a member of the Senior Executive Service under subsection (b) of section 5382 of title 5, United States Code, except that the certification requirement under that subsection shall not apply to the compensation of the Director.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture.”.

(2) Section 748 of Public Law 107-76 (7 U.S.C. 918b) is amended by striking “the Administrator of the Rural Utilities Service” and inserting “the Secretary of Agriculture”.

(3) Section 379B(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2008p(a)) is amended by striking “Secretary” and all that follows through “may” and inserting “Secretary may”.

(4) Section 6407(b)(4) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8107a(b)(4)) is amended by striking “Agriculture” and all that follows through “Service” and inserting “Agriculture”.

(5) Section 1004 of the Launching our Communities' Access to Local Television Act of 2000 (47 U.S.C. 1103) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “The Administrator (as defined in section 1005)” and inserting “The Secretary of Agriculture”; and

(B) in subsection (h)(2)(D), by striking “Administrator” each place it appears and inserting “Secretary of Agriculture”.

(6) Section 1005 of the Launching our Communities' Access to Local Television Act of 2000 (47 U.S.C. 1104) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “The Administrator” and all that follows through “shall” and inserting “The Secretary of Agriculture (referred to in this section as the ‘Secretary’) shall”; and

(B) by striking “Administrator” each place it appears and inserting “Secretary”.

SEC. 12408. RURAL HEALTH LIAISON.

Subtitle C of title II of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6941 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 236. RURAL HEALTH LIAISON.

“(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary shall establish in the Department the position of Rural Health Liaison.

“(b) DUTIES.—The Rural Health Liaison shall—

“(1) in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, coordinate the role of the Department with respect to rural health;

“(2) integrate across the Department the strategic planning and activities relating to rural health;

“(3) improve communication relating to rural health within the Department and between Federal agencies;

“(4) advocate on behalf of the health care and relevant infrastructure needs in rural areas;

“(5) provide to stakeholders, potential grant applicants, Federal agencies, State agencies, Indian Tribes, private organizations, and academic institutions relevant data and information, including the eligibility requirements for, and availability and outcomes of, Department programs applicable to the advancement of rural health;

“(6) maintain communication with public health, medical, occupational safety, and telecommunication associations, research entities, and other stakeholders to ensure that the Department is aware of current and upcoming issues relating to rural health;

“(7) consult on programs, pilot projects, research, training, and other affairs relating to rural health at the Department and other Federal agencies;

“(8) provide expertise on rural health to support the activities of the Secretary as Chair of the Interagency Task Force on Agriculture and Rural Prosperity; and

“(9) provide technical assistance and guidance with respect to activities relating to rural health to the outreach, extension, and county offices of the Department.”.

SEC. 12409. HEALTHY FOOD FINANCING INITIATIVE.

Section 243 of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6953) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “and enterprises” after “retailers”;

(2) in subsection (b)(3)(B)(iii), by inserting “and enterprises” after “retailers”; and

(3) in subsection (c)(2)(B)(ii), by inserting “as applicable,” before “to accept”.

SEC. 12410. NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE.

(a) FIELD OFFICES.—Section 246 of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6962) (as amended by section 12404(b)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) FIELD OFFICES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall not close any field office of the Natural Resources Conservation Service unless, not later than 60 days before the date of the closure, the Secretary submits to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a notification of the closure.

“(2) EMPLOYEES.—The Secretary shall not permanently relocate any field-based employees of the Natural Resources Conservation Service or the rural development mission area if doing so would result in a field office of the Natural Resources Conservation Service or the rural development mission area with 2 or fewer employees, unless, not later than 60 days before the date of the permanent relocation, the Secretary submits to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a notification of the permanent relocation.”.

(b) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—Section 246 of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6962) (as amended by subsection (a)) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking paragraph (2);

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (6) as paragraphs (2) through (5), respectively;

(C) in paragraph (4) (as so redesignated), by inserting “; Public Law 101-624” after “note”; and

(D) in paragraph (5) (as so redesignated), by striking “3831-3836” and inserting “3831 et seq.”; and

(2) in subsection (c), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of subsection (b) and the program under subchapter C of chapter 1 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3837-3837f)” and inserting “paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection (b)”.

(c) RELOCATION IN ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 246 of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6962) (as amended by subsection (b)) is—

(A) redesignated as section 228; and

(B) moved so as to appear at the end of subtitle B of title II (7 U.S.C. 6931 et seq.).

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 226 of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6932) (as amended by section 12404(a)) is amended—

(i) in subsection (b)(5), by striking “section 246(b)” and inserting “section 228(b)”; and

(ii) in subsection (g)(2), by striking “section 246(b)” and inserting “section 228(b)”.

(B) Section 271(2)(F) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6991(2)(F)) is amended by striking “section 246(b)” and inserting “section 228(b)”.

SEC. 12411. OFFICE OF THE CHIEF SCIENTIST.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 251(e) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6971(e)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION OFFICE” and inserting “OFFICE OF THE CHIEF SCIENTIST”;

(2) in paragraph (1), by striking “Research, Education, and Extension Office” and inserting “Office of the Chief Scientist”;

(3) in paragraph (2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “Research, Education, and Extension Office” and inserting “Office of the Chief Scientist”;

(4) in paragraph (3)(C), by striking “subparagraph (A) shall not exceed 4 years” and inserting “clauses (i) and (iii) of subparagraph (A) shall be for not less than 3 years”;

(5) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively;

(6) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) ADDITIONAL LEADERSHIP DUTIES.—In addition to selecting the Division Chiefs under paragraph (3), using available personnel authority under title 5, United States Code, the Under Secretary shall select personnel—

“(A) to oversee implementation, training, and compliance with the scientific integrity policy of the Department;

“(B)(i) to integrate strategic program planning and evaluation functions across the programs of the Department; and

“(ii) to help prepare the annual report to Congress on the relevance and adequacy of programs under the jurisdiction of the Under Secretary;

“(C) to assist the Chief Scientist in coordinating the international engagements of the Department with the Department of State and other international agencies and offices of the Federal Government; and

“(D) to oversee other duties as may be required by law or Department policy.”;

(7) in paragraph (5) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “Notwithstanding” and inserting the following:

“(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to fund the costs of Division personnel.

“(ii) ADDITIONAL FUNDING.—In addition to amounts made available under clause (i), notwithstanding”;

(B) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) provides strong staff continuity to the Office of the Chief Scientist.”;

(8) in paragraph (6) (as so redesignated), by striking “Research, Education and Extension Office” and inserting “Office of the Chief Scientist”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 251(f)(5)(B) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6971(f)(5)(B)) is amended by striking “Research, Education and Extension Office” and inserting “Office of the Chief Scientist”.

(2) Section 296(b)(6)(B) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 7014(b)(6)(B)) is amended by striking “Research, Education, and Extension Office” and inserting “Office of the Chief Scientist”.

SEC. 12412. TRADE AND FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS.

The Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 is amended—

(1) by redesignating subtitle J (7 U.S.C. 7011 et seq.) as subtitle K; and

(2) by inserting after subtitle I (7 U.S.C. 7005 et seq.) the following:

“Subtitle J—Trade and Foreign Agricultural Affairs

“SEC. 287. UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FOR TRADE AND FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Department the position of Under Secretary of Agriculture for Trade and Foreign Agricultural Affairs.

“(b) APPOINTMENT.—The Under Secretary of Agriculture for Trade and Foreign Agricultural Affairs shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

“(c) FUNCTIONS.—

“(1) PRINCIPAL FUNCTIONS.—The Secretary shall delegate to the Under Secretary of Agriculture for Trade and Foreign Agricultural Affairs those functions and duties under the

jurisdiction of the Department that are related to trade and foreign agricultural affairs.

“(2) ADDITIONAL FUNCTIONS.—The Under Secretary of Agriculture for Trade and Foreign Agricultural Affairs shall perform such other functions and duties as may be—

- “(A) required by law; or
- “(B) prescribed by the Secretary.”.

SEC. 12413. REPEALS.

(a) DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1994.—The following provisions of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 are repealed:

- (1) Section 211 (7 U.S.C. 6911).
- (2) Section 213 (7 U.S.C. 6913).
- (3) Section 214 (7 U.S.C. 6914).
- (4) Section 217 (7 U.S.C. 6917).
- (5) Section 247 (7 U.S.C. 6963).
- (6) Section 252 (7 U.S.C. 6972).
- (7) Section 295 (7 U.S.C. 7013).

(b) OTHER PROVISION.—Section 3208 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 6935) is repealed.

SEC. 12414. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) OFFICE OF RISK MANAGEMENT.—Section 226A(a) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6933(a)) is amended by striking “Subject to subsection (e), the Secretary” and inserting “The Secretary”.

(b) CORRECTION OF ERROR.—

(1) ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF AGRICULTURE.—Section 218 of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6918) (as in effect on the day before the effective date of the amendments made by section 2(a)(1) of the Presidential Appointment Efficiency and Streamlining Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-166; 126 Stat. 1283, 1295)) is amended by striking “Senate.” in subsection (b) and all that follows through “responsibility for—” in the matter preceding paragraph (1) of subsection (d) and inserting the following: “Senate.”

“(c) DUTIES OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS.—The Secretary may delegate to the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights responsibility for—”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) take effect on the effective date described in section 6(a) of the Presidential Appointment Efficiency and Streamlining Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-166; 126 Stat. 1295).

SEC. 12415. EFFECT OF SUBTITLE.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as provided in sections 12407(a)(1)(B) and 12414(b)(2), this subtitle and the amendments made by this subtitle take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this subtitle or an amendment made by this subtitle affects—

(1) the authority of the Secretary to continue to carry out a function vested in, and performed by, the Secretary as of the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) the authority of an agency, office, officer, or employee of the Department of Agriculture to continue to perform all functions delegated or assigned to the agency, office, officer, or employee as of the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 12416. TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.

Section 296(b) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 7014(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(9) The authority of the Secretary to carry out the amendments made to this title by the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018.”.

Subtitle E—Other Miscellaneous Provisions

SEC. 12501. ACER ACCESS AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

Section 12306(f) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 1632c(f)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 12502. SOUTH CAROLINA INCLUSION IN VIRGINIA/CAROLINA PEANUT PRODUCING REGION.

Section 1308(c)(2)(B)(iii) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 7958(c)(2)(B)(iii)) is amended by striking “Virginia and North Carolina” and inserting “Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina”.

SEC. 12503. PET AND WOMEN SAFETY.

(a) PET INVOLVEMENT IN CRIMES RELATED TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND STALKING.—

(1) INTERSTATE STALKING.—Section 2261A of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A)—

- (i) in clause (ii), by striking “or” at the end; and

- (ii) by inserting after clause (iii) the following:

“(iv) the pet of that person; or”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(A)—

- (i) by inserting after “to a person” the following: “or a pet”; and

- (ii) by striking “or (iii)” and inserting “(iii), or (iv)”.

(2) INTERSTATE VIOLATION OF PROTECTION ORDER.—Section 2262 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

- (i) in paragraph (1), by inserting after “another person” the following: “or the pet of that person”; and

- (ii) in paragraph (2), by inserting after “proximity to, another person” the following “or the pet of that person”; and

- (B) in subsection (b)(5), by inserting after “in any other case,” the following: “including any case in which the offense is committed against a pet.”.

(3) RESTITUTION TO INCLUDE VETERINARY SERVICES.—Section 2264 of title 18, United States Code, is amended in subsection (b)(3)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraph (F) as subparagraph (G);

(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking “and” at the end; and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following:

“(F) veterinary services relating to physical care for the victim’s pet; and”.

(4) PET DEFINED.—Section 2266 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after paragraph (10) the following:

“(11) PET.—The term ‘pet’ means a domesticated animal, such as a dog, cat, bird, rodent, fish, turtle, horse, or other animal that is kept for pleasure rather than for commercial purposes.”.

(b) EMERGENCY AND TRANSITIONAL PET SHELTER AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting in consultation with the Office of the Violence Against Women of the Department of Justice, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall award grants under this subsection to eligible entities to carry out programs to provide the assistance described in paragraph (3) with respect to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking and the pets of such victims.

(2) APPLICATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity seeking a grant under this subsection shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may reasonably require, including—

(i) a description of the activities for which a grant under this subsection is sought;

(ii) such assurances as the Secretary determines to be necessary to ensure compliance by the entity with the requirements of this subsection; and

(iii) a certification that the entity, before engaging with any individual domestic violence victim, will disclose to the victim any mandatory duty of the entity to report instances of abuse and neglect (including instances of abuse and neglect of pets).

(B) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—In addition to the requirements of subparagraph (A), each application submitted by an eligible entity under that subparagraph shall—

(i) not include proposals for any activities that may compromise the safety of a domestic violence victim, including—

(I) background checks of domestic violence victims; or

(II) clinical evaluations to determine the eligibility of such a victim for support services;

(ii) not include proposals that would require mandatory services for victims or that a victim obtain a protective order in order to receive proposed services; and

(iii) reflect the eligible entity’s understanding of the dynamics of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(C) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to require—

(i) domestic violence victims to participate in the criminal justice system in order to receive services; or

(ii) eligible entities receiving a grant under this subsection to breach client confidentiality.

(3) USE OF FUNDS.—Grants awarded under this subsection may only be used for programs that provide—

(A) emergency and transitional shelter and housing assistance for domestic violence victims with pets, including assistance with respect to any construction or operating expenses of newly developed or existing emergency and transitional pet shelter and housing (regardless of whether such shelter and housing is co-located at a victim service provider or within the community);

(B) short-term shelter and housing assistance for domestic violence victims with pets, including assistance with respect to expenses incurred for the temporary shelter, housing, boarding, or fostering of the pets of domestic violence victims and other expenses that are incidental to securing the safety of such a pet during the sheltering, housing, or relocation of such victims;

(C) support services designed to enable a domestic violence victim who is fleeing a situation of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to—

(i) locate and secure—

(I) safe housing with the victim’s pet; or

(II) safe accommodations for the victim’s pet; or

(ii) provide the victim with pet-related services, such as pet transportation, pet care services, and other assistance; or

(D) for the training of relevant stakeholders on—

(i) the link between domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking and the abuse and neglect of pets;

(ii) the needs of domestic violence victims;

(iii) best practices for providing support services to such victims;

(iv) best practices for providing such victims with referrals to victims’ services; and

(v) the importance of confidentiality.

(4) GRANT CONDITIONS.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this subsection shall, as a condition of such receipt, agree—

(A) to be bound by the nondisclosure of confidential information requirements of section 40002(b)(2) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291(b)(2)); and

(B) that the entity shall not condition the receipt of support, housing, or other benefits provided pursuant to this subsection on the participation of domestic violence victims in any or all of the support services offered to such victims through a program carried out by the entity using grant funds.

(5) DURATION OF ASSISTANCE PROVIDED TO VICTIMS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), assistance provided with respect to a pet of a domestic violence victim using grant funds awarded under this subsection shall be provided for a period of not more than 24 months.

(B) EXTENSION.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this subsection may extend the 24-month period referred to in subparagraph (A) for a period of not more than 6 months in the case of a domestic violence victim who—

(i) has made a good faith effort to acquire permanent housing for the victim's pet during that 24-month period; and

(ii) has been unable to acquire such permanent housing within that period.

(6) REPORT TO THE SECRETARY.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which an eligible entity receives a grant under this subsection and each year thereafter, the entity shall submit to the Secretary a report that contains, with respect to assistance provided by the entity to domestic violence victims with pets using grant funds received under this subsection, information on—

(A) the number of domestic violence victims with pets provided such assistance; and

(B) the purpose, amount, type of, and duration of such assistance.

(7) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(A) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than November 1 of each even-numbered fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that contains a compilation of the information contained in the reports submitted under paragraph (6).

(B) AVAILABILITY OF REPORT.—The Secretary shall transmit a copy of the report submitted under subparagraph (A) to—

(i) the Office on Violence Against Women of the Department of Justice;

(ii) the Office of Community Planning and Development of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; and

(iii) the Administration for Children and Families of the Department of Health and Human Services.

(8) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection \$3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.

(B) LIMITATION.—Of the amount made available under subparagraph (A) in any fiscal year, not more than 5 percent may be used for evaluation, monitoring, salaries, and administrative expenses.

(9) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM DEFINED.—The term “domestic violence victim” means a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(B) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term “eligible entity” means—

(i) a State;

(ii) a unit of local government;

(iii) an Indian tribe; or

(iv) any other organization that has a documented history of effective work concerning domestic violence, dating violence,

sexual assault, or stalking (as determined by the Secretary), including—

(I) a domestic violence and sexual assault victim service provider;

(II) a domestic violence and sexual assault coalition;

(III) a community-based and culturally specific organization;

(IV) any other nonprofit, nongovernmental organization; and

(V) any organization that works directly with pets and collaborates with any organization referred to in clauses (i) through (iv), including—

(aa) an animal shelter; and

(bb) an animal welfare organization.

(C) PET.—The term “pet” means a domesticated animal, such as a dog, cat, bird, rodent, fish, turtle, horse, or other animal that is kept for pleasure rather than for commercial purposes.

(D) OTHER TERMS.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, terms used in this section shall have the meaning given such terms in section 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291(a)).

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that States should encourage the inclusion of protections against violent or threatening acts against the pet of a person in domestic violence protection orders.

SEC. 12504. DATA ON CONSERVATION PRACTICES.

Subtitle E of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1247. DATA ON CONSERVATION PRACTICES.

“(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to increase the knowledge of how covered conservation practices or suites of covered conservation practices impact farm and ranch profitability (such as crop yields, soil health, and other risk-reducing factors) by using an appropriate collection, review, and analysis of data.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) COVERED CONSERVATION PRACTICE.—The term ‘covered conservation practice’ means a conservation practice—

“(A) that is approved and supported by the Department; and

“(B) for which the Department has developed 1 or more practice standards.

“(2) DEPARTMENT.—The term ‘Department’ means the Department of Agriculture.

“(3) PRIVACY AND CONFIDENTIALITY REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘privacy and confidentiality requirements’ means all laws applicable to the Department and the agencies of the Department that protect data provided to, or collected by, the agencies of the Department from being disclosed to the public in any manner except as authorized by those laws.

“(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ‘privacy and confidentiality requirements’ includes—

“(i) sections 552 and 552a of title 5, United States Code;

“(ii) section 502(c) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1502(c));

“(iii) section 1770 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 2276);

“(iv) section 1619 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8791); and

“(v) the Confidential Information Protection and Statistical Efficiency Act of 2002 (44 U.S.C. 3501 note; Public Law 107-347).

“(c) DATA COLLECTION, REVIEW, ANALYSIS, AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to applicable privacy and confidentiality requirements, the Secretary shall—

“(A) not less frequently than annually, review and publish a summary of existing research of the Department, institutions of

higher education, and other organizations relating to the impacts of covered conservation practices that relate to crop yields, soil health, risk, and farm and ranch profitability;

“(B) identify current data pertaining to the impacts of covered conservation practices that relate to crop yields, soil health, risk, and farm and ranch profitability collected by the Department, including—

“(i) the Farm Service Agency;

“(ii) the Risk Management Agency;

“(iii) the Natural Resources Conservation Service;

“(iv) the National Agricultural Statistics Service;

“(v) the Economic Research Service; and

“(vi) any other relevant agency, as determined by the Secretary;

“(C) collect additional data specifically pertaining to the impacts of covered conservation practices that relate to crop yields, soil health, risk, and farm and ranch profitability necessary to achieve the purpose described in subsection (a), on the condition that a producer shall not be compelled or required to provide that data;

“(D) ensure that data identified or collected under subparagraph (B) or (C), respectively, are collected in a compatible format at the field- and farm-level;

“(E) improve the interoperability of the data collected by the Department for the purposes of this section;

“(F) in carrying out subparagraph (C), use existing authorities and procedures of the National Agricultural Statistics Service to allow producers to voluntarily provide supplemental data that may be useful in analyzing the impacts of covered conservation practices relating to crop yields, soil health, risk, and farm and ranch profitability using the least burdensome means to collect that data, such as through voluntary producer surveys;

“(G) integrate and analyze the data identified or collected under this subsection to consider the impacts of covered conservation practices relating to crop yields, soil health, risk, and farm and ranch profitability;

“(H) acting through the Administrator of the Risk Management Agency, in coordination with the Administrator of the Farm Service Agency and the Chief of the Natural Resources Conservation Service—

“(i) research and analyze how yield variability and risk are affected by different soil types for major crops;

“(ii) research and analyze how yield variability and risk for different soil types are affected by individual, or combinations of, agricultural management practices, including cover crops, no-till farming, adaptive nitrogen management, skip-row planting, and crop rotation for major crops; and

“(iii) not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, publish the findings of the research under clauses (i) and (ii);

“(I) to the extent practicable, integrate, collate, and link data identified under this subsection with other external data sources that include crop yields, soil health, and conservation practices, ensuring that all privacy and confidentiality requirements are implemented to protect all data subject to the privacy and confidentiality requirements;

“(J) not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section—

“(i) establish a conservation and farm productivity data warehouse that contains the data identified or collected under subparagraph (B) or (C), respectively, in a form authorized under the privacy and confidentiality requirements applicable to each agency of the Department that contributes data to the data warehouse; and

“(ii) allow access to the data warehouse established under clause (i) by an academic institution or researcher, if the academic institution or researcher has complied with all requirements of the National Agricultural Statistics Service under section 1770 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 2276) relating to the sharing of data of the Natural Agricultural Statistics Service; and

“(K) not less frequently than annually, and, if practicable, more frequently than annually, disseminate the results of the research and analysis obtained through carrying out this section that demonstrate the impacts of covered conservation practices on crop yields, soil health, risk, and farm and ranch profitability in an aggregate manner that protects individual producer data and makes the results of the research and analysis easily used and implemented by producers and other stakeholders.

“(2) PROCEDURES TO PROTECT INTEGRITY AND CONFIDENTIALITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Before providing access to any data under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall establish procedures to protect the integrity and confidentiality of any data identified, collected, or warehoused under this section.

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—Procedures under subparagraph (A) shall—

“(i) ensure that any research or analysis published or disseminated by any person with access to the data identified, collected, or warehoused under this section complies with all applicable privacy and confidentiality requirements relating to that data; and

“(ii) limit access to data to only individuals specifically authorized to access the data by the Secretary.

“(3) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary shall carry out paragraph (1) using—

“(A) authorities available to the Secretary under other applicable laws; and

“(B) funds otherwise made available to the Secretary.

“(4) EFFECT.—

“(A) COMBINATION OF DATA.—The combination of data protected from disclosure under the privacy and confidentiality requirements with data covered by lesser protections or no protections in the data warehouse established under paragraph 1(J)(i) shall not modify or otherwise affect the privacy and confidentiality requirements that protect the data.

“(B) PROTECTIONS FROM RELEASE.—Data provided by an agency of the Department under this section shall continue to be covered by the same protections from release as if that data were in the possession of the agency.

“(d) PRODUCER TOOLS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall provide technical assistance, including through internet-based tools, based on the analysis conducted in carrying out this section and other sources of relevant data, to assist producers in improving sustainable production practices that increase yields and enhance environmental outcomes.

“(2) INTERNET-BASED TOOLS.—Internet-based tools described in paragraph (1) shall provide to producers, to the maximum extent practicable—

“(A) confidential data specific to each farm or ranch of the producer; and

“(B) general data relating to the impacts of covered conservation practices on crop yields, soil health, risk, and farm and ranch profitability.

“(e) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this section mandates the submission of information by a producer that is not already required for an-

other purpose under a program of the Department.

“(f) REPORTING.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, and each year thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that includes—

“(1) a summary of the analysis conducted under this section;

“(2) the number and regions of producers that voluntarily submitted information under subparagraphs (C) and (F) of subsection (c)(1);

“(3) a description of any additional or new activities planned to be conducted under this section in the next fiscal year, including—

“(A) research relating to any additional conservation practices;

“(B) any new types of data to be collected;

“(C) any improved or streamlined data collection efforts associated with this section; and

“(D) any new research projects; and

“(4) in the case of the first 2 reports submitted under this subsection, a description of the current status of the implementation of activities under subsection (c).”.

SEC. 12505. MARKETING ORDERS.

Section 8e(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (7 U.S.C. 608e-1(a)), reenacted with amendments by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, is amended by inserting “cherries, pecans,” after “walnuts.”.

SEC. 12506. STUDY ON FOOD WASTE.

(a) DEFINITION OF FOOD WASTE.—In this section, the term “food waste” means food waste that occurs—

(1) on the farm and ranch production level; and

(2) before and after the harvest period.

(b) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to evaluate and determine—

(1) methods of measuring food waste;

(2) standards for the volume of food waste;

(3) factors that create food waste;

(4) the cost and volume of food loss of—

(A) domestic fresh food products; and

(B) imported fresh food products that pass import inspection but do not make it to market in the United States, consistent with article III of the GATT 1994 (as defined in section 2 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501));

(5) the reason for the waste described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (4); and

(6) the potential economic value of the products described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (4) if the products were taken to market; and

(7) measures to ensure that programs contemplated, undertaken, or funded by the Department of Agriculture do not disrupt existing food waste recovery and disposal by commercial, marketing, or business relationships.

(c) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report that describes the results of the study conducted under subsection (b) to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

(d) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of submission of the report under subsection (c), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes—

(1) an estimate of the quantity of food waste during the 1-year period ending on the date of submission of the report under subsection (c); and

(2) the best practices or other recommendations that the Secretary, producers, or other stakeholders may consider to reduce food waste.

SEC. 12507. REPORT ON BUSINESS CENTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 365 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report evaluating each business center established in the Department of Agriculture.

(b) INCLUSIONS.—The report under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an examination of the effectiveness of each business center in carrying out its mission, including any recommendations to improve the operation of and function of any of those business centers; and

(2) an evaluation of—

(A) the impact the business centers have on customer service of the Department of Agriculture;

(B) the impact on the annual budget for agencies the budget offices of which have been relocated to the business center, and the effectiveness of funds used to support the business centers, including an accounting of all discretionary and mandatory funding provided to the business center for conservation and farm services from—

(i) the Natural Resources Conservation Service;

(ii) the Farm Service Agency; and

(iii) the Risk Management Agency;

(C) funding described in subparagraph (B) spent on information technology modernizations;

(D) the impact that the business centers have had on the human resources of the Department of Agriculture, including hiring;

(E) any concerns or problems with the business centers; and

(F) any positive or negative impact that the business centers have had on the functionality of the Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 12508. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MODERNIZATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States (referred to in this section as the “Comptroller General”) shall examine efforts of the Department of Agriculture —

(1) relating to information technology for the business center established by the Secretary for the farm production and conservation activities of the Department of Agriculture; and

(2) to modernize or otherwise improve information technology for—

(A) the Centers of Excellence of the Department of Agriculture; and

(B) other major information technology projects of the Department of Agriculture that have the potential to impact the ability of the Department of Agriculture to serve farmers, ranchers, and families.

(b) REPORTS.—

(1) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate an initial report or a detailed briefing on the efforts examined under subsection (a), including—

(A) a detailed description of each ongoing or planned information technology modernization project and investment in information technology at the Department of Agriculture described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) (referred to in this subsection as a “project or investment”);

(B) the justification of the Secretary for each project or investment;

(C) a description of whether a cost-benefit analysis was completed for each project or investment identifying savings that will be achieved through the completion of the project or investment; and

(D) a description of any concerns about the projects or investments or recommendations for improving the projects or investments.

(2) **UPDATES.**—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall provide to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate regular briefings to give status updates.

(3) **COMPREHENSIVE REPORT.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a comprehensive report that reviews each project or investment, including—

(A) a review of any contract awards or contracting activities;

(B) a description of any problems or inadequacies in the projects and investments; and

(C) any recommendations for improving the projects and investments.

SEC. 12509. REPORT ON PERSONNEL.

For the period of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a biannual report describing the number of staff years and employees of each agency of the Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 12510. REPORT ON ABSENT LANDLORDS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing the effects of absent landlords on the long-term economic health of agricultural production, including the effect of absent landlords on—

- (1) land valuation;
- (2) soil health; and
- (3) the economic stability of rural communities.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The report under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a description of the positive and negative effects of an absent landlord on the land owned by the landlord, including—

(A) the effect of an absent landlord on the long-term value of the land; and

(B) the environmental and economic impact of an absent landlord on the surrounding community; and

(2) recommendations to policymakers concerning how to mitigate those effects when necessary.

SEC. 12511. RESTRICTION ON USE OF CERTAIN POISONS FOR PREDATOR CONTROL.

(a) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this section is to restrict the use of sodium cyanide to kill predatory animals given the risks posed by sodium cyanide to—

- (1) public safety;
- (2) national security;
- (3) the environment; and
- (4) persons and other animals that come into accidental contact with sodium cyanide.

(b) **PROHIBITION.**—The Secretary shall use sodium cyanide in a predator control device described in subsection (c) only in accordance with Wildlife Services Directive Number 2.415 of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, dated February 27, 2018, and the implementation guidelines attached to that Directive.

(c) **PREDATOR CONTROL DEVICE DESCRIBED.**—A predator control device referred to in subsection (b) is—

(1) a dispenser designed to propel sodium cyanide when activated by an animal;

(2) a gas cartridge or other pyrotechnic device designed to emit sodium cyanide fumes; and

(3) any other means of dispensing sodium cyanide, including in the form of capsules, for wildlife management or other animal control purposes.

SEC. 12512. CENTURY FARMS PROGRAM.

The Secretary shall establish a program under which the Secretary recognizes any farm that—

(1) a State department of agriculture or similar statewide agricultural organization recognizes as a Century Farm; or

(2)(A) is defined as a farm or ranch under section 4284.902 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act);

(B) has been in continuous operation for at least 100 years; and

(C) has been owned by the same family for at least 100 consecutive years, as verified through deeds, wills, abstracts, tax statements, or other similar legal documents considered appropriate by the Secretary.

SEC. 12513. REPORT ON THE IMPORTATION OF LIVE DOGS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report on the importation of live dogs into the United States.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The Secretaries described in subsection (a) shall provide relevant data to complete the report submitted under subsection (a), which shall include, with respect to the importation of live dogs into the United States:

(1) An estimate of the number of live dogs imported annually, excluding personal pets.

(2) An estimate of the number of live dogs imported for resale annually.

(3) An estimate of the number of dogs during the period covered by the report for which a request for the importation of live dogs for resale was denied because the proposed importation failed to meet the requirements of section 18 of the Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. 2148).

(4) Any recommendations of the Secretary for any modifications to Federal law relating to the importation of live dogs for resale that the Secretary determines to be necessary to meet the requirements of section 18 of the Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. 2148).

SEC. 12514. ESTABLISHMENT OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “tribally designated housing entity” has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4103).

(b) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall establish a technical assistance program to improve access by Tribal entities to rural development programs funded by the Department of Agriculture through available cooperative agreement authorities of the Secretary.

(c) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.**—The technical assistance program established under subsection (b) shall address the unique challenge of Tribal governments, Tribal producers, Tribal businesses, Tribal business entities, and tribally designated housing entities in accessing Department of Agriculture-supported rural infrastructure, rural cooperative development, rural business and indus-

try, rural housing, and other rural development activities.

SEC. 12515. PROMISE ZONES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In this section, the term “Tribal Promise Zone” means an area that—

(1) is nominated by 1 or more Indian tribes (as defined in section 4(13) of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4103(13))) for designation as a Tribal Promise Zone (in this section referred to as a “nominated zone”);

(2) has a continuous boundary; and

(3) the Secretary designates as a Tribal Promise Zone, after consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Education, the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Transportation, and other agencies as appropriate.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION AND NUMBER OF DESIGNATIONS.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall nominate a minimum number of nominated zones, as determined by the Secretary in consultation with Indian tribes, to be designated as Tribal Promise Zones.

(c) **PERIOD OF DESIGNATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall designate nominated zones as Tribal Promise Zones before January 1, 2020.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATES OF DESIGNATIONS.**—The designation of any Tribal Promise Zone shall take effect—

(A) for purposes of priority consideration in Federal grant programs and initiatives (other than this section), upon execution of the Tribal Promise Zone agreement with the Secretary; and

(B) for purposes of this section, on January 1 of the first calendar year beginning after the date of the execution of the Tribal Promise Zone agreement.

(3) **TERMINATION OF DESIGNATIONS.**—The designation of any Tribal Promise Zone shall end on the earlier of—

(A)(i) with respect to a Tribal Promise Zone not described in paragraph (4), the end of the 10-year period beginning on the date that such designation takes effect; or

(ii) with respect to a Tribal Promise Zone described in paragraph (4), the end of the 10-year period beginning on the date the area was designated as a Tribal Promise Zone before the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(B) the date of the revocation of such designation.

(4) **APPLICATION TO CERTAIN ZONES ALREADY DESIGNATED.**—In the case of any area designated as a Tribal Promise Zone by the Secretary before the date of the enactment of this Act, such area shall be deemed a Tribal Promise Zone designated under this section (notwithstanding whether any such designation has been revoked before the date of the enactment of this Act) and shall reduce the number of Tribal Promise Zones remaining to be designated under paragraph (1).

(d) **LIMITATIONS ON DESIGNATIONS.**—No area may be designated under this section unless—

(1) the entities nominating the area have the authority to nominate the area of designation under this section;

(2) such entities provide written assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that the competitiveness plan described in the application under subsection (e) for such area will be implemented and that such entities will provide the Secretary with such data regarding the economic conditions of the area (before, during, and after the area’s period of designation as a Tribal Promise Zone) as such Secretary may require; and

(3) the Secretary determines that any information furnished is reasonably accurate.

(e) APPLICATION.—No area may be designated under this section unless the application for such designation—

(1) demonstrates that the nominated zone satisfies the eligibility criteria described in subsection (a); and

(2) includes a competitiveness plan that—

(A) addresses the need of the nominated zone to attract investment and jobs and improve educational opportunities;

(B) leverages the nominated zone's economic strengths and outlines targeted investments to develop competitive advantages;

(C) demonstrates collaboration across a wide range of stakeholders;

(D) outlines a strategy that connects the nominated zone to drivers of regional economic growth; and

(E) proposes a strategy for focusing on increased access to high quality affordable housing and improved public safety.

(f) SELECTION CRITERIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—From among the nominated zones eligible for designation under this section, the Secretary shall designate Tribal Promise Zones on the basis of—

(A) the effectiveness of the competitiveness plan submitted under subsection (e) and the assurances made under subsection (d);

(B) unemployment rates, poverty rates, vacancy rates, crime rates, and such other factors as the Secretary may identify, including household income, labor force participation, and educational attainment; and

(C) other criteria as determined by the Secretary.

(2) MINIMAL STANDARDS.—The Secretary may set minimal standards for the levels of unemployment and poverty that must be satisfied for designation as a Tribal Promise Zone.

(g) COMPETITIVE ENHANCEMENT IN FEDERAL AWARDS TO TRIBAL PROMISE ZONES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each Federal grant program, technical assistance, and capacity-building competitive funding application opportunity, made available under any appropriations law in effect for a year in which the designation of a Tribal Promise Zones is in effect, shall provide preference points or priority special consideration to each application which advances the specific objectives of a Tribal Promise Zones competitiveness plan described in subsection (e) if the project or activity to be funded includes specific and definable services or benefits that will be delivered to residents of a Tribal Economic Opportunity Area.

SEC. 12516. PRECISION AGRICULTURE CONNECTIVITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Precision agriculture technologies and practices allow farmers to significantly increase crop yields, eliminate overlap in operations, and reduce inputs such as seed, fertilizer, pesticides, water, and fuel.

(2) These technologies allow farmers to collect data in real time about their fields, automate field management, and maximize resources.

(3) Studies estimate that precision agriculture technologies can reduce agricultural operation costs by up to 25 dollars per acre and increase farm yields by up to 70 percent by 2050.

(4) The critical cost savings and productivity benefits of precision agriculture cannot be realized without the availability of reliable broadband Internet access service delivered to the agricultural land of the United States.

(5) The deployment of broadband Internet access service to unserved agricultural land

is critical to the United States economy and to the continued leadership of the United States in global food production.

(6) Despite the growing demand for broadband Internet access service on agricultural land, broadband Internet access service is not consistently available where needed for agricultural operations.

(7) The Federal Communications Commission has an important role to play in the deployment of broadband Internet access service on unserved agricultural land to promote precision agriculture.

(b) TASK FORCE.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

(A) the term “broadband Internet access service” has the meaning given the term in section 8.2 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation;

(B) the term “Commission” means the Federal Communications Commission;

(C) the term “Department” means the Department of Agriculture; and

(D) the term “Task Force” means the Task Force for Reviewing the Connectivity and Technology Needs of Precision Agriculture in the United States established under paragraph (2).

(2) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall establish the Task Force for Reviewing the Connectivity and Technology Needs of Precision Agriculture in the United States.

(3) DUTIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Task Force shall consult with the Secretary, or a designee of the Secretary, and collaborate with public and private stakeholders in the agriculture and technology fields to—

(i) identify and measure current gaps in the availability of broadband Internet access service on agricultural land;

(ii) develop policy recommendations to promote the rapid, expanded deployment of broadband Internet access service on unserved agricultural land, with a goal of achieving reliable capabilities on 95 percent of agricultural land in the United States by 2025;

(iii) promote effective policy and regulatory solutions that encourage the adoption of broadband Internet access service on farms and ranches and promote precision agriculture;

(iv) recommend specific new rules or amendments to existing rules of the Commission that the Commission should issue to achieve the goals and purposes of the policy recommendations described in clause (ii);

(v) recommend specific steps that the Commission should take to obtain reliable and standardized data measurements of the availability of broadband Internet access service as may be necessary to target funding support, from future programs of the Commission dedicated to the deployment of broadband Internet access service, to unserved agricultural land in need of broadband Internet access service; and

(vi) recommend specific steps that the Commission should consider to ensure that the expertise of the Secretary and available farm data are reflected in future programs of the Commission dedicated to the infrastructure deployment of broadband Internet access service and to direct available funding to unserved agricultural land where needed.

(B) NO DUPLICATE DATA REPORTING.—In performing the duties of the Commission under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall ensure that no provider of broadband Internet access service is required to report data to the Commission that is, on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, required to be reported by the provider of broadband Internet access service.

(C) HOLD HARMLESS.—The Task Force and the Commission shall not interpret the phrase “future programs of the Commission”, as used in clauses (v) and (vi) of subparagraph (A), to include the universal service programs of the Commission established under section 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 254).

(D) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary, or a designee of the Secretary, shall explain and make available to the Task Force the expertise, data mapping information, and resources of the Department that the Department uses to identify cropland, ranchland, and other areas with agricultural operations that may be helpful in developing the recommendations required under subparagraph (A).

(E) LIST OF AVAILABLE FEDERAL PROGRAMS AND RESOURCES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the Commission shall jointly submit to the Task Force a list of all Federal programs or resources available for the expansion of broadband Internet access service on unserved agricultural land to assist the Task Force in carrying out the duties of the Task Force.

(4) MEMBERSHIP.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Task Force shall be—

(i) composed of not more than 15 voting members who shall—

(I) be selected by the Chairman of the Commission; and

(II) include—

(aa) agricultural producers representing diverse geographic regions and farm sizes, including owners and operators of farms of less than 100 acres;

(bb) an agricultural producer representing tribal agriculture;

(cc) Internet service providers, including regional or rural fixed and mobile broadband Internet access service providers and telecommunications infrastructure providers;

(dd) representatives from the electric cooperative industry;

(ee) representatives from the satellite industry;

(ff) representatives from precision agriculture equipment manufacturers, including drone manufacturers, manufacturers of autonomous agricultural machinery, and manufacturers of farming robotics technologies; and

(gg) representatives from State and local governments; and

(ii) fairly balanced in terms of technologies, points of view, and fields represented on the Task Force.

(B) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT; VACANCIES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—A member of the Committee appointed under subparagraph (A)(i) shall serve for a single term of 2 years.

(ii) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Task Force—

(I) shall not affect the powers of the Task Force; and

(II) shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(C) EX-OFFICIO MEMBER.—The Secretary, or a designee of the Secretary, shall serve as an ex-officio, nonvoting member of the Task Force.

(5) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the Commission establishes the Task Force, and annually thereafter, the Task Force shall submit to the Chairman of the Commission a report, which shall be made public not later than 30 days after the date on which the Chairman receives the report, that details—

(A) the status of fixed and mobile broadband Internet access service coverage of agricultural land;

(B) the projected future connectivity needs of agricultural operations, farmers, and ranchers; and

(C) the steps being taken to accurately measure the availability of broadband Internet access service on agricultural land and the limitations of current, as of the date of the report, measurement processes.

(6) **TERMINATION.**—The Commission shall renew the Task Force every 2 years until the Task Force terminates on January 1, 2025.

SEC. 12517. IMPROVED SOIL MOISTURE AND PRECIPITATION MONITORING.

(a) **IMPROVED SOIL MOISTURE MONITORING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop and implement a strategy to improve the accuracy of the United States Drought Monitor through increased geographic resolution of rural in-situ soil moisture profile observation or other soil moisture profile measuring devices, as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(2) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In implementing the strategy required by paragraph (1), the Secretary shall prioritize adding soil moisture profile stations in States described in subparagraph (B) so that the number of drought monitoring stations is increased to an average of 1 soil moisture profile station per 1,250 square miles in each State described in subparagraph (B) or by 50 stations in each State described in subparagraph (B), whichever is less.

(B) **STATES DESCRIBED.**—A State described in this paragraph is a State that has experienced D3 (extreme drought) or D4 (exceptional drought) (as defined by the United States Drought Monitor) within any 6 months during the period beginning on January 1, 2016, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) **COORDINATION.**—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary may coordinate with other Federal agencies, State and local governments, and non-Federal entities that collaborate with the United States Drought Monitor.

(4) **COST-EFFECTIVENESS.**—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall consider cost-effective solutions to maximize the efficiency and accuracy of the United States Drought Monitor.

(5) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023 to carry out this subsection.

(b) **STANDARDS FOR INTEGRATING CITIZEN SCIENCE INTO DROUGHT MODELS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(A) develop a set of standards for integration of data derived from citizen science (as defined in the Crowdsourcing and Citizen Science Act (15 U.S.C. 3724)) into the United States Drought Monitor models, including data relating to—

(i) location and spacing of monitoring stations;

(ii) data quality standards;

(iii) incorporation of data from commercially available weather stations;

(iv) standardized procedures for autonomous integration of data;

(v) streamlining of data entry methods; and

(vi) reasonable metadata fields; and

(B) develop a set of consistent standards for soil moisture data collection based on equipment that is readily available, including standards relating to—

(i) acceptable error ranges;

(ii) sensor installation procedures;

(iii) manufacturers of soil moisture probes;

(iv) calibration methodology;

(v) metadata fields; and

(vi) soil descriptions.

(2) **INCLUSION OF DATA FROM COOPERATIVE OBSERVER PROGRAM.**—For purposes of paragraph (1)(A), data derived from citizen science includes data from the Cooperative Observer Program of the National Weather Service.

(c) **REQUIREMENT FOR ELEMENTS OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE TO USE THE SAME MONITORING DATA.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—To be consistent with assistance provided under the livestock forage disaster program established under section 1501(c) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9081(c)) and a policy or plan of insurance established under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) for producers of livestock commodities the source of feedstock of which is pasture, rangeland, and forage, and the annual establishment of grazing rates, as applicable, on Forest Service grasslands and other applicable land, the Secretary shall use the United States Drought Monitor, in-situ soil moisture profile monitoring stations described in subsection (a), data from the Cooperative Observer Program described in subsection (b)(2), and any other applicable data to determine and establish grazing loss assistance and grazing rates, as applicable.

(2) **COORDINATION.**—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary may coordinate with—

(A) other Federal agencies, State and local governments, and non-Federal entities that collaborate with the United States Drought Monitor; and

(B) other Federal and non-Federal entities involved in collecting data on precipitation and soil monitoring.

(3) **COST-EFFECTIVENESS.**—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall consider cost-effective solutions to maximize the efficiency and accuracy of the data utilized to determine eligibility for assistance under the programs specified in paragraph (1).

SEC. 12518. STUDY OF MARKETPLACE FRAUD OF UNIQUE TRADITIONAL FOODS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on—

(1) the market impact of traditional foods, Tribally produced products, and products that use traditional foods;

(2) fraudulent foods that mimic Tribal foods that are available in the commercial marketplace as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(3) the means by which authentic traditional foods and Tribally produced foods might be protected against the impact of fraudulent foods in the marketplace.

(b) **INCLUSIONS.**—The study conducted under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a consideration of the circumstances under which fraudulent foods in the marketplace occur; and

(2) an analysis of Federal laws administered by the Secretary, intellectual property laws, and trademark laws that might offer protections against fraudulent foods in a the context of Tribal foods.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of completion of the study, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report describing the results of the study under this section to—

(1) the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives;

(2) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives;

(3) the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate;

(4) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

(5) the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate.

SEC. 12519. DAIRY BUSINESS INNOVATION INITIATIVES.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **DAIRY BUSINESS.**—The term “dairy business” means a business that develops, produces, markets, or distributes dairy products.

(2) **INITIATIVE.**—The term “initiative” means a dairy product and business innovation initiative established under subsection (b).

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service, shall establish not less than 3 regionally located dairy product and business innovation initiatives for the purposes of—

(1) encouraging the use of regional milk production;

(2) creating higher-value uses for dairy products;

(3) promoting business development that diversifies farmer income through processing and marketing innovation;

(4) diversifying dairy product markets to reduce risk; and

(5) leveraging Federal resources by encouraging entities that host initiatives and partners of those entities to provide matching funds.

(c) **SELECTION OF INITIATIVES.**—An initiative—

(1) shall be located in a region with a history of dairy farming;

(2) shall be positioned to draw on existing dairy industry resources, including research capacity, academic and industry expertise, a density of dairy farms or farmland suitable for dairying, and dairy businesses;

(3) may serve a certain product niche, such as artisanal cheese, or serve dairy businesses with dairy products derived from a specific type of dairy animal, including dairy products made from cow milk, sheep milk, and goat milk; and

(4) shall serve dairy businesses in other regions.

(d) **ENTITIES ELIGIBLE TO HOST INITIATIVE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Any of the following entities may submit to the Secretary an application to host an initiative:

(A) A State department of agriculture or other State entity.

(B) A nonprofit entity with capacity to provide consultation, expertise, and grant distribution and tracking.

(C) An institution of higher education.

(D) A cooperative extension service.

(2) **PARTNERS.**—An entity described in paragraph (1) may establish partners prior to the submission of the application under that paragraph, or add partners in consultation with the Secretary, which may include organizations or entities with expertise or experience in dairy, including the marketing, research, education, or promotion of dairy.

(e) **ACTIVITIES OF INITIATIVES.**—

(1) **DIRECT ASSISTANCE TO DAIRY BUSINESSES.**—An initiative shall provide non-monetary assistance to dairy businesses in accordance with the following:

(A) **PROVISION OF DIRECT ASSISTANCE.**—Assistance may be provided directly to dairy businesses in a private consultation or through widely available distribution, and may be provided—

(i) directly by the entity that hosts the initiative under subsection (d)(1);

(ii) through contracting with industry experts;

(iii) through the provision of technical assistance, such as informational websites, webinars, conferences, trainings, plant tours, and field days; and

(iv) through research institutions, including cooperative extension services.

(B) **TYPES OF ASSISTANCE.**—Eligible forms of assistance include—

(i) business consulting, including business plan development for processed dairy products;

(ii) accounting and financial literacy training;

(iii) market evaluation;

(iv) strategic planning assistance;

(v) product innovation, including relating to value-added products;

(vi) marketing and branding assistance, including market messaging, consumer assessments, and evaluation of regional, national, and international markets;

(vii) innovation in emerging market opportunities, including agritourism, and marketing communication methods;

(viii) packaging, distribution, and supply chain innovation;

(ix) dairy product production training, including in new, rare, or innovative techniques;

(x) innovation in byproduct reprocessing and use maximization; and

(xi) other non-monetary assistance, as determined by the Secretary.

(2) GRANTS TO DAIRY BUSINESSES.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—An initiative shall provide grants for new and existing dairy businesses for the purposes of—

(i) modernization, specialization, and grazing transition on dairy farms;

(ii) value chain and commodity innovation and facility and process updates for dairy processors; and

(iii) product development, packaging, and marketing of dairy products.

(B) **GRANTS.**—An initiative shall provide grants under subparagraph (A)—

(i) on a competitive basis, with opportunities to apply for funding available on a rolling basis; and

(ii) to an entity that receives assistance under paragraph (1) to advance the business activities recommended as a result of that assistance.

(C) **CONSULTATION.**—An entity that hosts an initiative shall consult with the Secretary and the Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service in carrying out the initiative.

(D) CONFLICT OF INTEREST.—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall establish guidelines and procedures to prevent any conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest by an initiative (including a partner of the initiative) during the grant selection process under subparagraph (B)(i).

(ii) **PENALTY.**—The Secretary may suspend or terminate an initiative if the initiative or a partner of the initiative is found to be in violation of the guidelines and procedures established under clause (i).

(f) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Of the funds made available to carry out this section, the Secretary shall provide not less than 3 awards to eligible entities described in subsection (d)(1) for the purposes of carrying out the activities under subsection (e).

(2) **MULTIYEAR FUNDING.**—The Secretary is encouraged—

(A) to award funds under paragraph (1) in multiyear funding allocations; and

(B) to require frequent reporting, as appropriate.

(3) USE OF FUNDS.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The funds awarded to an eligible entity under paragraph (1) may be used—

(i) for program administration of an initiative, including staff costs; and

(ii) for workshops or other informational sessions that—

(I) directly benefit dairy businesses and entrepreneurs; or

(II) enhance the capacity of providers of technical assistance to dairy businesses.

(B) **ALLOCATION.**—Not less than 50 percent of the funds made available under subsection (h) shall be allocated to grants under subsection (e)(2).

(4) **PRIORITY.**—An entity hosting an initiative shall give priority to the provision of direct assistance under subsection (e)(1) and grants under subsection (e)(2) to—

(A) dairy farms and dairy businesses with limited access to other forms of assistance;

(B) employee-owned dairy businesses;

(C) cooperatives;

(D) dairy businesses that establish contracting mechanisms that return profits to farmers who supply their milk;

(E) dairy businesses that, in addition to salary and wage compensation, return profits to employees; and

(F) dairy businesses that seek to create dairy products that add substantial value in processing or marketing, such as specialty cheeses.

(5) **REQUIREMENT.**—In the case of direct assistance under subsection (e)(1) or a grant under subsection (e)(2) that is provided to a specific dairy business and does not benefit the general public, as determined by the Secretary, the assistance or grant shall exclusively be available to dairy businesses owned in the United States.

(6) **SUPPLEMENTATION.**—To the extent practicable, the Secretary shall ensure that funds provided to an initiative supplement, and do not duplicate or replace, existing dairy product research, development, and promotion activities.

(g) REPORTING.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing the implementation of this section.

(2) **INNOVATION REPORTS.**—The Secretary, in coordination with the Chief Economist, shall publish an annual report on the impact of initiatives carried out under this section on—

(A) innovation in dairy products;

(B) product development under the program under this section;

(C) growth areas for dairy product development; and

(D) barriers inhibiting majority member-owned domestic dairy firms from—

(i) updating capacity;

(ii) performing competitively in the marketplace; and

(iii) returning gains to members or reinvesting the gains in ways that benefit the long-term financial stability of the majority member-owned domestic dairy firm and the members of that firm.

(h) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$20,000,000 for each fiscal year.

Subtitle F—General Provisions

SEC. 12601. EXPEDITED EXPORTATION OF CERTAIN SPECIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (referred to in this section as the “Director”) shall issue a proposed rule to amend section 14.92 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, to establish expedited procedures relating to the export permission requirements of section 9(d)(1) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1538(d)(1)) for fish or wildlife described in subsection (c).

(b) EXEMPTIONS.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—As part of the rulemaking under subsection (a), subject to paragraph (2), the Director may provide an exemption from the requirement to procure—

(A) permission under section 9(d)(1) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1538(d)(1)); or

(B) an export license under subpart I of part 14 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations.

(2) **LIMITATIONS.**—The Director shall not provide an exemption under paragraph (1)—

(A) unless the Director determines that the exemption will not have a negative impact on the conservation of the species that is the subject of the exemption; or

(B) to an entity that has been convicted of a violation of a Federal law relating to the importation, transportation, or exportation of wildlife during a period of not less than 5 years ending on the date on which the entity applies for exemption under paragraph (1).

(c) **COVERED FISH OR WILDLIFE.**—The fish or wildlife referred to in subsection (a) are the species commonly known as sea urchins and sea cucumbers (including any product of a sea urchin or sea cucumber) that—

(1) do not require a permit under part 16, 17, or 23 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations;

(2) are harvested in waters under the jurisdiction of the United States; and

(3) are exported for purposes of human or animal consumption.

SEC. 12602. BAITING OF MIGRATORY GAME BIRDS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) **NORMAL AGRICULTURAL OPERATION.**—The term “normal agricultural operation” has the meaning given the term in section 20.11 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act).

(2) **POST-DISASTER FLOODING.**—The term “post-disaster flooding” means the destruction of a crop through flooding in accordance with practices required by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for agricultural producers to obtain crop insurance under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) on land on which a crop was not harvestable due to a natural disaster (including any hurricane, storm, tornado, flood, high water, wind-driven water, tidal wave, tsunami, earthquake, volcanic eruption, landslide, mudslide, drought, fire, snowstorm, or other catastrophe that is declared a major disaster by the President in accordance with section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170)) in the crop year—

(A) in which the natural disaster occurred; or

(B) immediately preceding the crop year in which the natural disaster occurred.

(3) **RICE RATOONING.**—The term “rice ratooning” means the agricultural practice of harvesting rice by cutting the majority of the aboveground portion of the rice plant but leaving the roots and growing shoot apices intact to allow the plant to recover and produce a second crop yield.

(b) **REGULATIONS TO EXCLUDE RICE RATOONING AND POST-DISASTER FLOODING.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall revise part 20 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, to clarify that rice ratooning and post-disaster flooding, when carried out as part of a normal agricultural operation, do not constitute baiting.

(c) **REPORTS.**—Not less frequently than once each year, the Secretary of Agriculture shall—

(1) submit to the Secretary of the Interior a report that describes any changes to normal agricultural operations across the range of crops grown by agricultural producers in each region of the United States in which the official recommendations described in section 20.11(h) of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act), are provided to agricultural producers; and

(2) in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and after seeking input from the heads of State departments of fish and wildlife or the Regional Migratory Bird Flyway Councils of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, publicly post a report on the impact that rice ratooning and post-disaster flooding have on the behavior of migratory game birds that are hunted in the area in which rice ratooning and post-disaster flooding, respectively, have occurred.

SEC. 12603. PIMA AGRICULTURE COTTON TRUST FUND.

Section 12314 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 2101 note; Public Law 113-79) is amended—

(1) by striking “2018” each place it appears and inserting “2023”;

(2) by striking “calendar year 2013” each place it appears and inserting “the prior calendar year”;

(3) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively;

(B) in the matter preceding clause (i) (as so redesignated), by striking “(2) Twenty-five” and inserting the following:

“(2)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), twenty-five”;

(C) in subparagraph (A)(ii) (as so designated), by striking “subparagraph (A)” and inserting “clause (i)”;

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(B)(i) A yarn spinner shall not receive an amount under subparagraph (A) that exceeds the cost of pima cotton that—

“(I) was purchased during the prior calendar year; and

“(II) was used in spinning any cotton yarns.

“(ii) The Secretary shall reallocate any amounts reduced by reason of the limitation under clause (i) to spinners using the ratio described in subparagraph (A), disregarding production of any spinner subject to that limitation.”;

(4) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “(b)(2)(A)” and inserting “(b)(2)(A)(i)”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) the dollar amount of pima cotton purchased during the prior calendar year—

“(A) that was used in spinning any cotton yarns; and

“(B) for which the producer maintains supporting documentation.”;

(5) in subsection (e)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “by the Secretary—” and inserting “by the Secretary not later than March 15 of the applicable calendar year.”; and

(B) by striking paragraphs (1) and (2); and

(6) in subsection (f), by striking “subsection (b)—” in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and all that follows through “not later than” in paragraph (2) and inserting “subsection (b) not later than”.

SEC. 12604. AGRICULTURE WOOL APPAREL MANUFACTURERS TRUST FUND.

Section 12315 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 7101 note; Public Law 113-79) is amended—

(1) by striking “2019” each place it appears and inserting “2023”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “the payment—” and inserting “the payment, payments in amounts authorized under that paragraph.”; and

(II) by striking clauses (i) and (ii); and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “4002(c)—” and inserting “4002(c), payments in amounts authorized under that paragraph.”; and

(II) by striking clauses (i) and (ii); and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “submitted—” in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) and all that follows through “to the Secretary” in subparagraph (B) and inserting “submitted to the Secretary”; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “subsection (b)—” and inserting “subsection (b) not later than April 15 of the year of the payment.”; and

(B) by striking paragraphs (1) and (2).

SEC. 12605. WOOL RESEARCH AND PROMOTION.

Section 12316(a) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 7101 note; Public Law 113-79) is amended by striking “2015 through 2019” and inserting “2019 through 2023”.

SEC. 12606. EMERGENCY CITRUS DISEASE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT TRUST FUND.

(a) DEFINITION OF CITRUS.—In this section, the term “citrus” means edible fruit of the family Rutaceae, including any hybrid of that fruit and any product of that hybrid that is produced for commercial purposes in the United States.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUST FUND.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund, to be known as the “Emergency Citrus Disease Research and Development Trust Fund” (referred to in this section as the “Citrus Trust Fund”), consisting of such amounts as shall be transferred to the Citrus Trust Fund pursuant to subsection (d).

(c) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—From amounts in the Citrus Trust Fund, the Secretary shall make payments annually beginning in fiscal year 2019 to—

(A) entities engaged in scientific research and extension activities, technical assistance, or development activities to combat domestic or invasive citrus diseases and pests that pose imminent harm to the United States citrus production and threaten the future viability of the citrus industry, including huanglongbing and the Asian Citrus Psyllid; and

(B) entities engaged in supporting the dissemination and commercialization of relevant information, techniques, or technologies discovered under research and extension activities funded through—

(i) the Citrus Trust Fund; or

(ii) other research and extension projects intended to solve problems caused by citrus production diseases and invasive pests.

(2) PRIORITY.—In making payments under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall give priority to entities that use the payments to address the research and extension priorities established pursuant to section 1408A(g)(4) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3123a(g)(4)).

(3) COORDINATION.—In determining how to distribute funds under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) seek input from Federal and State agencies and other entities involved in citrus disease response; and

(B) take into account other public and private citrus-related research and extension projects and the funding for those projects.

(4) NONDUPLICATION.—The Secretary shall ensure that funds provided under paragraph (1) shall be in addition to and not supplant funds made available to carry out other citrus disease activities carried out by the Department of Agriculture in consultation with State agencies.

(d) FUNDING.—Of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary shall transfer to the Citrus Trust Fund \$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 12607. EXTENSION OF MERCHANDISE PROCESSING FEES.

Section 503 of the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 112-41; 19 U.S.C. 3805 note) is amended by striking “February 24, 2027” and inserting “May 26, 2027”.

SEC. 12608. CONFORMING CHANGES TO CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 102(16) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802(16)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(16) The” and inserting “(16)(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), the”;

and

(2) by striking “Such term does not include the” and inserting the following:

“(B) The term ‘marihuana’ does not include—

“(i) hemp, as defined in section 297A of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946; or

“(ii) the”.

(b) TETRAHYDROCANNABINOL.—Schedule I, as set forth in section 202(c) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 812(c)), is amended in subsection (c)(17) by inserting after “Tetrahydrocannabinols” the following: “, except for tetrahydrocannabinols in hemp (as defined under section 297A of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946)”.

SEC. 12609. NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION.

(a) FINANCING.—Section 1309(a) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4016(a)) is amended by striking “September 30, 2017” and inserting “January 31, 2019”.

(b) PROGRAM EXPIRATION.—Section 1319 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4026) is amended by striking “September 30, 2017” and inserting “January 31, 2019”.

SEC. 12610. EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE FOR LIVESTOCK, HONEY BEES, AND FARM-RAISED FISH.

Section 1501(d)(2) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9081(d)(2)) is amended by inserting “, including inspections of cattle tick fever” before the period at the end.

SEC. 12611. ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS.

Section 1117 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9017) (as amended by section 1104(6)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of agriculture risk coverage payments in the case of county coverage, a county may be divided into not greater than 2 administrative units in accordance with this subsection.

“(2) ELIGIBLE COUNTIES.—A county that may be divided into administrative units under this subsection is a county that—

“(A) is larger than 1,400 square miles;

“(B) is contained within a State that is larger than 140,000 square miles; and

“(C) contains more than 190,000 base acres.

“(3) ELECTIONS.—Before making any agriculture risk coverage payments for the 2019 crop year, the Farm Service Agency State committee, in consultation with the Farm Service Agency county or area committee of a county described in paragraph (2), may make a 1-time election to divide the county into administrative units under this subsection along a boundary that better reflects differences in weather patterns, soil types, or other factors.

“(4) ADMINISTRATION.—For purposes of providing agriculture risk coverage payments in the case of county coverage, the Secretary shall consider an administrative unit elected

under paragraph (3) to be a county for the 2019 through 2023 crop years.”.

SEC. 12612. DROUGHT AND WATER CONSERVATION AGREEMENTS.

Section 1231A of the Food Security Act of 1985 (as added by section 2105(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) DROUGHT AND WATER CONSERVATION AGREEMENTS.—In the case of an agreement under subsection (b)(1) to address regional drought concerns, in accordance with the conservation purposes of the program, the Secretary, in consultation with the applicable State technical committee established under section 1261(a), may—

“(1) notwithstanding subsection (a)(1), enroll other agricultural land on which the resource concerns identified in the agreement can be addressed if the enrollment of the land is critical to the accomplishment of the purposes of the agreement;

“(2) permit dryland agricultural uses with the adoption of best management practices on enrolled land if the agreement involves the significant long-term reduction of consumptive water use and dryland production is compatible with the agreement; and

“(3) calculate annual rental payments consistent with existing administrative practice for similar drought and water conservation agreements under this subchapter and ensure regional consistency in those rates.”.

SEC. 12613. ENCOURAGEMENT OF POLLINATOR HABITAT DEVELOPMENT AND PROTECTION.

Section 1244(h) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3844(h)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) the development of a conservation and recovery plan for protection of pollinators through conservation biological control or practices and strategies to integrate natural predators and parasites of crop pests into agricultural systems for pest control; and

“(4) training for producers relating to background science, implementation, and promotion of conservation biological control such that producers base conservation activities on practices and techniques that conserve or enhance natural habitat for beneficial insects as a way of reducing pest problems and pesticide applications on farms.”.

SEC. 12614. REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF FENCING; COST SHARE PAYMENTS.

(a) REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF FENCING.—(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 401 of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2201) is amended—

(A) by inserting “wildfires,” after “hurricanes.”;

(B) by striking the section designation and all that follows through “The Secretary of Agriculture” and inserting the following:

“SEC. 401. PAYMENTS TO PRODUCERS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Agriculture (referred to in this title as the ‘Secretary’); and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF FENCING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to a payment to an agricultural producer under subsection (a) for the repair or replacement of fencing, the Secretary shall give the agricultural producer the option of receiving not more than 25 percent of the payment, determined by the Secretary based on the applicable percentage of the fair market value of the cost of the repair or replacement, before the agricultural producer carries out the repair or replacement.

“(2) RETURN OF FUNDS.—If the funds provided under paragraph (1) are not expended

by the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date on which the agricultural producer receives those funds, the funds shall be returned within a reasonable timeframe, as determined by the Secretary.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Sections 402, 403, 404, and 405 of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205) are amended by striking “Secretary of Agriculture” each place it appears and inserting “Secretary”.

(B) Section 407(a) of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2206(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (4).

(b) COST SHARE PAYMENTS.—Title IV of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 402 the following:

“SEC. 402A. COST-SHARE REQUIREMENT.

“(a) COST-SHARE RATE.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), the maximum cost-share payment under sections 401 and 402 shall not exceed 75 percent of the total allowable cost, as determined by the Secretary.

“(b) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), a payment to a limited resource farmer or rancher, a socially disadvantaged farmer or rancher (as defined in 2501(a) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(a)), or a beginning farmer or rancher under section 401 or 402 shall not exceed 90 percent of the total allowable cost, as determined by the Secretary.

“(c) LIMITATION.—The total payment under sections 401 and 402 for a single event may not exceed 50 percent of the agriculture value of the land, as determined by the Secretary.”.

SEC. 12615. FOOD DONATION STANDARDS.

Section 203D of the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 7507) (as amended by section 4115(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) FOOD DONATION STANDARDS.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) APPARENTLY WHOLESOME FOOD.—The term ‘apparently wholesome food’ has the meaning given the term in section 22(b) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1791(b)).

“(B) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ‘institution of higher education’ has the meaning given the term in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002).

“(C) QUALIFIED DIRECT DONOR.—The term ‘qualified direct donor’ means a retail food store, wholesaler, agricultural producer, restaurant, caterer, school food authority, or institution of higher education.

“(2) GUIDANCE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, the Secretary shall issue guidance to promote awareness of donations of apparently wholesome food protected under section 22(c) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1791(c)) by qualified direct donors in compliance with applicable State and local health, food safety, and food handling laws (including regulations).

“(B) ISSUANCE.—The Secretary shall encourage State agencies and emergency feeding organizations to share the guidance issued under subparagraph (A) with qualified direct donors.”.

SEC. 12616. MICRO-GRANTS FOR FOOD SECURITY.

The Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 is amended by inserting after section 4405 (7 U.S.C. 7517) the following:

“SEC. 4406. MICRO-GRANTS FOR FOOD SECURITY.

“(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to increase the quantity and quality of locally grown food through small-scale gardening, herding, and livestock operations in

food insecure communities in areas of the United States that have significant levels of food insecurity and import a significant quantity of food.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term ‘eligible entity’ means an entity that—

“(A) is—

“(i) an individual;

“(ii) an Indian tribe (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304)) or a consortium of Indian tribes;

“(iii) a nonprofit organization engaged in increasing food security, as determined by the Secretary, including—

“(I) a religious organization;

“(II) a food bank; and

“(III) a food pantry;

“(iv) a federally funded educational facility, including—

“(I) a Head Start program or an Early Head Start program carried out under the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.);

“(II) a public elementary school or public secondary school;

“(III) a public institution of higher education (as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001));

“(IV) a Tribal College or University (as defined in section 316(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059c(b))); and

“(V) a job training program; or

“(v) a local or Tribal government that may not levy local taxes under State or Federal law; and

“(B) is located in an eligible State.

“(2) ELIGIBLE STATE.—The term ‘eligible State’ means—

“(A) the State of Alaska;

“(B) the State of Hawaii;

“(C) American Samoa;

“(D) the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands;

“(E) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

“(F) the Federated States of Micronesia;

“(G) Guam;

“(H) the Republic of the Marshall Islands;

“(I) the Republic of Palau; and

“(J) the United States Virgin Islands.

“(c) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall distribute funds to the agricultural department or agency of each eligible State for the competitive distribution of subgrants to eligible entities to increase the quantity and quality of locally grown food in food insecure communities, including through small-scale gardening, herding, and livestock operations.

“(d) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount made available under subsection (g), the Secretary shall distribute—

“(A) 40 percent to the State of Alaska;

“(B) 40 percent to the State of Hawaii; and

“(C) 2.5 percent to each insular area described in subparagraphs (C) through (J) of subsection (b)(2).

“(2) CARRYOVER OF FUNDS.—Funds distributed under paragraph (1) shall remain available until expended.

“(3) ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDS.—An eligible State that receives funds under paragraph (1) may use not more than 3 percent of those funds—

“(A) to administer the competition for providing subgrants to eligible entities in that eligible State;

“(B) to provide oversight of the subgrant recipients in that eligible State; and

“(C) to collect data and submit a report to the Secretary under subsection (f)(2).

“(e) SUBGRANTS TO ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—

“(1) AMOUNT OF SUBGRANTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The amount of a subgrant to an eligible entity under this section shall be—

“(i) in the case of an eligible entity that is an individual, not greater than \$5,000 per year; and

“(ii) in the case of an eligible entity described in clauses (i) through (v) of subsection (b)(1)(A), not greater than \$10,000 per year.

“(B) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—As a condition of receiving a subgrant under this section, an eligible entity shall provide funds equal to 10 percent of the amount received by the eligible entity under the subgrant, to be derived from non-Federal sources.

“(C) CARRYOVER OF FUNDS.—Funds received by an eligible entity that is awarded a subgrant under this section shall remain available until expended.

“(2) PRIORITY.—In carrying out the competitive distribution of subgrants under subsection (c), an eligible State may give priority to an eligible entity that—

“(A) has not previously received a subgrant under this section; or

“(B) is located in a community or region in that eligible State with the highest degree of food insecurity, as determined by the agricultural department or agency of the eligible State.

“(3) PROJECTS.—An eligible State may provide subgrants to 2 or more eligible entities to carry out the same project.

“(4) USE OF SUBGRANT FUNDS BY ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—An eligible entity that receives a subgrant under this section shall use the funds to engage in activities that will increase the quantity and quality of locally grown food, including by—

“(A) purchasing gardening tools or equipment, soil, soil amendments, seeds, plants, animals, canning equipment, refrigeration, or other items necessary to grow and store food;

“(B) purchasing or building composting units;

“(C) purchasing or building towers designed to grow leafy green vegetables;

“(D) expanding an area under cultivation or engaging in other activities necessary to be eligible to receive funding under the environmental quality incentives program established under chapter 4 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa et seq.) for a high tunnel;

“(E) engaging in an activity that extends the growing season;

“(F) starting or expanding hydroponic and aeroponic farming of any scale;

“(G) building, buying, erecting, or repairing fencing for livestock, poultry, or reindeer;

“(H) purchasing and equipping a slaughter and processing facility approved by the Secretary;

“(I) travelling to participate in agricultural education provided by—

“(i) a State cooperative extension service;

“(ii) a land-grant college or university (as defined in section 1404 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103));

“(iii) a Tribal College or University (as defined in section 316(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059c(b)));

“(iv) an Alaska Native-serving institution or a Native Hawaiian-serving institution (as those terms are defined in section 317(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059d(b))); or

“(v) a Federal or State agency;

“(J) paying for shipping of purchased items relating to increasing food security;

“(K) creating or expanding avenues for—

“(i) the sale of food commodities, specialty crops, and meats that are grown by the eligible entity for sale in the local community; or

“(ii) the availability of fresh, locally grown, and nutritious food; and

“(L) engaging in other activities relating to increasing food security (including subsistence), as determined by the Secretary.

“(5) ELIGIBILITY FOR OTHER FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—An eligible entity shall not be ineligible to receive financial assistance under another program administered by the Secretary as a result of receiving a subgrant under this section.

“(f) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—

“(1) SUBGRANT RECIPIENTS.—As a condition of receiving a subgrant under this section, an eligible entity shall submit to the eligible State in which the eligible entity is located a report—

“(A) as soon as practicable after the end of the project; and

“(B) that describes the quantity of food grown and the number of people fed as a result of the subgrant.

“(2) REPORT TO THE SECRETARY.—Not later than 120 days after the date on which an eligible State receives a report from each eligible entity in that State under paragraph (1), the eligible State shall submit to the Secretary a report that describes, in the aggregate, the information and data contained in the reports received from those eligible entities.

“(g) FUNDING.—

“(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2019 and each fiscal year thereafter, to remain available until expended.

“(2) APPROPRIATIONS IN ADVANCE.—Only funds appropriated under paragraph (1) in advance specifically to carry out this section shall be available to carry out this section.

“(h) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section takes effect on the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018.”

SEC. 12617. USE OF ADDITIONAL COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FUNDS FOR DIRECT OPERATING MICROLOANS UNDER CERTAIN CONDITIONS.

Section 346(b) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1994(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) USE OF ADDITIONAL COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FUNDS FOR DIRECT OPERATING MICROLOANS UNDER CERTAIN CONDITIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary determines that the amount needed for a fiscal year for direct operating loans (including microloans) under subtitle B is greater than the aggregate principal amount authorized for that fiscal year by this Act, an appropriations Act, or any other provision of law, the Secretary shall make additional microloans under subtitle B using amounts made available under subparagraph (B).

“(B) FUNDING.—Of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary shall use to make microloans under subtitle B, under the conditions described in subparagraph (A), not more than \$5,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.

“(C) NOTICE.—Not later than 15 days before the date on which the Secretary uses the authority under subparagraphs (A) and (B), the Secretary shall submit a notice of the use of that authority to—

“(i) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives;

“(ii) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

“(iii) the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives; and

“(iv) the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.”

SEC. 12618. BUSINESS AND INNOVATION SERVICES ESSENTIAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES.

Section 306(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a))

(as amended by section 6105) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(28) BUSINESS AND INNOVATION SERVICES ESSENTIAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES.—The Secretary may make loans and loan guarantees under this subsection and grants under paragraphs (19), (20), and (21) for essential community facilities for business and innovation services, such as incubators, co-working spaces, makerspaces, and residential entrepreneur and innovation centers.”

SEC. 12619. RURAL INNOVATION STRONGER ECONOMY GRANT PROGRAM.

Subtitle D of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1981 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 379I. RURAL INNOVATION STRONGER ECONOMY GRANT PROGRAM.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term ‘eligible entity’ means a rural jobs accelerator partnership established after the date of enactment of this section that—

“(A) organizes key community and regional stakeholders into a working group that—

“(i) focuses on the shared goals and needs of the industry clusters that are objectively identified as existing, emerging, or declining;

“(ii) represents a region defined by the partnership in accordance with subparagraph (B);

“(iii) includes 1 or more representatives of—

“(I) an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001));

“(II) a private entity; or

“(III) a government entity;

“(iv) may include 1 or more representatives of—

“(I) an economic development or other community or labor organization;

“(II) a financial institution, including a community development financial institution (as defined in section 103 of the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4702));

“(III) a philanthropic organization; or

“(IV) a rural cooperative, if the cooperative is organized as a nonprofit organization; and

“(v) has, as a lead applicant—

“(I) a District Organization (as defined in section 300.3 of title 13, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation));

“(II) an Indian tribe (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304)), or a consortium of Indian tribes;

“(III) a State or a political subdivision of a State, including a special purpose unit of a State or local government engaged in economic development activities, or a consortium of political subdivisions;

“(IV) an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001)) or a consortium of institutions of higher education; or

“(V) a public or private nonprofit organization; and

“(B) subject to approval by the Secretary, may—

“(i) serve a region that is—

“(I) a single jurisdiction; or

“(II) if the region is a rural area, multi-jurisdictional; and

“(ii) define the region that the partnership represents, if the region—

“(I) is large enough to contain critical elements of the industry cluster prioritized by the partnership;

“(II) is small enough to enable close collaboration among members of the partnership;

“(III) includes a majority of communities that are located in—

“(aa) a nonmetropolitan area that qualifies as a low-income community (as defined in section 45D(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986); and

“(bb) an area that has access to or has a plan to achieve broadband service (within the meaning of title VI of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 950bb et seq.)); and

“(IV)(aa) has a population of 50,000 or fewer inhabitants; or

“(bb) for a region with a population of more than 50,000 inhabitants, is the subject of a positive determination by the Secretary with respect to a rural-in-character petition, including such a petition submitted concurrently with the application of the partnership for a grant under this section.

“(2) INDUSTRY CLUSTER.—The term ‘industry cluster’ means a broadly defined network of interconnected firms and supporting institutions in related industries that accelerate innovation, business formation, and job creation by taking advantage of assets and strengths of a region in the business environment.

“(3) HIGH-WAGE JOB.—The term ‘high-wage job’ means a job that provides a wage that is greater than the median wage for the applicable region, as determined by the Secretary.

“(4) JOBS ACCELERATOR.—The term ‘jobs accelerator’ means a jobs accelerator center or program located in or serving a low-income rural community that may provide co-working space, in-demand skills training, entrepreneurship support, and any other services described in subsection (d)(1)(B).

“(5) SMALL AND DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS.—The term ‘small and disadvantaged business’ has the meaning given the term ‘small business concern owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals’ in section 8(d)(3)(C) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)(3)(C)).

“(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a grant program under which the Secretary shall award grants, on a competitive basis, to eligible entities to establish jobs accelerators, including related programming, that—

“(A) improve the ability of distressed rural communities to create high-wage jobs, accelerate the formation of new businesses with high-growth potential, and strengthen regional economies, including by helping to build capacity in the applicable region to achieve those goals; and

“(B) help rural communities identify and maximize local assets and connect to regional opportunities, networks, and industry clusters that demonstrate high growth potential.

“(2) COST-SHARING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of the cost of any activity carried out using a grant made under paragraph (1) shall be not greater than 80 percent.

“(B) IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS.—The non-Federal share of the total cost of any activity carried out using a grant made under paragraph (1) may be in the form of donations or in-kind contributions of goods or services fairly valued.

“(3) SELECTION CRITERIA.—In selecting eligible entities to receive grants under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consider—

“(A) the commitment of participating core stakeholders in the jobs accelerator partnership, including a demonstration that—

“(i) investment organizations, including venture development organizations, venture capital firms, revolving loan funders, angel investment groups, community lenders, community development financial institutions,

rural business investment companies, small business investment companies (as defined in section 103 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 662)), philanthropic organizations, and other institutions focused on expanding access to capital, are committed partners in the jobs accelerator partnership and willing to potentially invest in projects emerging from the jobs accelerator; and

“(ii) institutions of higher education, applied research institutions, workforce development entities, and community-based organizations are willing to partner with the jobs accelerator to provide workers with skills relevant to the industry cluster needs of the region, with an emphasis on the use of on-the-job training, registered apprenticeships, customized training, classroom occupational training, or incumbent worker training;

“(B) the ability of the eligible entity to provide the non-Federal share as required under paragraph (2);

“(C) the speed of available broadband service and how the jobs accelerator plans to improve access to high-speed broadband service, if necessary, and leverage that broadband service for programs of the jobs accelerator;

“(D) the identification of a targeted industry cluster, including a description of—

“(i) data showing the existence of emergence of an industry cluster;

“(ii) the importance of the industry cluster to economic growth in the region;

“(iii) the specific needs and opportunities for growth in the industry cluster;

“(iv) the unique assets a region has to support the industry cluster and to have a competitive advantage in that industry cluster;

“(v) evidence of a concentration of firms or concentration of employees in the industry cluster; and

“(vi) available industry-specific infrastructure that supports the industry cluster;

“(E) the ability of the partnership to link rural communities to markets, networks, industry clusters, and other regional opportunities and assets—

“(i) to improve the competitiveness of the rural region;

“(ii) to repatriate United States jobs;

“(iii) to foster high-wage job creation;

“(iv) to support innovation and entrepreneurship; and

“(v) to promote private investment in the rural regional economy;

“(F) other grants or loans of the Secretary and other Federal agencies that the jobs accelerator would be able to leverage; and

“(G) prospects for the proposed center and related programming to have sustainability beyond the full maximum length of assistance under this subsection, including the maximum number of renewals.

“(4) GRANT TERM AND RENEWALS.—

“(A) TERM.—The initial term of a grant under paragraph (1) shall be 4 years.

“(B) RENEWAL.—The Secretary may renew a grant under paragraph (1) for an additional period of not longer than 2 years if the Secretary is satisfied, using the evaluation under subsection (e)(2), that the grant recipient has successfully established a jobs accelerator and related programming.

“(5) GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall provide grants under paragraph (1) for jobs accelerators and related programming in not fewer than 25 States at any time.

“(c) GRANT AMOUNT.—A grant awarded under subsection (b) may be in an amount equal to—

“(1) not less than \$500,000; and

“(2) not more than \$2,000,000.

“(d) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), funds from a grant awarded under subsection (b) may be used—

“(A) to construct, purchase, or equip a building to serve as an innovation center, which may include—

“(i) housing for business owners or workers;

“(ii) co-working space, which may include space for remote work;

“(iii) space for businesses to utilize with a focus on entrepreneurs and small and disadvantaged businesses but that may include collaboration with companies of all sizes;

“(iv) job training programs; and

“(v) efforts to utilize the innovation center as part of the development of a community downtown; or

“(B) to support programs to be carried out at, or in direct partnership with, the jobs accelerator that support the objectives of the jobs accelerator, including—

“(i) linking rural communities to markets, networks, industry clusters, and other regional opportunities to support high-wage job creation, new business formation, and economic growth;

“(ii) integrating small businesses into a supply chain;

“(iii) creating or expanding commercialization activities for new business formation;

“(iv) identifying and building assets in rural communities that are crucial to supporting regional economies;

“(v) facilitating the repatriation of high-wage jobs to the United States;

“(vi) supporting the deployment of innovative processes, technologies, and products;

“(vii) enhancing the capacity of small businesses in regional industry clusters, including small and disadvantaged businesses;

“(viii) increasing United States exports and business interaction with international buyers and suppliers;

“(ix) developing the skills and expertise of local workforces, entrepreneurs, and institutional partners to support growing industry clusters, including the upskilling of incumbent workers;

“(x) ensuring rural communities have the capacity and ability to carry out projects relating to housing, community facilities, infrastructure, or community and economic development to support regional industry cluster growth;

“(xi) establishing training programs to meet the needs of employers in a regional industry cluster and prepare workers for high-wage jobs; or

“(xii) any other activities that the Secretary may determine to be appropriate.

“(2) REQUIREMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), not more than 10 percent of a grant awarded under subsection (b) shall be used for indirect costs associated with administering the grant.

“(B) INCREASE.—The Secretary may increase the percentage described in subparagraph (A) on a case-by-case basis.

“(e) ANNUAL ACTIVITY REPORT AND EVALUATION.—Not later than 1 year after receiving a grant under this section, and annually thereafter for the duration of the grant, an eligible entity shall—

“(1) report to the Secretary on the activities funded with the grant; and

“(2)(A) evaluate the progress that the eligible entity has made toward the strategic objectives identified in the application for the grant; and

“(B) measure that progress using performance measures during the project period, which may include—

“(i) high-wage jobs created;

“(ii) high-wage jobs retained;

“(iii) private investment leveraged;

“(iv) businesses improved;

“(v) new business formations;

“(vi) new products or services commercialized;

“(vii) improvement of the value of existing products or services under development;

“(viii) regional collaboration, as measured by such metrics as—

“(I) the number of organizations actively engaged in the industry cluster;

“(II) the number of symposia held by the industry cluster, including organizations that are not located in the immediate region defined by the partnership; and

“(III) the number of further cooperative agreements;

“(ix) the number of education and training activities relating to innovation;

“(x) the number of jobs relocated from outside of the United States to the region;

“(xi) the amount and number of new equity investments in industry cluster firms;

“(xii) the amount and number of new loans to industry cluster firms;

“(xiii) the dollar increase in exports resulting from the project activities;

“(xiv) the percentage of employees for which training was provided;

“(xv) improvement in sales of participating businesses;

“(xvi) improvement in wages paid at participating businesses;

“(xvii) improvement in income of participating workers; or

“(xviii) any other measure the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

“(f) INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish an interagency Federal task force to support the network of jobs accelerators by—

“(A) providing successful applicants with available information and technical assistance on Federal resources relevant to the project and region;

“(B) establishing a Federal support team comprised of staff from participating agencies in the task force that shall provide coordinated and dedicated support services to jobs accelerators; and

“(C) providing opportunities for the network of jobs accelerators to share best practices and further collaborate to achieve the purposes of this section.

“(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The task force established under paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) be co-chaired by—

“(i) the Secretary of Commerce (or a designee); and

“(ii) the Secretary (or a designee); and

“(B) include—

“(i) the Secretary of Education (or a designee);

“(ii) the Secretary of Energy (or a designee);

“(iii) the Secretary of Health and Human Services (or a designee);

“(iv) the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (or a designee);

“(v) the Secretary of Labor (or a designee);

“(vi) the Secretary of Transportation (or a designee);

“(vii) the Secretary of the Treasury (or a designee);

“(viii) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (or a designee);

“(ix) the Administrator of the Small Business Administration (or a designee);

“(x) the Federal Co-Chair of the Appalachian Regional Commission (or a designee);

“(xi) the Federal Co-Chairman of the Board of the Delta Regional Authority (or a designee);

“(xii) the Federal Co-Chair of the Northern Border Regional Commission (or a designee);

“(xiii) national and local organizations that have relevant programs and interests

that could serve the needs of the jobs accelerators;

“(xiv) representatives of State and local governments or State and local economic development agencies;

“(xv) representatives of institutions of higher education, including land-grant universities; and

“(xvi) such other heads of Federal agencies and non-Federal partners as determined appropriate by the co-chairs of the task force.”.

SEC. 12620. DRYLAND FARMING AGRICULTURAL SYSTEMS.

Section 1672(d) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5925(d)) (as amended by section 7209(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(15) DRYLAND FARMING AGRICULTURAL SYSTEMS.—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purposes of carrying out or enhancing research on the utilization of big data for more precise management of dryland farming agricultural systems.”.

SEC. 12621. REMOTE SENSING TECHNOLOGIES.

The Chief of the Forest Service shall—

(1) continue to find efficiencies in the operations of the forest inventory and analysis program under section 3(e) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 1642(e)) through the improved use and integration of advanced remote sensing technologies to provide estimates for State- and national-level inventories, where appropriate; and

(2) partner with States and other interested stakeholders to carry out the program described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 12622. BUY AMERICAN REQUIREMENTS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) fully enforce the Buy American provisions applicable to domestic food assistance programs administered by the Food and Nutrition Service; and

(2) submit to Congress a report on the actions the Secretary has taken and plans to take to comply with paragraph (1).

SEC. 12623. ELIGIBILITY FOR OPERATORS ON HEIRS PROPERTY LAND TO OBTAIN A FARM NUMBER.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE DOCUMENTATION.—The term “eligible documentation”, with respect to land for which a farm operator seeks assignment of a farm number under subsection (b)(1), includes—

(A) in States that have adopted a statute consisting of an enactment or adoption of the Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act, as approved and recommended for enactment in all States by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws in 2010—

(i) a court order verifying the land meets the definition of heirs property (as defined in that Act); or

(ii) a certification from the local recorder of deeds that the recorded owner of the land is deceased and not less than 1 heir of the recorded owner of the land has initiated a procedure to retitle the land in the name of the rightful heir;

(B) a fully executed, unrecorded tenancy-in-common agreement that sets out ownership rights and responsibilities among all of the owners of the land that—

(i) has been approved by a majority of the ownership interests in that property;

(ii) has given a particular owner the right to manage and control any portion or all of the land for purposes of operating a farm or ranch; and

(iii) was validly entered into under the authority of the jurisdiction in which the land is located;

(C) the tax return of a farm operator farming a property with undivided interests for each of the 5 years preceding the date on which the farm operator submits the tax returns as eligible documentation under subsection (b);

(D) self-certification that the farm operator has control of the land for purposes of operating a farm or ranch; and

(E) any other documentation identified by the Secretary under subsection (c).

(2) FARM NUMBER.—The term “farm number” has the meaning given the term in section 718.2 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act).

(b) FARM NUMBER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide for the assignment of a farm number to any farm operator who provides any form of eligible documentation for purposes of demonstrating that the farm operator has control of the land for purposes of defining that land as a farm.

(2) ELIGIBILITY.—Any farm number provided under paragraph (1) shall be sufficient to satisfy any requirement of the Secretary to have a farm number to participate in a program of the Secretary.

(c) ELIGIBLE DOCUMENTATION.—The Secretary shall identify alternative forms of eligible documentation that a farm operator may provide in seeking the assignment of a farm number under subsection (b)(1).

SEC. 12624. LOANS TO PURCHASERS OF LAND WITH UNDIVIDED INTEREST AND NO ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORITY.

(a) REAUTHORIZATION OF BEGINNING FARMER AND RANCHER INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT ACCOUNTS PILOT PROGRAM.—Section 333B(h) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1983b(h)) (as amended by section 5301) is amended by striking “2023” and inserting “2024”.

(b) PILOT PROGRAM.—Subtitle D of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1981 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 333D the following:

“SEC. 333E. FARMER LOAN PILOT PROJECTS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may conduct pilot projects of limited scope and duration that are consistent with subtitles A, B, C, and this subtitle to evaluate processes and techniques that may improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the programs carried out under subtitles A, B, C, and this subtitle.

“(b) NOTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall—

“(1) not less than 60 days before the date on which the Secretary initiates a pilot project under subsection (a), submit notice of the proposed pilot project to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate; and

“(2) consider any recommendations or feedback provided to the Secretary in response to the notice provided under paragraph (1).”.

(c) RELENDING PROGRAM.—Subtitle A of title III of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1922 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 310I. RELENDING PROGRAM TO RESOLVE OWNERSHIP AND SUCCESSION ON FARMLAND.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make or guarantee loans to eligible entities described in subsection (b) using amounts made available for farm ownership loans under this subtitle so that the eligible entities may relend the funds to individuals and entities for the purposes described in subsection (c).

“(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—Entities eligible for loans and loan guarantees described in subsection (a) are cooperatives, credit unions, and nonprofit organizations with—

“(1) certification under section 1805.201 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations) to operate as a lender;

“(2) experience assisting socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers (as defined in section 2501(a) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(a))) or limited resource or new and beginning farmers and ranchers, rural businesses, cooperatives, or credit unions, including experience in making and servicing agricultural and commercial loans; and

“(3) the ability to provide adequate assurance of the repayment of a loan.

“(c) ELIGIBLE PURPOSES.—The proceeds from loans made or guaranteed by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (a) shall be re-lent by eligible entities for projects that assist heirs with undivided ownership interests to resolve ownership and succession on farmland that has multiple owners.

“(d) PREFERENCE.—In making loans under subsection (a), the Secretary shall give preference to eligible entities—

“(1) with not less than 10 years of experience serving socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers; and

“(2) in States that have adopted a statute consisting of an enactment or adoption of the Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act, as approved and recommended for enactment in all States by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws in 2010, that relend to owners of heirs property (as defined in that Act).

“(e) LOAN TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The following terms and conditions shall apply to loans made or guaranteed under this section:

“(1) The interest rate at which intermediaries may borrow funds under this section shall be equal to the rate at which farm ownership loans under this subtitle are made.

“(2) The rates, terms, and payment structure for borrowers to which intermediaries lend shall be—

“(A) determined by the intermediary in an amount sufficient to cover the cost of operating and sustaining the revolving loan fund; and

“(B) clearly and publicly disclosed to qualified ultimate borrowers.

“(3) Borrowers to which intermediaries lend shall be—

“(A) required to complete a succession plan as a condition of the loan; and

“(B) be offered the opportunity to borrow sufficient funds to cover costs associated with the succession plan under subparagraph (A) and other associated legal and closing costs.

“(f) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report describing the operation and outcomes of the program under this section, with recommendations on how to strengthen the program.

“(g) FUNDING.—The Secretary shall carry out this section using funds otherwise made available to the Secretary.”

SEC. 12625. FARMLAND OWNERSHIP DATA COLLECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall collect and, not less frequently than once every 5 years report, data and analysis on farmland ownership, tenure, transition, and entry of beginning farmers and ranchers (as defined in section 343(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1991(a))) and socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers (as defined in section 2501(a) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(a))).

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall, at a minimum—

(1) collect and distribute comprehensive reporting of trends in farmland ownership, tenure, transition, barriers to entry, profitability, and viability of beginning farmers and ranchers and socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers;

(2) develop surveys and report statistical and economic analysis on farmland ownership, tenure, transition, barriers to entry, profitability, and viability of beginning farmers and ranchers, including a regular follow-on survey to each Census of Agriculture with results of the follow-on survey made public not later than 3 years after the previous Census of Agriculture; and

(3) require the National Agricultural Statistics Service—

(A) to include in the Tenure, Ownership, and Transition of Agricultural Land survey questions relating to—

(i) the extent to which non-farming landowners are purchasing and holding onto farmland for the sole purpose of real estate investment;

(ii) the impact of these farmland ownership trends on the successful entry and viability of beginning farmers and ranchers and socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers;

(iii) the extent to which farm and ranch land with undivided interests and no administrative authority identified have farms or ranches operating on that land; and

(iv) the impact of land tenure patterns, categorized by—

(I) race, gender, and ethnicity; and

(II) region; and

(B) to include in the report of each Tenure, Ownership, and Transition of Agricultural Land survey the results of the questions under subparagraph (A).

SEC. 12626. RURAL BUSINESS INVESTMENT PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 384A of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2009cc) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “VENTURE”; and

(B) by striking “venture”; and

(2) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

“(4) EQUITY CAPITAL.—The term ‘equity capital’ means—

“(A) common or preferred stock or a similar instrument, including subordinated debt with equity features; and

“(B) any other type of equity-like financing that might be necessary to facilitate the purposes of this Act, excluding financing such as senior debt or other types of financing that competes with routine loanmaking of commercial lenders.”

(b) PURPOSES.—Section 384B of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2009cc-1) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “venture”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “venture”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “venture”.

(c) SELECTION OF RURAL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES.—Section 384D(b)(1) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2009cc-3(b)(1)) is amended by striking “developmental venture” and inserting “developmental”.

(d) FEES.—Section 384G of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2009cc-6) is amended—

(1) in subsections (a) and (b), by striking “a fee that does not exceed \$500” each place it appears and inserting “such fees as the Secretary considers appropriate, so long as

those fees are proportionally equal for each rural business investment company.”; and

(2) in subsection (c)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “solely to cover the costs of licensing examinations” and inserting “as the Secretary considers appropriate”; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) shall be in such amounts as the Secretary considers appropriate.”

(e) LIMITATION ON RURAL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES CONTROLLED BY FARM CREDIT SYSTEM INSTITUTIONS.—Section 384J(c) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2009cc-9(c)) is amended by striking “25” and inserting “50”.

(f) FLEXIBILITY ON SOURCES OF INVESTMENT OR CAPITAL.—Section 384J(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2009cc-9(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(2) by striking the subsection designation and heading and all that follows through “Except as” in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) (as so redesignated) and inserting the following:

“(a) INVESTMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) LIMITATION ON REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary may not require that an entity described in paragraph (1) provide investment or capital that is not required of other companies eligible to apply to operate as a rural business investment company under section 384D(a).”

SEC. 12627. NATIONAL OILHEAT RESEARCH ALLIANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 713 of the National Oilheat Research Alliance Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 6201 note; Public Law 106-469) is repealed.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON OBLIGATIONS OF FUNDS.—The National Oilheat Research Alliance Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 6201 note; Public Law 106-469) is amended by inserting after section 707 the following:

“SEC. 708. LIMITATIONS ON OBLIGATION OF FUNDS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In each fiscal year of the covered period, the Alliance may not obligate an amount greater than the sum of—

“(1) 75 percent of the amount of assessments estimated to be collected under section 707 in that fiscal year;

“(2) 75 percent of the amount of assessments actually collected under section 707 in the most recent fiscal year for which an audit report has been submitted under section 706(f)(2)(B) as of the beginning of the fiscal year for which the amount that may be obligated is being determined, less the estimate made pursuant to paragraph (1) for that most recent fiscal year; and

“(3) amounts permitted in preceding fiscal years to be obligated pursuant to this subsection that have not been obligated.

“(b) EXCESS AMOUNTS DEPOSITED IN ESCROW ACCOUNT.—Assessments collected under section 707 in excess of the amount permitted to be obligated under subsection (a) in a fiscal year shall be deposited in an escrow account for the duration of the covered period.

“(c) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS IN ESCROW ACCOUNT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—During the covered period, the Alliance may not obligate, expend, or borrow against amounts required under subsection (b) to be deposited in the escrow account.

“(2) INTEREST.—Any interest earned on amounts described in paragraph (1) shall be—

“(A) deposited in the escrow account; and

“(B) unavailable for obligation for the duration of the covered period.

“(d) RELEASE OF AMOUNTS IN ESCROW ACCOUNT.—After the expiration of the covered period, the Alliance may withdraw and obligate in any fiscal year an amount in the escrow account that does not exceed ½ of the amount in the escrow account on the last day of the covered period.

“(e) SPECIAL RULE FOR ESTIMATES FOR PARTICULAR FISCAL YEARS.—

“(1) RULE.—For purposes of subsection (a)(1), the amount of assessments estimated to be collected under section 707 in a fiscal year described in paragraph (2) shall be equal to 62 percent of the amount of assessments actually collected under that section in the most recent fiscal year for which an audit report has been submitted under section 706(f)(2)(B) as of the beginning of the fiscal year for which the amount that may be obligated is being determined.

“(2) FISCAL YEARS DESCRIBED.—The fiscal years referred to in paragraph (1) are the 9th and 10th fiscal years that begin on or after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018.

“(f) COVERED PERIOD DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘covered period’ means the period that begins on the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 and ends on the last day of the 11th fiscal year that begins on or after that date of enactment.”.

SA 3225. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. NELSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 4112, insert the following:

SEC. 411 . CONSOLIDATED BLOCK GRANTS FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO.

Section 19(a)(2)(B) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2028(a)(2)(B)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR DISASTER RECOVERY EFFORTS IN THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO FOR FISCAL YEARS 2020 AND 2021.—

“(I) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Due to the needs associated with disaster recovery efforts in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, in addition to amounts made available under clause (i) there is authorized to be appropriated not more than \$635,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 and 2021 to make additional payments to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico for the expenditures and expenses described in clause (i).

“(II) APPROPRIATION IN ADVANCE.—Except as provided in subclause (III), only amounts appropriated under subclause (I) in advance specifically for the expenditures and expenses described in clause (i) shall be available for payment to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico for the expenditures and expenses described in that clause.

“(III) OTHER FUNDS.—Funds appropriated under subclause (I) shall be in addition to funds made available under clause (i).”.

SA 3226. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other pro-

grams of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 125 . PROHIBITION ON SLAUGHTER OF DOGS AND CATS FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (c), no person may—

(1) knowingly slaughter a dog or cat for human consumption; or

(2) knowingly ship, transport, move, deliver, receive, possess, purchase, sell, or donate—

(A) a dog or cat to be slaughtered for human consumption; or

(B) a dog or cat part for human consumption.

(b) SCOPE.—Subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to conduct—

(1) in or affecting interstate commerce or foreign commerce; or

(2) within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

(c) EXCEPTION FOR INDIAN TRIBES.—The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to an Indian (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304)) carrying out any activity described in subsection (a) for the purpose of a religious ceremony.

(d) PENALTY.—Any person who violates subsection (a) shall be subject to a fine in an amount not greater than \$5,000 for each violation.

(e) EFFECT ON STATE LAW.—Nothing in this section—

(1) limits any State or local law or regulation protecting the welfare of animals; or

(2) prevents a State or unit of local government from adopting and enforcing an animal welfare law or regulation that is more stringent than this section.

SA 3227. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . STOP SUBSIDIZING CHILDHOOD OBESITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Childhood obesity has more than doubled in children and tripled in adolescents in the past 30 years. Currently, more than ½ of children and adolescents in the United States are overweight or obese.

(2) A report by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and Trust for America’s Health found that if the population of the United States continues on its current trajectory, adult obesity rates could exceed 60 percent in a number of States by 2030.

(3) Health-related behaviors, such as eating habits and physical activity patterns, develop early in life and affect behavior and health in adulthood. The diets of American children and adolescents depart substantially from recommended patterns that put their health at risk. Overall, American children and youth are not achieving basic nutritional goals. They are consuming excess calories and added sugars and have higher than recommended intakes of sodium, total fat, and saturated fats.

(4) According to a 2012 report from the Federal Trade Commission, the total amount spent on food marketing to children is about \$2,000,000,000 per year.

(5) Companies market food to children through television, radio, Internet, magazines, product placement in movies and video games, schools, product packages, toys, clothing and other merchandise.

(6) According to a comprehensive review by the National Academy of Medicine, studies demonstrate that television food advertising affects children’s food choices, food purchase requests, diets, and health. The Academy concluded that the marketing of high-calorie foods to children and adolescents is one of the major contributors to childhood obesity.

(7) More than 80 percent of the food advertisements seen by children on television are for foods of poor nutritional value.

(8) A study published in the Journal of Law and Economics and funded by the National Institutes of Health found that the elimination of the tax deduction that allows companies to deduct costs associated with advertising food of poor nutritional quality to children could reduce the rates of childhood obesity by 5 to 7 percent.

(9) A study published in the Journal of Health Affairs found that the elimination of the tax deduction for costs described in paragraph (8) would save up to \$260,000,000 in health care costs and prevent nearly 130,000 cases of childhood obesity over 10 years.

(b) DENIAL OF DEDUCTION FOR ADVERTISING AND MARKETING DIRECTED AT CHILDREN TO PROMOTE THE CONSUMPTION OF FOOD OF POOR NUTRITIONAL QUALITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Part IX of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 280I. DENIAL OF DEDUCTION FOR ADVERTISING AND MARKETING DIRECTED AT CHILDREN TO PROMOTE THE CONSUMPTION OF FOOD OF POOR NUTRITIONAL QUALITY.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—No deduction shall be allowed under this chapter with respect to—

“(1) any advertisement or marketing—

“(A) primarily directed at children for purposes of promoting the consumption by children of any food of poor nutritional quality, or

“(B) of a brand primarily associated with food of poor nutritional quality that is primarily directed at children, and

“(2) any of the following which are incurred or provided primarily for purposes described in paragraph (1):

“(A) Travel expenses (including meals and lodging).

“(B) Goods or services of a type generally considered to constitute entertainment, amusement, or recreation or the use of a facility in connection with providing such goods and services.

“(C) Gifts.

“(D) Other promotion expenses.

“(b) NAM STUDY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall enter into a contract with the National Academy of Medicine under which the National Academy of Medicine shall develop procedures for the evaluation and identification of—

“(A) food of poor nutritional quality, and

“(B) brands that are primarily associated with food of poor nutritional quality.

“(2) NAM REPORT.—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this section, the National Academy of Medicine shall submit to the Secretary a report that establishes the proposed procedures described in paragraph (1).

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) BRAND.—The term ‘brand’ means a corporate or product name, a business image,

or a mark, regardless of whether it may legally qualify as a trademark, used by a seller or manufacturer to identify goods or services and to distinguish them from the goods of a competitor.

“(2) CHILD.—The term ‘child’ means an individual who is age 14 or under.

“(3) FOOD.—The term ‘food’ shall include beverages, candy, and chewing gum.

“(d) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Federal Trade Commission and based on the report prepared by the National Academy of Medicine pursuant to subsection (b)(2), shall promulgate such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section, including regulations defining the terms ‘marketing’, ‘directed at children’, ‘food of poor nutritional quality’, and ‘brand primarily associated with food of poor nutritional quality’ for purposes of this section.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such part IX is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 280I. Denial of deduction for advertising and marketing directed at children to promote the consumption of food of poor nutritional quality.”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning 24 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR THE FRESH FRUIT AND VEGETABLE PROGRAM.—In addition to any other amounts made available to carry out the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program under section 19 of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1769a), the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary’s delegate) shall, on an annual basis, transfer to such program, from amounts in the general fund of the Treasury of the United States, an amount determined by the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary’s delegate) to be equal to the increase in revenue for the preceding 12-month period by reason of the amendments made by subsection (b).

SA 3228. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. 121 . GRASS-FED LABELING OF CERTAIN MEAT PRODUCTS.

Subtitle A of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621 et seq.) (as amended by section 10102(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 210B. GRASS-FED LABELING OF CERTAIN MEAT PRODUCTS.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) COVERED PRODUCT.—The term ‘covered product’ means a beef product, a lamb product, a goat product, and a bison product.

“(2) NONTHERAPEUTIC.—The term ‘nontherapeutic’, with respect to an antibiotic, hormone, or other drug, means administration of the drug to an animal for purposes other than individualized disease treatment or nonroutine disease control, such as

growth promotion, feed efficiency, weight gain, or disease prevention.

“(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF STANDARD.—The Secretary shall establish a standard for the use of the claim ‘grass-fed’ on covered product labels relating to the raising of animals for the covered products.

“(c) REQUIREMENTS.—In the standard established under subsection (b), the term ‘grass fed’, or any substantially similar word or phrase, shall not be used on the label of any covered product unless the person making the claim submits and continues to submit not less than once every 15 months to the Secretary a certificate indicating that a qualified auditor has determined that all producers supplying animals for the covered product are in compliance with the following standards:

“(1) The animal is not confined to a feedlot at any point in their life from birth to slaughter.

“(2) The animal is not treated with nontherapeutic antibiotics or hormones from birth to slaughter.

“(3) The animal is not fed any diet other than grass or forage after being weaned from the milk of the applicable animal until slaughter.

“(4) The animal is provided continuous access to pasture during the grazing season from weaning until slaughter.”.

SA 3229. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 125 . FOOD DATE LABELING.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTERING SECRETARIES.—The term ‘administering Secretaries’ means—

(A) with respect to products described in paragraph (4)(A), the Secretary; and

(B) with respect to products described in paragraph (4)(B), the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(2) FOOD LABELER.—The term ‘food labeler’ means the producer, manufacturer, distributor, or retailer that places a date label on food packaging of a product.

(3) QUALITY DATE.—The term ‘quality date’ means a date voluntarily printed on food packaging that is intended to communicate to consumers the date after which the quality of the product may begin to deteriorate, but the product remains apparently wholesome food (as defined in section 22(b) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1791(b))).

(4) READY-TO-EAT PRODUCT.—The term ‘ready-to-eat product’ means—

(A) with respect to a product under the jurisdiction of the Secretary, a product that—

(i) is in a form that is edible without additional preparation to achieve food safety and may receive additional preparation for palatability or aesthetic, epicurean, gastronomic, or culinary purposes; and

(ii) is—

(I) a poultry product (as defined in section 4 of the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 453));

(II) a meat food product (as defined in section 1 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 601)); or

(III) an egg product (as defined in section 4 of the Egg Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 1033)); and

(B) with respect to a food (as defined in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321)) under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Health and Human Services—

(i) a food that is normally eaten in its raw state; or

(ii) any other food, including a processed food, for which it is reasonably foreseeable that the food will be eaten without further processing that would significantly minimize biological hazards.

(5) SAFETY DATE.—The term ‘safety date’ means a date printed on food packaging of a high-risk ready-to-eat product, which signifies the end of the estimated period of shelf life under any stated storage conditions, after which the product may pose a health safety risk.

(b) QUALITY DATES AND SAFETY DATES.—

(1) QUALITY DATES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If a food labeler includes a quality date on food packaging, the label shall use the uniform quality date label phrase under subparagraph (B).

(B) UNIFORM PHRASE.—The uniform quality date label phrase under this paragraph shall be “BEST If Used By”, unless and until the administering Secretaries, acting jointly, specify through rulemaking another uniform phrase to be used for purposes of complying with subparagraph (A).

(C) OPTION OF LABELER.—The decision to include a quality date on food packaging shall be at the discretion of the food labeler.

(2) SAFETY DATES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The label of a ready-to-eat product that meets the criteria established under subparagraph (C)(i) shall include a safety date determined under subparagraph (C)(ii) that is immediately preceded by the uniform safety date label phrase under subparagraph (B).

(B) UNIFORM PHRASE.—The uniform safety date label phrase under this paragraph shall be “USE By”, unless and until the administering Secretaries jointly specify through rulemaking another uniform phrase to be used for purposes of complying with subparagraph (A).

(C) HIGH-RISK READY-TO-EAT PRODUCTS.—The administering Secretaries, acting jointly, shall issue guidance—

(i) establishing criteria for determining the conditions under which ready-to-eat products may have a high level of risk associated with consumption after a certain date; and

(ii) for determining safety dates for high-risk ready-to-eat products described in clause (i).

(3) QUALITY DATE AND SAFETY DATE LABELING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The quality date and safety date, as applicable, and immediately adjacent uniform quality date label phrase or safety date label phrase shall be—

(i) in single easy-to-read type style; and

(ii) located in a conspicuous place on the package of the food.

(B) DATE FORMAT.—Each quality date and safety date shall be stated in terms of day and month and, as appropriate, year.

(C) ABBREVIATIONS.—A food labeler may use a standard abbreviation of “BB” and “UB” for the quality date and safety date, respectively, only if the food packaging is too small to include the uniform phrase described in paragraph (1)(B) or (2)(B), as applicable.

(D) FREEZE BY.—A food labeler may add “or Freeze By” following a quality date or safety date uniform phrase described in paragraph (1)(B) or (2)(B), as applicable.

(4) SALE OR DONATION AFTER QUALITY DATE.—The sale, donation, or use of any product shall not be prohibited based on passage of the quality date of the product.

(5) EDUCATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the administering Secretaries, acting jointly, shall provide consumer education and outreach on the meaning of quality date and safety date food labels.

(6) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION; PREEMPTION.—

(A) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section prohibits any State or political subdivision of a State from establishing or continuing in effect any requirement that prohibits the sale or donation of foods based on passage of the safety date.

(B) PREEMPTION.—No State or political subdivision of a State may establish or continue in effect any requirement that—

(i) relates to the inclusion in food labeling of a quality date or a safety date that is different from or in addition to, or that is otherwise not identical with, the requirements under this section; or

(ii) prohibits the sale or donation of foods based on passage of the quality date.

(C) ENFORCEMENT.—The administering Secretaries, acting jointly and in coordination with the Federal Trade Commission, shall ensure that the uniform quality date label phrase and uniform safety date label phrase are standardized across all food products.

(D) SAVINGS.—Nothing in this section, any amendment made by this section, or any standard or requirement imposed pursuant to this section preempts, displaces, or supplants any State or Federal common law rights or any State or Federal statute creating a remedy for civil relief, including those for civil damage, or a penalty for criminal conduct.

(7) TIME TEMPERATURE INDICATOR LABELS.—Nothing in this subsection prohibits or restricts the use of time-temperature indicator labels or similar technology that is consistent with the requirements of this section.

(C) MISBRANDING VIOLATION FOR QUALITY DATES AND SAFETY DATES IN FOOD LABELING.—

(1) FDA VIOLATIONS.—Section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 343) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(z) if its labeling is in violation of section 402 of the Food Recovery Act of 2017 (relating to quality dates and safety dates).”

(2) POULTRY PRODUCTS.—Section 4(h) of the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 453(h)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (11), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (12), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(13) if it does not bear a label in accordance with section 402 of the Food Recovery Act of 2017.”

(3) MEAT PRODUCTS.—Section 1(n) of the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 601(n)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (11), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (12), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(13) if it does not bear a label in accordance with section 402 of the Food Recovery Act of 2017.”

(4) EGG PRODUCTS.—Section 7(b) of the Egg Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 1036(b)) is amended in the first sentence by adding before the period at the end “or if it does not bear a label in accordance with section 402 of the Food Recovery Act of 2017”.

(d) REGULATIONS AND GUIDANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the administering Secretaries, acting jointly, shall—

(A) promulgate final regulations for carrying out this section and the amendments

made by this section (other than subsection (b)(2)(C)); and

(B) issue the guidance required by subsection (b)(2)(C).

(2) UPDATES TO GUIDANCE.—Not less frequently than once every 4 years, the administering Secretaries, acting jointly, shall review and, as the administering Secretaries determine to be appropriate, update the guidance required by subsection (b)(2)(C).

(e) DELAYED APPLICABILITY.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall apply only with respect to food products that are labeled on or after the date that is 2 years after the date on which final regulations are promulgated under subsection (d)(1)(A).

(f) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the administering Secretaries, acting jointly, shall report to the appropriate committees of Congress on rates of compliance of food labelers with the food date labeling requirements under this section and the amendments made by this section.

SA 3230. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 127, strike lines 4 through 7 and insert the following:

(6) in subsection (i)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking “\$20,000 per year or \$80,000 during any 6-year period” and inserting “\$160,000 during the period of fiscal years 2019 through 2023”;

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) ALLOCATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, the Secretary shall allocate payments to States for the purposes described in paragraph (1) in accordance with subparagraph (B).

“(B) DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall determine the allocation to a State under this subsection based on—

“(i) the certified and transitioning organic operations in the State;

“(ii) the organic acreage of the State; and

“(iii) historical data on organic and transitioning participation within the program.”; and

SA 3231. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. ENZI, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 63, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SEC. 1704. DEFINITION OF SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION OF ACTIVE PERSONAL MANAGEMENT.

Section 1001(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION OF ACTIVE PERSONAL MANAGEMENT.—The term ‘significant contribution of active personal management’ means active personal management activities performed by a person with a direct or indirect ownership interest in the farming operation on a regular, continuous, and substantial basis to the farming operation, and that meet at least one of the following to be considered significant:

“(A) Are performed for at least 25 percent of the total management hours required for the farming operation on an annual basis.

“(B) Are performed for at least 500 hours annually for the farming operation.”

SEC. 1705. ACTIVELY ENGAGED IN FARMING REQUIREMENT.

Section 1001A(b) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308-1(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) ACTIVELY ENGAGED IN FARMING REQUIREMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, section 1001, and sections 1001B through 1001F, and any regulations to implement those provisions or sections, the Secretary shall consider not more than 1 person or legal entity per farming operation to be actively engaged in farming using active personal management.

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary may only consider a person or legal entity to be actively engaged in farming using active personal management under subparagraph (A) if the person or legal entity—

“(i) together with other persons or legal entities in the farming operation qualifying as actively engaged in farming under subsection (b)(2), does not collectively receive, directly or indirectly, an amount equal to more than the limitation under section 1001(b);

“(ii) does not use the active management contribution allowed under this section to qualify as actively engaged in farming in more than 1 farming operation; and

“(iii) manages a farming operation that does not substantially share equipment, labor, or management with persons or legal entities that, together with the person or legal entity, collectively receive, directly or indirectly, an amount equal to more than the limitation under section 1001(b).”

On page 366, line 6, strike “\$20,000,000” and insert “\$23,000,000”.

On page 366, line 8, strike “\$23,000,000” and insert “\$35,000,000”.

On page 366, line 10, strike “\$24,000,000” and insert “\$35,000,000”.

On page 366, line 12, strike “\$25,000,000” and insert “\$35,000,000”.

On page 366, line 14, strike “\$25,000,000” and insert “\$35,000,000”.

SA 3232. Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle F of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 86. STREAMLINING THE FOREST SERVICE PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY LOCATION APPLICATIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY.—The term “communications facility” includes—

(A) any infrastructure, including any transmitting device, tower, or support structure, and any equipment, switches, wiring, cabling, power sources, shelters, or cabinets, associated with the licensed or permitted unlicensed wireless or wireline transmission of writings, signs, signals, data, images, pictures, and sounds of all kinds; and

(B) any antenna or apparatus that is—

(i) designed for the purpose of emitting radio frequency;

(ii) (I) designed to be operated, or is operating, from a fixed location pursuant to authorization by the Federal Communications Commission; or

(II) using duly authorized devices that do not require individual licenses; and

(iii) is added to a tower, building, or other structure.

(2) COMMUNICATIONS SITE.—The term “communications site” means an area of covered land designated for communications uses.

(3) COMMUNICATIONS USE.—The term “communications use” means the placement and operation of communications facility.

(4) COMMUNICATIONS USE AUTHORIZATION.—The term “communications use authorization” means an easement, right-of-way, lease, license, or other authorization to locate or modify a communications facility on covered land by the Forest Service for the primary purpose of authorizing the occupancy and use of the covered land for communications use.

(5) COVERED LAND.—The term “covered land” means National Forest System land.

(6) ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT.—The term “organizational unit”, with respect to the Forest Service, means—

(A) a regional office;

(B) the headquarters;

(C) a management unit; or

(D) a ranger district office.

(7) SPECIAL ACCOUNT.—The term “special account” means the special account established for the Forest Service under subsection (f)(1).

(b) REGULATIONS.—Notwithstanding section 6409 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1455) or section 606 of the Repack Airwaves Yielding Better Access for Users of Modern Services Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-141), not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations—

(1) to streamline the process for considering applications to locate or modify communications facilities on covered land;

(2) to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that the process is uniform and standardized across the organizational units of the Forest Service; and

(3) to require that the applications described in paragraph (1) be considered and granted on a competitively neutral, technology neutral, and nondiscriminatory basis.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—The regulations promulgated under subsection (b) shall—

(1) include procedures for the tracking of applications described in subsection (b)(1), including—

(A) identifying the number of applications—

(i) received;

(ii) approved; and

(iii) denied;

(B) in the case of an application that is denied, describing the reasons for the denial; and

(C) describing the period of time between the receipt of an application and the issuance of a final decision on an application;

(2) provide for minimum lease terms of not less than 15 years for leases with respect to the location of communications facilities on covered land;

(3) include a procedure under which a communications use authorization renews automatically on expiration, unless the communications use authorization is revoked for good cause;

(4) include a structure of fees for—

(A) submitting an application described in subsection (b)(1), based on the cost to the Forest Service of considering such an application; and

(B) issuing communications use authorizations, based on the cost to the Forest Service of any maintenance or other activities required to be performed by the Forest Service as a result of the location or modification of the communications facility;

(5) provide that if the Forest Service does not grant or deny an application described in subsection (b)(1) by the deadline described in section 6409(b)(3)(A) of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1455(b)(3)(A)), the Forest Service shall be deemed to have granted the application; and

(6) provide for prioritization or streamlining of the consideration of applications to locate or modify communications facilities on covered land in a previously disturbed right-of-way.

(d) ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS.—In promulgating regulations under subsection (b), the Secretary shall consider—

(1) how discrete reviews in considering an application described in paragraph (1) of that subsection can be conducted simultaneously, rather than sequentially, by any organizational units of the Forest Service that must approve the location or modification; and

(2) how to eliminate overlapping requirements among the organizational units of the Forest Service with respect to the location or modification of a communications facility on covered land administered by those organizational units.

(e) COMMUNICATION OF STREAMLINED PROCESS TO ORGANIZATIONAL UNITS.—With respect to the regulations promulgated under subsection (b), the Secretary shall—

(1) communicate the regulations to the organizational units of the Forest Service; and

(2) ensure that the organizational units of the Forest Service follow the regulations.

(f) DEPOSIT AND AVAILABILITY OF FEES.—

(1) SPECIAL ACCOUNT.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall establish a special account in the Treasury for the Forest Service for the deposit of fees collected by the Forest Service under subsection (c)(4) for communications use authorizations on covered land granted, issued, or executed by the Forest Service.

(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR FEES COLLECTED.—Fees collected by the Forest Service under paragraph (4) of subsection (c) shall be—

(A) based on the costs described in that paragraph; and

(B) competitively neutral, technology neutral, and nondiscriminatory with respect to other users of the communications site.

(3) DEPOSIT OF FEES.—Fees collected by the Forest Service under subsection (c)(4) shall be deposited in the special account.

(4) AVAILABILITY OF FEES.—Amounts deposited in the special account shall be available, to the extent and in such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriation Acts, to the Secretary to cover costs incurred by the Forest Service described in subsection (c)(4), including—

(A) preparing needs assessments or other programmatic analyses necessary to designate communications sites and issue communications use authorizations;

(B) developing management plans for communications sites;

(C) training for management of communications sites; and

(D) obtaining or improving access to communications sites.

(5) NO ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED.—Except as provided in paragraph (4), no other amounts are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section.

(g) SAVINGS PROVISIONS.—

(1) REAL PROPERTY AUTHORITIES.—Nothing in this section provides any executive agency with any new leasing or other real property authorities not in existence before the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section, including any action taken pursuant to this section, impacts a decision or determination by any executive agency to sell, dispose of, declare excess or surplus, lease, reuse, or redevelop any Federal real property pursuant to title 40, United States Code, the Federal Assets Sale and Transfer Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-287; 40 U.S.C. 1303 note), or any other law governing real property activities of the Federal Government.

(B) AGREEMENTS.—No agreement entered into pursuant to this section obligates the Federal Government to hold, control, or otherwise retain or use real property that may otherwise be deemed as excess, surplus, or that could otherwise be sold, leased, or redeveloped.

SA 3233. Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle F of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 86 FOREST PLAN AMENDMENTS.

Section 6(d) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) CONSULTATION WITH SECRETARIES OF THE INTERIOR AND COMMERCE.—

“(A) DEFINITION OF NEW, SIGNIFICANT INFORMATION.—In this paragraph, the term ‘new, significant information’ means new, significant information relevant to the listing of a species as threatened or endangered, or the designation of critical habitat pursuant to the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) on a unit of the National Forest System covered by a land management plan under this section.

“(B) CONSULTATION.—If appropriate or on request of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Commerce, as appropriate, if new, significant information becomes available to the Secretary, the Secretary, in accordance with applicable regulations, shall consult with the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Commerce, as applicable, for the sole purpose of assessing whether the new, significant information indicates that the applicable land management plan should be amended or revised.

“(C) APPLICATION.—The consultation under subparagraph (B) shall not be subject to—

“(i) section 7(d) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536(d)); or

“(ii) judicial review.”

SA 3234. Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for

the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 62 . USE OF ASSISTANCE FOR DEPLOYMENT OF BROADBAND INFRASTRUCTURE.

Title VI of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 950bb et seq.) (as amended by section 6208) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 606. USE OF ASSISTANCE FOR DEPLOYMENT OF BROADBAND INFRASTRUCTURE.

“(a) DEFINITION OF QUALIFYING BROADBAND-CAPABLE INFRASTRUCTURE.—In this section, the term ‘qualifying broadband-capable infrastructure’ means fixed broadband-capable infrastructure—

“(1) used by a service provider to provide fixed broadband service for which the service provider receives universal service support under section 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 254), if—

“(A) the broadband service satisfies any applicable broadband speed standards under that section and the regulations issued under that section; or

“(B) the service provider is in compliance with buildout obligations to provide retail fixed broadband service that will comply with applicable broadband speed standards described in subparagraph (A); or

“(2) that—

“(A) was financed with funds provided by the Secretary under this Act or any other program carried out by the Secretary for the costs of the construction, improvement, or acquisition of facilities or equipment for the purpose of providing fixed telecommunications or broadband service; and

“(B)(i) is used to provide fixed broadband service, if—

“(I) the broadband service satisfies any applicable broadband speed standards established by the Secretary; or

“(II) the service provider is in compliance with buildout obligations to provide retail fixed broadband service that will comply with applicable broadband speed standards described in subclause (I); or

“(ii) was financed with a loan under this Act or any other program carried out by the Secretary that remains outstanding.

“(b) RESTRICTION ON USE OF ASSISTANCE.—A loan, grant, or other assistance awarded under this Act, or by the rural development mission area under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1921 et seq.), may not be used to coordinate, approve, or finance the deployment of broadband-capable infrastructure by a service provider to provide retail fixed broadband service that would overbuild or otherwise duplicate qualifying broadband-capable infrastructure that another service provider is using to provide retail fixed broadband service in the same area.

“(c) USE OF ASSISTANCE IN UNSERVED AREAS.—A loan, grant, or other assistance provided by the Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Rural Utilities Service, to coordinate, approve, or finance the deployment of broadband-capable infrastructure by a service provider may be used to provide retail fixed broadband service in an area in which there is no qualifying broadband-capable infrastructure owned or operated by another service provider.”.

SA 3235. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr.

ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle F of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 863 . COLLABORATIVE PROJECTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COLLABORATIVE PROCESS.—The term “collaborative process” means the process described in section 603(b)(1)(C) of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6591b(b)(1)(C)).

(2) LEAD OBJECTOR.—The term “lead objector”, with respect to a filed objection that lists multiple individuals or entities, means, as applicable, the individual or entity—

(A) identified on the objection as the representative of all other objectors for the purposes of communication, written or otherwise, regarding the objection; or

(B) designated under subsection (d)(1)(B)(ii).

(3) PROJECT.—The term “project” means any project carried out by the Chief of the Forest Service that is developed through a collaborative process, including—

(A) an authorized hazardous fuel reduction project under section 102 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6512); and

(B) the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program under section 4003(b) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (16 U.S.C. 7303(b)).

(b) CIVIL ACTION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an individual or entity that files a predecisional administrative objection to a project, or any portion of a project, may only commence a civil action for review of the project, subject to subsection (d).

(c) TREATMENT OF COLLABORATIVE MEMBERS.—For purposes of a civil action for review of a project commenced under subsection (b), any individual or entity that is recognized by the Secretary as a member of the collaborative process for that project shall be—

(1) entitled to intervene, as of right, in any subsequent civil action; and

(2) considered to be a full participant in any settlement negotiation regarding the project.

(d) ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES.—

(1) MEETINGS REQUIRED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, subject to subparagraph (C), on request by the Secretary, an individual or entity or lead objector that files a predecisional administrative objection regarding a project, or any portion of a project, shall publicly meet with the Secretary to resolve the objection before filing a petition for review of the project with a court of competent jurisdiction.

(B) MULTIPLE OBJECTORS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—If multiple individuals or entities are listed on an objection, on request for a meeting under subparagraph (A), identification of the lead objector shall be provided to the Secretary.

(ii) DESIGNATION OF LEAD OBJECTOR.—If identification of the lead objector is not provided under clause (i), the Secretary shall designate the lead objector.

(C) TELEPHONE CONFERENCES.—The Secretary may elect, on a limited, case-by-case basis, to hold a meeting under subparagraph (A) through a telephone conference call, if the Secretary determines an in-person meeting to be impracticable.

(D) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—The Secretary shall provide to each individual or entity that is recognized by the Secretary as a member of the collaborative process—

(i) notice that a public meeting has been scheduled under subparagraph (A); and

(ii) an opportunity to comment at that public meeting.

(2) AUTHORITY TO DISMISS.—The Secretary shall dismiss any predecisional administrative objection if an objector or lead objector fails to appear for a meeting scheduled under paragraph (1)(A).

(3) TREATMENT.—If an objection is dismissed under paragraph (2), each individual or entity that filed the objection shall be—

(A) considered to have failed to exhaust administrative remedies; and

(B) ineligible to seek judicial review of the applicable project.

SA 3236. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 84 . INJUNCTIONS FOR AGENCY ACTIONS UNDER COLLABORATIVELY DEVELOPED FOREST PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VI of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6591 et seq.) (as amended by section 861(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 607. INJUNCTIONS FOR AGENCY ACTIONS UNDER COLLABORATIVELY DEVELOPED FOREST PROJECTS.

“A court may not enjoin an agency action under a collaboratively developed forest project carried out under this Act, section 4003 of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (16 U.S.C. 7303), or any other applicable law, unless the court determines that the plaintiff has demonstrated that the claim is likely to succeed on the merits.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6501 note; Public Law 108-148) (as amended by section 861(b)) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 606 the following:

“Sec. 607. Injunctions for agency actions under collaboratively developed forest projects.”.

SA 3237. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part I of subtitle F of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 861 . EMERGENCY SITUATION DETERMINATIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) EMERGENCY ACTION.—The term “emergency action” means an action carried out pursuant to an emergency situation determination.

(2) EMERGENCY SITUATION.—The term “emergency situation” means a situation on

National Forest System land for which immediate implementation of a decision is necessary to mitigate harm to life, property, or important natural or cultural resources on National Forest System land or adjacent land.

(3) **EMERGENCY SITUATION DETERMINATION.**—The term “emergency situation determination” means a determination that an emergency situation exists.

(4) **LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—The term “land and resource management plan” means a plan developed under section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604).

(5) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service.

(b) **AUTHORIZED EMERGENCY ACTIONS TO RESPOND TO EMERGENCY SITUATIONS.**—

(1) **AUTHORIZED EMERGENCY ACTIONS.**—After making an emergency situation determination with respect to National Forest System land, the Secretary may carry out emergency actions on that National Forest System land, including through—

(A) the salvage of dead or dying trees;

(B) the harvest of trees damaged by wind or ice;

(C) the commercial and noncommercial sanitation harvest of trees to control insects or disease;

(D) the felling and harvest of trees infested with insects or disease;

(E) the construction or reconstruction of existing utility lines; and

(F) replacing underground cables.

(2) **RELATION TO LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS.**—To the maximum extent practicable, an emergency action carried out under paragraph (1) shall be conducted consistent with the land and resource management plan.

(c) **ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS.**—

(1) **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.**—If the Secretary determines that an emergency action requires an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement pursuant to section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)), the Secretary shall study, develop, and describe—

(A) the proposed agency action; and

(B) the alternative of no action.

(2) **PUBLIC NOTICE.**—The Secretary shall provide notice of each emergency action that the Secretary determines requires an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement under paragraph (1), in accordance with applicable regulations and administrative guidelines.

(3) **PUBLIC COMMENT.**—The Secretary shall provide an opportunity for public comment during the preparation of any environmental assessment or environmental impact statement under paragraph (1).

(4) **SAVINGS CLAUSE.**—Nothing in this subsection prohibits the Secretary from making an emergency situation determination, including a determination that an emergency exists pursuant to section 220.4(b) of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), that makes it necessary to take an emergency action before preparing an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(d) **ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OF EMERGENCY ACTIONS.**—An emergency action carried out under this section shall not be subject to objection under the predecisional administrative review processes established under section 105 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6515) and section 428 of the Department of the Interior, Environ-

ment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012 (16 U.S.C. 6515 note; Public Law 112-74).

(e) **JUDICIAL REVIEW OF EMERGENCY ACTIONS.**—

(1) **JUDICIAL REVIEW OF PROJECTS.**—Section 106 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6516) shall apply to an emergency action carried out under this section.

(2) **INJUNCTIONS.**—A court of competent jurisdiction may not enjoin an emergency action based solely on a finding by the court that—

(A) an environmental assessment was improperly prepared in lieu of an environmental impact statement for the emergency action; or

(B) any other procedural error was made with respect to the environmental analysis or implementation of the emergency action.

(f) **ENVIRONMENTAL AND JUDICIAL REVIEW OF EMERGENCY SITUATION DETERMINATIONS.**—An emergency situation determination under this section shall not be subject to—

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

(2) judicial review.

SA 3238. Ms. SMITH (for herself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 125 . BUY AMERICAN REQUIREMENTS.

The Secretary shall—

(1) fully enforce the Buy American requirements applicable to domestic food assistance programs administered by the Food and Nutrition Service; and

(2) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to Congress a report on the actions the Secretary has taken to comply with paragraph (1).

SA 3239. Mr. KING (for himself, Mr. DAINES, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part III of subtitle F of title VIII, add following:

SEC. 864 . INSTITUTIONAL MASS TIMBER BUILDING COMPETITION.

Subject to the availability of appropriations, not less frequently than once each fiscal year during the period of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, the Secretary shall carry out a competition for a mass timber building design or other innovative wood product demonstration at or relating to institutions of higher education, in accordance with section 24 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3719).

SA 3240. Mr. HEINRICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr.

ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 7209(a), strike the closing quotation marks and the following period at the end and insert the following:

“(15) **RANGELAND SOIL HEALTH RESEARCH.**—Research and extension grants may be used to improve the scientific understanding of methods to improve rangeland soil health and to increase the carbon content of rangeland soil by developing new technologies and methods for producers to better manage and promote soil health.”

SA 3241. Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. DAINES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 2503, add at the end the following:

(g) **ADMINISTRATION OF CONSERVATION PROGRAMS ON PUBLICLY OWNED LAND.**—Section 1244 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3844) (as amended by subsection (f)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(q) **ADMINISTRATION OF CONSERVATION PROGRAMS ON FEDERAL LAND.**—

“(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection:

“(A) **FEDERAL LAND.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘Federal land’ means land owned by the Federal Government.

“(ii) **EXCLUSION.**—The term ‘Federal land’ does not include land held in trust for an Indian tribe.

“(B) **PUBLICLY OWNED LAND.**—The term ‘publicly owned land’ means land owned by the Federal Government, a State, or a unit of local government.

“(2) **ELIGIBLE LAND FOR CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the following land shall be eligible for enrollment in any conservation program administered by the Secretary:

“(A) Privately owned land.

“(B) Publicly owned land, if—

“(i) the land is a working component of an agricultural or forestry operation of a producer under the applicable conservation program;

“(ii) a producer under the applicable conservation program has control of the land for the term of the contract under that program; and

“(iii) the conservation practices to be implemented on the publicly owned land are necessary and will contribute to an improvement in an identified resource concern, as determined by the Secretary.

“(C) Tribal land.

“(3) **CONTRACTS.**—The Secretary may enter into a contract with a soil and water conservation district or another local partner, as determined by the Secretary, to coordinate projects under conservation programs administered by the Secretary on publicly owned land, in accordance with paragraph (2)(B).

“(4) **FEDERAL LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCY COLLABORATION.**—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal agency that manages Federal land enrolled in a conservation program administered by the Secretary may contribute matching funds or other in-kind contributions to the conservation project carried out on that land.

“(B) USE OF MATCHING FUNDS.—Matching funds provided by a Federal agency under subparagraph (A) may be used by the Secretary or a local partner, including a soil and water conservation district, for costs relating to planning or technical assistance.”.

SA 3242. Mr. JONES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In subtitle C of title V, add at the end the following:

SEC. 53 . REFINANCING OF CERTAIN RURAL HOSPITAL DEBT.

Subtitle D of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act is amended by inserting after section 374 (7 U.S.C. 2008i) the following:

“SEC. 375. REFINANCING OF CERTAIN RURAL HOSPITAL DEBT.

“Assistance under section 306(a) for a community facility or under section 310B may include the refinancing of a debt obligation of a rural hospital as an eligible loan or loan guarantee purpose if the assistance would—

“(1) help preserve access to a health service in a rural community; and

“(2) meaningfully improve the financial position of the hospital.”.

SA 3243. Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. CORKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title III, add the following:

SEC. 31 . INCREASED SUPPORT FOR ELIGIBLE ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 202(e)(1) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1722(e)(1)) is amended in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking “20 percent” and inserting “25 percent”.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the amendment made by subsection (a) is intended to support—

(1) monetization replacement activities; and

(2) an expansion of market-based food assistance modalities, such as food vouchers or local and regional procurement of commodities.

SA 3244. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture

through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 7131 and insert the following:

SEC. 7131. SPECIAL AUTHORIZATION FOR BIOSECURITY PLANNING AND RESPONSE.

Section 1484 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3351) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “and cooperative agreements” after “competitive grants”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting “and cooperative agreements” after “competitive grants”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) To coordinate the tactical science and educational activities of the Research, Education, and Economics mission area of the Department of Agriculture that protect the integrity, reliability, sustainability, and profitability of the food and agricultural system of the United States against biosecurity threats from pests, diseases, contaminants, and disasters.”.

SA 3245. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title I, add the following:

SEC. 17 . STORAGE FACILITY LOANS.

Section 1614(a) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8789(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking the subsection designation and all that follows through “As soon as” and inserting the following:

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) INCLUSION.—Funds under the storage facility loan program under paragraph (1) may be used to construct or upgrade temporary refrigerated beehive storage facilities.”.

SA 3246. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 637, strike lines 11 and 12 and insert the following:

(4) in subsection (e)(2)—

(A) by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$2,000,000”; and

(B) by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SA 3247. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr.

ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 8634 (relating to prairie dogs) and insert the following:

SEC. 8634. PRAIRIE DOGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the grasslands plan guidance of the Forest Service relating to prairie dogs, the Chief of the Forest Service shall base policies of the Forest Service on sound ecological and livestock management principles.

(b) GRAZING ALLOTMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Chief of the Forest Service shall permit prairie dogs to occupy not more than 2.5 percent of each total grazing allotment acreage.

(2) REQUIREMENT.—Paragraph (1) shall apply only to grazing allotments where prairie dogs are or have previously been present as of the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 3248. Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. SASSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES REPEAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The final rule issued by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of the Army entitled “Clean Water Rule: Definition of ‘Waters of the United States’” (80 Fed. Reg. 37054 (June 29, 2015)) is void.

(b) EFFECT.—Until such time as the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of the Army issue a final rule after the date of enactment of this Act defining the scope of waters protected under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) and that final rule goes into effect, any regulation or policy revised under, or otherwise affected as a result of, the rule voided by this section shall be applied as if the voided rule had not been issued.

SA 3249. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES AND NAVIGABLE WATERS.

(a) WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES RULE REPEAL.—The final rule issued by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of the Army entitled “Clean Water Rule: Definition of

'Waters of the United States'' (80 Fed. Reg. 37054 (June 29, 2015)) is repealed.

(b) NAVIGABLE WATERS DEFINITION.—Section 502 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1362) is amended by striking paragraph (7) and inserting the following:

“(7) NAVIGABLE WATERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘navigable waters’ means—

“(i) the territorial seas;

“(ii) interstate waters that are used, or are susceptible to use in the natural and ordinary condition of those waters, as a means to transport interstate or foreign commerce;

“(iii) relatively permanent, standing, or continuously flowing bodies of water that form geographical features commonly known as streams, rivers, or lakes, that flow directly into waters described in clause (ii); and

“(iv) wetlands that have a continuous surface water connection to waters described in clause (ii) or (iii).

“(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term ‘navigable waters’ does not include—

“(i) intermittent or ephemeral waters;

“(ii) subsurface waters, including groundwater or underground streams;

“(iii) intrastate waters, unless the waters meet the requirements described in subparagraph (A);

“(iv) a man-made channel or ditch, including irrigation, distribution, and drainage systems;

“(v) waters that require the use of means beyond visual inspection by the naked eye, including aerial photographs, satellite imaging, or hydrological testing, to determine if the waters meet the requirements described in subparagraph (A);

“(vi) prior converted cropland;

“(vii) waste treatment systems, including systems created in or with impounded waters described in subparagraph (A) and all features and components of any system designed to actively or passively retain or reduce or remove pollutants from wastewater or stormwater, including those features or components that convey the pollutants into and out of the system; or

“(viii) any other waters that do not meet the requirements under subparagraph (A), without regard to whether the water—

“(I) previously met or would have met those requirements; or

“(II) may in the future meet those requirements.

“(C) ASSOCIATED DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this paragraph:

“(i) CONTINUOUS SURFACE WATER CONNECTION.—The term ‘continuous surface water connection’ means a connection with respect to which an ordinary person would not be able to visually determine by the naked eye, by looking at the water surface, where 1 body of water ends and the other begins.

“(ii) PRIOR CONVERTED CROPLAND.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘prior converted cropland’ means areas that, prior to December 23, 1985, were drained or otherwise manipulated for the purpose, or having the effect, of making an agricultural product possible, and that are inundated for not more than 14 consecutive days during the growing season.

“(II) INCLUSION.—The term ‘prior converted cropland’ includes agricultural drainage features, including ditches and conveyances, that are the means by which the original conversion from wetlands to cropland took place and that are integral to the continued production of agricultural products by providing drainage or irrigation to maintain productive growing conditions.

“(iii) RELATIVELY PERMANENT, STANDING, OR CONTINUOUSLY FLOWING BODIES OF WATER.—The term ‘relatively permanent, standing, or continuously flowing bodies of

water’ means waters that stand or have continuous flow for not less than 290 days each year, except in cases of extreme events, such as a drought.

“(iv) WETLANDS.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘wetlands’ means areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances does support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions.

“(II) INCLUSION.—The term ‘wetlands’ includes swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas.”

(c) JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION.—Title V of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1361 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 519 (33 U.S.C. 1251 note) as section 520; and

(2) by inserting after section 518 (33 U.S.C. 1377) the following:

“SEC. 519. JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATIONS.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) AFFECTED PERSON.—The term ‘affected person’ means an applicant for a permit under section 402, landowner, or other affected person with an identifiable and substantial legal interest in a property.

“(2) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of the Army.

“(b) BINDING DETERMINATION.—On written request of an affected person, the Secretary shall provide a binding determination of whether the waters on the property of the affected person are navigable waters that meet the requirements described in section 502(7)(A)(iv).

“(c) COSTS.—A determination of the Secretary under subsection (b) shall be made at the cost of the Secretary.

“(d) TIMING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make a determination under subsection (b) not later than 60 days after the date on which the Secretary receives a written request from an affected person.

“(2) EFFECT OF NONRESPONSE.—If the Secretary does not make a determination by the end of the period described in paragraph (1), the waters on the property of the affected person shall not be considered to be navigable waters.

“(e) TERM OF DETERMINATION.—

“(1) FINDING OF NAVIGABLE WATERS.—If the Secretary determines under subsection (b) that the waters on the property of the affected person are navigable waters, the determination shall be binding on the Secretary and the Administrator for a period to be determined by the Secretary, but in any case not longer than 5 years after the date of the determination.

“(2) FINDING OF NONNAVIGABLE WATERS.—If the Secretary determines under subsection (b) that the waters on the property of the affected person are not navigable waters, the determination shall be binding on the Secretary and the Administrator for as long as the affected person has an identifiable and substantial legal interest in the property.

“(f) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An affected person may obtain expedited judicial review of a determination of the Secretary under subsection (b).

“(2) TIMING.—To obtain expedited judicial review under paragraph (1), the affected person shall submit a claim under that paragraph not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary makes the determination under subsection (b).

“(3) JURISDICTION.—A district court of the United States with appropriate venue for the State in which the affected person resides or in which a substantial part of the property of the affected person is located shall have ju-

risdiction over an action under this subsection.”

SA 3250. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____ . PROHIBITION ON MANDATORY OR COMPULSORY CHECKOFF PROGRAMS.

(a) DEFINITION OF CHECKOFF PROGRAM.—In this section, the term “checkoff program” means a program to promote and provide research and information for a particular agricultural commodity without reference to specific producers or brands, including a program carried out under any of the following:

(1) The Cotton Research and Promotion Act (7 U.S.C. 2101 et seq.).

(2) The Potato Research and Promotion Act (7 U.S.C. 2611 et seq.).

(3) The Egg Research and Consumer Information Act (7 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

(4) The Beef Research and Information Act (7 U.S.C. 2901 et seq.).

(5) The Wheat and Wheat Foods Research and Nutrition Education Act (7 U.S.C. 3401 et seq.).

(6) The Floral Research and Consumer Information Act (7 U.S.C. 4301 et seq.).

(7) Subtitle B of the Dairy Production Stabilization Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 4501 et seq.).

(8) The Honey Research, Promotion, and Consumer Information Act (7 U.S.C. 4601 et seq.).

(9) The Pork Promotion, Research, and Consumer Information Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 4801 et seq.).

(10) The Watermelon Research and Promotion Act (7 U.S.C. 4901 et seq.).

(11) The Pecan Promotion and Research Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6001 et seq.).

(12) The Mushroom Promotion, Research, and Consumer Information Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6101 et seq.).

(13) The Lime Research, Promotion, and Consumer Information Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.).

(14) The Soybean Promotion, Research, and Consumer Information Act (7 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.).

(15) The Fluid Milk Promotion Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6401 et seq.).

(16) The Fresh Cut Flowers and Fresh Cut Greens Promotion and Information Act of 1993 (7 U.S.C. 6801 et seq.).

(17) The Sheep Promotion, Research, and Information Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.).

(18) Section 501 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7401).

(19) The Commodity Promotion, Research, and Information Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7411 et seq.).

(20) The Canola and Rapeseed Research, Promotion, and Consumer Information Act (7 U.S.C. 7441 et seq.).

(21) The National Kiwifruit Research, Promotion, and Consumer Information Act (7 U.S.C. 7461 et seq.).

(22) The Popcorn Promotion, Research, and Consumer Information Act (7 U.S.C. 7481 et seq.).

(23) The Hass Avocado Promotion, Research, and Information Act of 2000 (7 U.S.C. 7801 et seq.).

(b) PROHIBITION.—No checkoff program shall be mandatory or compulsory.

(c) VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION.—Producer participation in a checkoff program shall be voluntary at the point of sale.

SA 3251. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike subtitle C of title II and insert the following:

Subtitle C—Repeal of Environmental Quality Incentives Program

SEC. 2301. REPEAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY INCENTIVES PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 4 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa et seq.) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1211(a)(3) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3811(a)(3)) is amended—

(A) by striking subparagraph (A);
(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) through (D) as subparagraphs (A) through (C), respectively; and

(C) in subparagraph (A) (as so redesignated), by striking “any other provision of”.

(2) Section 1221(b)(3) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3821(b)(3)) is amended—

(A) by striking subparagraph (A);
(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) through (D) as subparagraphs (A) through (C), respectively; and

(C) in subparagraph (A) (as so redesignated), by striking “any other provision of”.

(3) Section 1235(e)(1)(D) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3835(e)(1)(D)) (as amended by section 2106(a)(2)) is amended by striking “or the environmental quality incentives program”.

(4) Section 1241(i) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841(i)) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (2); and
(B) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (6) as paragraphs (2) through (5), respectively.

(5) Section 1244 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3844) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c)—
(i) in paragraph (1)(B), by adding “and” at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(iii) by striking paragraph (3); and
(B) in subsection (l), by striking “D and the environmental quality incentives program under chapter 4 of subtitle”.

(6) Section 1271A(1) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3871a(1)) is amended—

(A) by striking subparagraph (B); and
(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (C) and (D) as subparagraphs (B) and (C), respectively.

(7) Section 344(f)(8) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1344(f)(8)) is amended in the proviso of the first sentence by striking “Act, the environmental quality incentives program established under chapter 4 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985,” and inserting “Act”.

(8) Section 377 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1377) is amended in the first proviso by striking “Act or the environmental quality incentives program established under chapter 4 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985;” and inserting “Act”.

(9) The last proviso of the matter under the heading “CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM” under the heading “SOIL BANK PROGRAMS” of

title I of the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration Appropriation Act, 1959 (7 U.S.C. 1831a), is amended by striking “(1) payments” and all that follows through “or (2)”.

(10) Section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) is amended by striking paragraph (1).

(11) Section 1271(c)(3)(C) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 2106a(c)(3)(C)) is amended—

(A) by striking “section, the” and inserting “section and the”; and

(B) by striking “(16 U.S.C. 2101 et seq.)” and all that follows through “or other” and inserting “(16 U.S.C. 2101 et seq.) or any other applicable”.

(12) Section 304 of the Lake Champlain Special Designation Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 1270 note; Public Law 101–596) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (a);

(B) by redesignating subsections (b) through (d) as subsections (a) through (c), respectively; and

(C) in subsection (c) (as so redesignated)—

(i) by striking “(1) There” in paragraph (1) and all that follows through “(2) There” in paragraph (2) and inserting “There”; and

(ii) by striking “(b) and (c)” and inserting “(a) and (b)”.

(13) Section 202 of the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act (43 U.S.C. 1592) is amended by striking subsection (c).

In section 1271A(1) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3871a(1)), redesignate subparagraphs (E) and (F) (as added by section 2411(b)(1)(B)) as subparagraphs (D) and (E), respectively.

In section 2501(a), strike paragraph (4) and insert the following:

(4) by striking paragraph (5).

In section 2501, strike subsection (d) and insert the following:

(d) ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN FARMERS OR RANCHERS FOR CONSERVATION ACCESS.—Section 1241(h) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841(h)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”;
(ii) by striking “funds” and inserting “acres”; and

(iii) by striking “to carry out the environmental quality incentives program and the acres made available for each of such fiscal years”; and

(B) by striking “5 percent” each place it appears and inserting “15 percent”;

(2) by striking paragraph (2); and

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively.

SA 3252. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 6206, strike paragraph (4).

In section 6206, redesignate paragraphs (5) through (10) as paragraphs (4) through (9), respectively.

SA 3253. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricul-

tural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title III, add the following:

SEC. 31 ____. CARGO PREFERENCE.

Section 207 of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1726a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) CARGO PREFERENCE EXEMPTION.—Section 55305(b) of title 46, United States Code, shall not apply to agricultural commodities provided under this title.”.

SA 3254. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 6206(9), strike subparagraph (A) and insert the following:

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “2008 through 2018” and inserting “2019 through 2023”; and

SA 3255. Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 12608, insert the following:

SEC. 12609. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF REGULATIONS.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW.—

(1) PUBLICATION AND SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS OF DRAFT REGULATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, before a regulation prescribed by the Secretary to carry out this Act or any amendment made by this Act may take effect, the Secretary shall—

(i) publish in the Federal Register a list of information on which the regulation is based, including data, scientific and economic studies, and cost-benefit analyses, and identify how the public can access such information online; and

(ii) submit to each House of Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States a report containing—

(I) a copy of the regulation;
(II) a concise general statement relating to the regulation;

(III) a classification of the regulation as a major regulation or nonmajor regulation, including an explanation of the classification specifically addressing each criteria for a major regulation contained within subparagraphs (A) through (C) of subsection (e)(1);

(IV) a list of any other related regulatory actions intended to implement the same provision of or amendment made by this Act, as well as the individual and aggregate economic effects of those actions; and

(V) the proposed effective date of the regulation.

(B) ADDITIONAL SUBMISSIONS.—On the date of the submission of the report under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall submit to

the Comptroller General and make available to each House of Congress—

(i) a complete copy of the cost-benefit analysis of the regulation, if any, including an analysis of any jobs added or lost, differentiating between public and private sector jobs;

(ii) the Secretary's actions pursuant to sections 202, 203, 204, and 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1532, 1533, 1534, 1535); and

(iii) any other relevant information or requirements under any other Act and any relevant Executive orders.

(C) COPIES TO COMMITTEES AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—Upon receipt of a report submitted under subparagraph (A), each House shall provide copies of the report to the chairman and ranking member of each standing committee with jurisdiction under the rules of the House of Representatives or the Senate to report a bill to amend the provision of law under which the regulation is issued and, upon request, any Member of Congress.

(2) REPORT BY GAO.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall provide a report on each major regulation to the committees of jurisdiction by the end of 15 calendar days after the submission or publication date. The report of the Comptroller General shall include an assessment of the Secretary's compliance with procedural steps required by paragraph (1)(B) and an assessment of whether the major regulation imposes any new limits or mandates on private-sector activity.

(B) COOPERATION OF FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Secretary shall cooperate with the Comptroller General by providing information relevant to the Comptroller General's report under subparagraph (A).

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE OF REGULATIONS.—

(A) MAJOR REGULATIONS.—A major regulation relating to a report submitted under subsection (a) shall take effect upon enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in subsection (c) or as provided for in the regulation following enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in subsection (c), whichever is later.

(B) NONMAJOR REGULATIONS.—A nonmajor regulation shall take effect as provided by subsection (d) after submission to Congress under paragraph (1).

(4) PROHIBITION ON SUBSEQUENT CONSIDERATION OF SAME REGULATION.—If a joint resolution of approval relating to a major regulation is not enacted within the period provided in subsection (b)(2), then a joint resolution of approval relating to the same regulation may not be considered under this section in the same Congress by either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

(b) EFFECTIVENESS OF REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A major regulation shall not take effect unless the Congress enacts a joint resolution of approval described under subsection (c).

(2) EFFECT OF NOT ENACTING JOINT RESOLUTION OF APPROVAL.—If a joint resolution of approval described in subsection (c) is not enacted into law by the end of 70 session days or legislative days, as applicable, beginning on the date on which the report referred to in subsection (a)(1)(A) is received by Congress (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), then the regulation described in that resolution shall be deemed not to be approved and such regulation shall not take effect.

(3) TEMPORARY EFFECTIVENESS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section (except subject to subparagraph (C)), a major regulation may take effect for one 90-calendar-day pe-

riod if the President makes a determination under subparagraph (B) and submits written notice of such determination to Congress.

(B) DETERMINATION.—Subparagraph (A) applies to a determination made by the President by Executive order that a major regulation should take effect because such regulation is—

(i) necessary because of an imminent threat to health or safety or other emergency;

(ii) necessary for the enforcement of criminal laws;

(iii) necessary for national security; or

(iv) issued pursuant to any statute implementing an international trade agreement.

(C) EFFECT ON OTHER PROVISIONS.—An exercise by the President of the authority under this paragraph shall have no effect on the procedures under subsection (c).

(4) CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW AROUND ADJOURNMENTS OF CONGRESS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the opportunity for review otherwise provided under this section, in the case of any regulation for which a report was submitted in accordance with subsection (a)(1)(A) during the period beginning on the date occurring—

(i) in the case of the Senate, 60 session days, or

(ii) in the case of the House of Representatives, 60 legislative days,

before the date Congress is scheduled to adjourn a session of Congress through the date on which the same or succeeding Congress first convenes its next session, subsection (c) or (d) shall apply to such rule in the succeeding session of Congress.

(B) SPECIAL RULES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In applying subsections (c) and (d) for purposes of such additional review, a regulation described in subparagraph (A) shall be treated as though—

(I) such regulation were published in the Federal Register on—

(aa) in the case of the Senate, the 15th session day, or

(bb) in the case of the House of Representatives, the 15th legislative day, after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes; and

(II) a report on such regulation were submitted to Congress under subsection (a)(1) on such date.

(ii) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to affect the requirement under subsection (a)(1) that a report shall be submitted to Congress before a regulation can take effect.

(C) EFFECT IN ACCORDANCE WITH LAW.—A regulation described in subparagraph (A) shall take effect as otherwise provided by law (including any other provision of this section).

(c) CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL PROCEDURE FOR MAJOR REGULATIONS.—

(1) JOINT RESOLUTIONS.—

(A) JOINT RESOLUTION DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term "joint resolution" means only a joint resolution addressing a report classifying a regulation as a major regulation pursuant to subsection (a)(1)(A)(i)(III) that—

(i) bears no preamble;

(ii) bears the following title (with blanks filled as appropriate): "Approving the regulation submitted by the Department of Agriculture relating to _____";

(iii) includes after its resolving clause only the following (with blanks filled as appropriate): "That Congress approves the regulation submitted by the Department of Agriculture relating to _____"; and

(iv) is introduced pursuant to subparagraph (B).

(B) INTRODUCTION.—After a House of Congress receives a report classifying a regula-

tion as a major regulation pursuant to subsection (a)(1)(A)(i)(III), the majority leader of that House (or his or her respective designee) shall introduce (by request, if appropriate) a joint resolution described in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the case of the House of Representatives, within 3 legislative days, and

(ii) in the case of the Senate, within 3 session days.

(C) PROHIBITION ON AMENDMENTS.—A joint resolution described in subparagraph (A) shall not be subject to amendment at any stage of proceeding.

(2) REFERRAL.—A joint resolution described in paragraph (1) shall be referred in each House of Congress to the committees having jurisdiction over the provision of law under which the regulation is issued.

(3) DISCHARGE IN SENATE.—In the Senate, if the committee or committees to which a joint resolution described in paragraph (1) has been referred have not reported it at the end of 15 session days after its introduction, such committee or committees shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the resolution and it shall be placed on the calendar. A vote on final passage of the resolution shall be taken on or before the close of the 15th session day after the resolution is reported by the committee or committees to which it was referred, or after such committee or committees have been discharged from further consideration of the resolution.

(4) FLOOR CONSIDERATION IN SENATE.—

(A) MOTIONS TO PROCEED.—In the Senate, when the committee or committees to which a joint resolution is referred have reported, or when a committee or committees are discharged (under paragraph (3)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in paragraph (1), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

(B) DEBATE.—In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 2 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

(C) VOTE ON FINAL PASSAGE.—In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in paragraph (1), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

(D) APPEALS FROM DECISIONS OF CHAIR.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in paragraph (1) shall be decided without debate.

(5) CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—In the House of Representatives, if any committee to which a joint resolution

described in paragraph (1) has been referred has not reported it to the House at the end of 15 legislative days after its introduction, such committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution, and it shall be placed on the appropriate calendar. On the second and fourth Thursdays of each month it shall be in order at any time for the Speaker to recognize a Member who favors passage of a joint resolution that has appeared on the calendar for at least 5 legislative days to call up that joint resolution for immediate consideration in the House without intervention of any point of order. When so called up a joint resolution shall be considered as read and shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered to its passage without intervening motion. It shall not be in order to reconsider the vote on passage. If a vote on final passage of the joint resolution has not been taken by the third Thursday on which the Speaker may recognize a Member under this subsection, such vote shall be taken on that day.

(6) PROCEDURES UPON RECEIPT OF RESOLUTION FROM OTHER HOUSE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If, before passing a joint resolution described in paragraph (1), one House receives from the other a joint resolution having the same text, then—

(i) the joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

(ii) the procedure in the receiving House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House until the vote on passage, when the joint resolution received from the other House shall supplant the joint resolution of the receiving House.

(B) REVENUE MEASURES.—This paragraph shall not apply to the House of Representatives if the joint resolution received from the Senate is a revenue measure.

(7) FINAL VOTE.—If either House has not taken a vote on final passage of the joint resolution by the last day of the period described in subsection (b)(2), then such vote shall be taken on that day.

(8) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—This subsection and subsection (d) are enacted by Congress—

(A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such are deemed to be part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution described in paragraph (1) and superseding other rules only where explicitly so; and

(B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as they relate to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

(d) CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL PROCEDURE FOR NONMAJOR REGULATIONS.—

(1) JOINT RESOLUTION DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term “joint resolution” means only a joint resolution introduced in the period beginning on the date on which the report referred to in subsection (a)(1)(A) is received by Congress and ending 60 days thereafter (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: “That Congress disapproves the nonmajor regulation submitted by the Department of Agriculture relating to _____, and such regulation shall have no force or effect.” (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in).

(2) REFERRAL.—A joint resolution described in paragraph (1) shall be referred to the committees in each House of Congress with jurisdiction.

(3) DISCHARGE IN SENATE.—In the Senate, if the committee to which is referred a joint resolution described in paragraph (1) has not reported such joint resolution (or an identical joint resolution) at the end of 15 session days after the date of introduction of the joint resolution, such committee may be discharged from further consideration of such joint resolution upon a petition supported in writing by 30 Members of the Senate, and such joint resolution shall be placed on the calendar.

(4) FLOOR CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

(A) MOTIONS TO PROCEED.—In the Senate, when the committee to which a joint resolution is referred has reported, or when a committee is discharged (under paragraph (3)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in paragraph (1), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

(B) DEBATE.—In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

(C) VOTE ON FINAL PASSAGE.—In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in paragraph (1), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

(D) APPEALS FROM DECISIONS OF THE CHAIR.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

(5) SPECIAL RULE IN SENATE.—In the Senate, the procedure specified in paragraph (3) or (4) shall not apply to the consideration of a joint resolution respecting a nonmajor regulation—

(A) after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning with the applicable submission or publication date; or

(B) if the report under subsection (a)(1)(A) was submitted during the period referred to in subsection (b)(2), after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning on the 15th session day after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes.

(6) RECEIPT OF RESOLUTION FROM OTHER HOUSE.—If, before the passage by one House of a joint resolution of that House described in paragraph (1), that House receives from the other House a joint resolution described in paragraph (1), then the following procedures shall apply:

(A) The joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

(B) With respect to a joint resolution described in paragraph (1) of the House receiving the joint resolution—

(i) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House; but

(ii) the vote on final passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) MAJOR REGULATION.—The term “major regulation” means any regulation, including an interim final rule, that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget finds has resulted in or is likely to result in—

(A) an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more;

(B) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions; or

(C) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets.

(2) NONMAJOR REGULATION.—The term “nonmajor regulation” means any regulation that is not a major regulation.

(3) REGULATION.—The term “regulation” has the meaning given the term “rule” in section 551 of title 5, United States Code, except that such term does not include—

(A) any rule of particular applicability, including a rule that approves or prescribes for the future rates, wages, prices, services, or allowances therefore, corporate or financial structures, reorganizations, mergers, or acquisitions thereof, or accounting practices or disclosures bearing on any of the foregoing;

(B) any rule relating to agency management or personnel; or

(C) any rule of agency organization, procedure, or practice that does not substantially affect the rights or obligations of non-agency parties.

(4) SUBMISSION OF PUBLICATION DATE.—The term “submission or publication date”, except as otherwise provided in this section, means—

(A) in the case of a major regulation, the date on which Congress receives the report submitted under subsection (a)(1); and

(B) in the case of a nonmajor regulation, the later of—

(i) the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under subsection (a)(1); and

(ii) the date on which the nonmajor regulation is published in the Federal Register, if so published.

(f) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—No determination, finding, action, or omission under this section shall be subject to judicial review.

(2) DETERMINATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), a court may determine whether the Secretary has completed the necessary requirements under this section for a regulation described in subsection (a)(1)(A) to take effect.

(3) EFFECT.—The enactment of a joint resolution of approval under subsection (c) shall not be interpreted to serve as a grant or modification of statutory authority by Congress for the promulgation of a regulation, shall not extinguish or affect any claim, whether substantive or procedural, against any alleged defect in a regulation, and shall not form part of the record before the court in any judicial proceeding concerning a regulation except for purposes of determining whether or not the regulation is in effect.

(g) BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF REGULATIONS.—Section 257(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2

U.S.C. 907(b)(2) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(E) BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF CERTAIN REGULATIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.—Any regulation subject to the congressional approval procedure under section 12609 of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 affecting budget authority, outlays, or receipts shall be assumed to be effective unless it is not approved in accordance with such section”.

SA 3256. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

Subtitle D—Congressional Review of Unilateral Trade Actions

SEC. 3301. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF UNILATERAL TRADE ACTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 5 of title I of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2191 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following: “**SEC. 155. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF UNILATERAL TRADE ACTIONS.**

“(a) UNILATERAL TRADE ACTION DEFINED.—“(1) IN GENERAL.—In this section, the term ‘unilateral trade action’ means any of the following actions taken with respect to the importation of an article pursuant to a provision of law specified in paragraph (2):

“(A) A prohibition on importation of the article.

“(B) The imposition of or an increase in a duty applicable to the article.

“(C) The imposition or tightening of a tariff-rate quota applicable to the article.

“(D) The imposition or tightening of a quantitative restriction on the importation of the article.

“(E) The suspension, withdrawal, or prevention of the application of trade agreement concessions with respect to the article.

“(F) Any other restriction on importation of the article.

“(2) PROVISIONS OF LAW SPECIFIED.—The provisions of law specified in this paragraph are the following:

“(A) Section 122.

“(B) Title III.

“(C) Sections 406, 421, and 422.

“(D) Section 338 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1338).

“(E) Section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1862).

“(F) Section 103(a) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (19 U.S.C. 4202(a)).

“(G) The Trading with the Enemy Act (50 U.S.C. 4301 et seq.).

“(H) The International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

“(I) Any provision of law enacted to implement a trade agreement to which the United States is a party.

“(3) EXCEPTION FOR TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO HARMONIZED TARIFF SCHEDULE.—A technical correction to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States shall not be considered a unilateral trade action for purposes of this section.

“(b) CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL REQUIRED.—Except as provided by subsection (d), a unilateral trade action may not take effect unless—

“(1) the President submits to Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States a report that includes—

“(A) a description of the proposed unilateral trade action;

“(B) the proposed effective period for the action;

“(C) an analysis of the action, including whether the action is in the national economic interest of the United States;

“(D) an assessment of the potential effect of retaliation from trading partners affected by the action; and

“(E) a list of articles that will be affected by the action by subheading number of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States; and

“(2) a joint resolution of approval is enacted pursuant to subsection (e).

“(c) REPORT OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—Not later than 15 days after the submission of the report required by subsection (b)(1) with respect to a proposed unilateral trade action, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the proposed action that includes an assessment of the compliance of the President with the provision of law specified in subsection (a)(2) pursuant to which the action would be taken.

“(d) TEMPORARY AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, a unilateral trade action may take effect for one 90-calendar-day period (without renewal) if the President—

“(1) determines that is necessary for the unilateral trade action to take effect because the action is—

“(A) necessary because of a national emergency;

“(B) necessary because of an imminent threat to health or safety;

“(C) necessary for the enforcement of criminal laws; or

“(D) necessary for national security; and

“(2) submits written notice of the determination to Congress.

“(e) PROCEDURES FOR JOINT RESOLUTION.—

“(1) JOINT RESOLUTION DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘joint resolution’ means only a joint resolution of either House of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ‘That Congress approves the action proposed by the President under section 155(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 in the report submitted to Congress under that section on _____’, with the blank space being filled with the appropriate date.

“(2) INTRODUCTION.—After a House of Congress receives a report under subsection (b)(1) with respect to a unilateral trade action, the majority leader of that House (or his or her respective designee) shall introduce (by request, if appropriate) a joint resolution—

“(A) in the case of the House of Representatives, within 3 legislative days; and

“(B) in the case of the Senate, within 3 session days.

“(3) APPLICATION OF SECTION 152.—The provisions of subsections (b) through (f) of section 152 shall apply to a joint resolution under this subsection to the same extent those provisions apply to a resolution under section 152.

“(f) REPORT BY THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION.—Not later than 12 months after the date of a unilateral trade action taken pursuant to this section, the United States International Trade Commission shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the effects of the action on the United States economy, including a comprehensive assessment of the economic effects of the action on producers and consumers in the United States.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Trade Act of 1974 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 154 the following:

“Sec. 155. Congressional review of unilateral trade actions.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS AUTHORITY.—Section 122 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2132) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), in the flush text following paragraph (3), by inserting “and subject to approval under section 155” after “Congress”;

(B) in subsection (c), in the flush text following paragraph (2), by inserting “and subject to approval under section 155” after “Congress”;

(C) in subsection (g), by inserting “and subject to approval under section 155” after “of this section”.

(2) RULES OF HOUSE AND SENATE.—Section 151(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2191(a)) is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “and 153” and inserting “, 153, and 155”; and

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “and 153(a)” and inserting “, 153(a), and 155(e)”.

(3) ENFORCEMENT OF RIGHTS UNDER TRADE AGREEMENTS.—Title III of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2411 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 301—

(i) in subsection (a), in the flush text, by inserting “to approval under section 155 and” after “subsection (c), subject”; and

(ii) in subsection (b)(2), by inserting “to approval under section 155 and” after “subsection (c), subject”;

(B) in section 305(a)(1), by inserting “to approval under section 155 and” after “section 301, subject”; and

(C) in section 307(a)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “to approval under section 155 and” after “any action, subject”.

(4) MARKET DISRUPTION.—Section 406 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2436) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “With respect to” and inserting “Subject to approval under section 155, with respect to”; and

(B) in subsection (c), in the second sentence, by striking “If the President” and inserting “Subject to approval under section 155, if the President”.

(5) ACTION TO ADDRESS MARKET DISRUPTION.—Section 421 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2451) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by inserting “and subject to approval under section 155” after “of this section”;

(B) in subsection (i)(4)(A), by inserting “, subject to approval under section 155,” after “provisional relief and”;

(C) in subsection (k)(1), by striking “Within 15 days” and inserting “Subject to section 155, within 15 days”;

(D) by striking subsection (m) and by redesignating subsections (n) and (o) as subsections (m) and (n), respectively;

(E) in subsection (m), as redesignated by subparagraph (D)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking “subsection (m)” and inserting “this section”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by inserting “and subject to approval under section 155” after “paragraph (1)”; and

(F) in paragraph (3) of subsection (n), as redesignated by subparagraph (D), by striking “subsection (m)” and inserting “this section”.

(6) ACTION IN RESPONSE TO TRADE DIVERSION.—Section 422(h) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2451a(h)) is amended by striking “Within 20 days” and inserting “Subject to approval under section 155, within 20 days”.

(7) DISCRIMINATION BY FOREIGN COUNTRIES.—Section 338 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1338) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “, subject to approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974,” after “by proclamation”;

(B) in subsection (b), by inserting “subject to approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974 and” after “hereby authorized.”;

(C) in subsection (c), by striking “Any proclamation” and inserting “Subject to approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974, any proclamation”;

(D) in subsection (d), by inserting “subject to approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974 and” after “he shall.”; and

(E) in subsection (e), by inserting “subject to approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974 and” after “he shall.”.

(8) SAFEGUARDING NATIONAL SECURITY.—Section 232(c)(1)(B) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1862(c)(1)(B)) is amended by inserting “, subject to approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974,” after “shall”.

(9) BIPARTISAN CONGRESSIONAL TRADE PRIORITIES AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2015.—Section 103(a) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (19 U.S.C. 4202(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by inserting “and approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974” after “paragraphs (2) and (3)”;

(B) in paragraph (7), by inserting “and approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974” after “3524”.

(10) INTERNATIONAL EMERGENCY ECONOMIC POWERS ACT.—Section 203(a)(1)(B) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702(a)(1)(B)) is amended by inserting “(subject to section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974)” after “importation”.

(11) TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT.—Section 11 of the Trading with the Enemy Act (50 U.S.C. 4311) is amended by striking “Whenever” and inserting “Subject to approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974, whenever”.

(12) FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTING BILLS.—

(A) NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT.—Section 201 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3331) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “may” and inserting “may, subject to approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974.”; and

(ii) in subsection (b)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “and the consultation and layover requirements of section 103(a)” and inserting “, the consultation and layover requirements of section 103(a), and approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974.”.

(B) URUGUAY ROUND AGREEMENTS ACT.—Section 111 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3521) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “and subject to approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974” after “2902”;

(ii) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “and approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974” after “section 115”;

(iii) in subsection (c)(1)(A), in the flush text at the end, by striking “may” and inserting “may, subject to approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974.”; and

(iv) in subsection (e)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “and approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974” after “section 115”.

(C) UNITED STATES-ISRAEL FREE TRADE AREA IMPLEMENTATION ACT OF 1985.—Section 4 of the United States-Israel Free Trade Area Imple-

mentation Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-47; 19 U.S.C. 2112 note) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “and subject to approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974” after “subsection (c)”;

(ii) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “and subject to approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974” after “subsection (c)”.

(D) UNITED STATES-JORDAN FREE TRADE AREA IMPLEMENTATION ACT.—Section 101 of the United States-Jordan Free Trade Area Implementation Act (Public Law 107-43; 19 U.S.C. 2112 note) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “may” and inserting “may, subject to approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974.”; and

(ii) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “may” and inserting “may, subject to approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974.”.

(E) DOMINICAN REPUBLIC-CENTRAL AMERICA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT.—Section 201 of the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 4031) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “may” and inserting “may, subject to approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974.”; and

(ii) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “and approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974” after “section 104”.

(F) UNITED STATES-CHILE FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT.—Section 201 of the United States-Chile Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 108-77; 19 U.S.C. 3805 note) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “may” and inserting “may, subject to approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974.”; and

(ii) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “and approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974” after “section 103(a)”.

(G) UNITED STATES-SINGAPORE FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT.—Section 201 of the United States-Singapore Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 108-78; 19 U.S.C. 3805 note) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “may” and inserting “may, subject to approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974.”; and

(ii) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “and approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974” after “section 103(a)”.

(H) UNITED STATES-AUSTRALIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT.—Section 201 of the United States-Australia Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 108-286; 19 U.S.C. 3805 note) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “may” and inserting “may, subject to approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974.”; and

(ii) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “and approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974” after “section 104”.

(I) UNITED STATES-MOROCCO FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT.—Section 201 of the United States-Morocco Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 108-302; 19 U.S.C. 3805 note) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “may”

and inserting “may, subject to approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974.”; and

(ii) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “and approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974” after “section 104”.

(J) UNITED STATES-BAHRAIN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT.—Section 201 of the United States-Bahrain Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 109-169; 19 U.S.C. 3805 note) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “may” and inserting “may, subject to approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974.”; and

(ii) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “and approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974” after “section 104”.

(K) UNITED STATES-OMAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT.—Section 201 of the United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 109-283; 19 U.S.C. 3805 note) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “may” and inserting “may, subject to approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974.”; and

(ii) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “and approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974” after “section 104”.

(L) UNITED STATES-PERU TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT.—Section 201 of the United States-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 110-138; 19 U.S.C. 3805 note) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “may” and inserting “may, subject to approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974.”; and

(ii) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “and approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974” after “section 104”.

(M) UNITED STATES-KOREA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT.—Section 201 of the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 112-41; 19 U.S.C. 3805 note) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “may” and inserting “may, subject to approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974.”; and

(ii) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “and approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974” after “section 104”.

(N) UNITED STATES-COLOMBIA TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT.—Section 201 of the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 112-42; 19 U.S.C. 3805 note) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “may” and inserting “may, subject to approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974.”; and

(ii) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “and approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974” after “section 104”.

(O) UNITED STATES-PANAMA TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT.—Section 201 of the United States-Panama Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 112-43; 19 U.S.C. 3805 note) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “may” and inserting “may, subject to approval

under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974," and

(ii) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting "and approval under section 155 of the Trade Act of 1974" after "section 104".

SA 3257. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12609. PRIVATE FLOOD INSURANCE.

(a) MANDATORY PURCHASE REQUIREMENT.—(1) AMOUNT AND TERM OF COVERAGE.—Section 102 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a) is amended by striking "Sec. 102. (a)" and all that follows through the end of subsection (a) and inserting the following:

"SEC. 102. (a) AMOUNT AND TERM OF COVERAGE.—After the expiration of sixty days following the date of enactment of this Act, no Federal officer or agency shall approve any financial assistance for acquisition or construction purposes for use in any area that has been identified by the Administrator as an area having special flood hazards and in which the sale of flood insurance has been made available under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), unless the building or mobile home and any personal property to which such financial assistance relates is covered by flood insurance: *Provided*, That the amount of flood insurance (1) in the case of Federal flood insurance, is at least equal to the development or project cost of the building, mobile home, or personal property (less estimated land cost), the outstanding principal balance of the loan, or the maximum limit of Federal flood insurance coverage made available with respect to the particular type of property, whichever is less; or (2) in the case of private flood insurance, is at least equal to the development or project cost of the building, mobile home, or personal property (less estimated land cost), the outstanding principal balance of the loan, or the maximum limit of Federal flood insurance coverage made available with respect to the particular type of property, whichever is less: *Provided further*, That if the financial assistance provided is in the form of a loan or an insurance or guaranty of a loan, the amount of flood insurance required need not exceed the outstanding principal balance of the loan and need not be required beyond the term of the loan. The requirement of maintaining flood insurance shall apply during the life of the property, regardless of transfer of ownership of such property."

(2) REQUIREMENT FOR MORTGAGE LOANS.—Subsection (b) of section 102 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking the subsection designation and all that follows through the end of paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

"(b) REQUIREMENT FOR MORTGAGE LOANS.—

(1) REGULATED LENDING INSTITUTIONS.—Each Federal entity for lending regulation (after consultation and coordination with the Financial Institutions Examination Council established under the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.)) shall by regulation direct regulated lending institutions not to make, increase, extend, or renew any loan secured by improved real estate or a mobile

home located or to be located in an area that has been identified by the Administrator as an area having special flood hazards and in which flood insurance has been made available under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), unless the building or mobile home and any personal property securing such loan is covered for the term of the loan by flood insurance: *Provided*, That the amount of flood insurance (A) in the case of Federal flood insurance, is at least equal to the outstanding principal balance of the loan or the maximum limit of Federal flood insurance coverage made available with respect to the particular type of property, whichever is less; or (B) in the case of private flood insurance, is at least equal to the outstanding principal balance of the loan or the maximum limit of Federal flood insurance coverage made available with respect to the particular type of property, whichever is less.

"(2) FEDERAL AGENCY LENDERS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—A Federal agency lender may not make, increase, extend, or renew any loan secured by improved real estate or a mobile home located or to be located in an area that has been identified by the Administrator as an area having special flood hazards and in which flood insurance has been made available under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), unless the building or mobile home and any personal property securing such loan is covered for the term of the loan by flood insurance in accordance with paragraph (1). Each Federal agency lender may issue any regulations necessary to carry out this paragraph. Such regulations shall be consistent with and substantially identical to the regulations issued under paragraph (1).

"(B) REQUIREMENT TO ACCEPT FLOOD INSURANCE.—Each Federal agency lender shall accept flood insurance as satisfaction of the flood insurance coverage requirement under subparagraph (A) if the flood insurance coverage meets the requirements for coverage under that subparagraph.

"(3) GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED ENTERPRISES FOR HOUSING.—The Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation shall implement procedures reasonably designed to ensure that, for any loan that is—

"(A) secured by improved real estate or a mobile home located in an area that has been identified, at the time of the origination of the loan or at any time during the term of the loan, by the Administrator as an area having special flood hazards and in which flood insurance is available under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), and

"(B) purchased or guaranteed by such entity, the building or mobile home and any personal property securing the loan is covered for the term of the loan by flood insurance in the amount provided in paragraph (1). The Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation shall accept flood insurance as satisfaction of the flood insurance coverage requirement under paragraph (1) if the flood insurance coverage provided meets the requirements for coverage under that paragraph and any requirements established by the Federal National Mortgage Association or the Federal Home Loan Corporation, respectively, relating to the financial strength of private insurance companies from which the Federal National Mortgage Association or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation will accept private flood insurance, provided that such requirements shall not affect or conflict with any State law, regulation, or procedure concerning the regulation of the business of insurance.

"(4) APPLICABILITY.—

"(A) EXISTING COVERAGE.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), paragraph (1) shall apply on the date of enactment of the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4701 et seq.).

"(B) NEW COVERAGE.—Paragraphs (2) and (3) shall apply only with respect to any loan made, increased, extended, or renewed after the expiration of the 1-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4701 et seq.). Paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to any loan made, increased, extended, or renewed by any lender supervised by the Farm Credit Administration only after the expiration of the period under this subparagraph.

"(C) CONTINUED EFFECT OF REGULATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, the regulations to carry out paragraph (1), as in effect immediately before the date of enactment of the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4701 et seq.), shall continue to apply until the regulations issued to carry out paragraph (1) as amended by section 522(a) of such Act take effect.

"(5) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Except as otherwise specified, any reference to flood insurance in this section shall be considered to include Federal flood insurance and private flood insurance. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to supersede or limit the authority of a Federal entity for lending regulation, the Federal Housing Finance Agency, a Federal agency lender, the Federal National Mortgage Association, or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation to establish requirements relating to the financial strength of private insurance companies from which the entity or agency will accept private flood insurance, provided that such requirements shall not affect or conflict with any State law, regulation, or procedure concerning the regulation of the business of insurance." and

(B) by striking paragraph (7) and inserting the following new paragraph:

"(7) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(A) FLOOD INSURANCE.—The term 'flood insurance' means—

"(i) Federal flood insurance; and

"(ii) private flood insurance.

"(B) FEDERAL FLOOD INSURANCE.—The term 'Federal flood insurance' means an insurance policy made available under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.).

"(C) PRIVATE FLOOD INSURANCE.—The term 'private flood insurance' means an insurance policy that—

"(i) is issued by an insurance company that is—

"(I) licensed, admitted, or otherwise approved to engage in the business of insurance in the State in which the insured building is located, by the insurance regulator of that State; or

"(II) eligible as a nonadmitted insurer to provide insurance in the home State of the insured, in accordance with sections 521 through 527 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 8201 through 8206);

"(ii) is issued by an insurance company that is not otherwise disapproved as a surplus lines insurer by the insurance regulator of the State in which the property to be insured is located; and

"(iii) provides flood insurance coverage that complies with the laws and regulations of that State.

"(D) STATE.—The term 'State' means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto

Rico, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.”.

(b) EFFECT OF PRIVATE FLOOD INSURANCE COVERAGE ON CONTINUOUS COVERAGE REQUIREMENTS.—Section 1308 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015) is amended by adding at the end the following: “(n) EFFECT OF PRIVATE FLOOD INSURANCE COVERAGE ON CONTINUOUS COVERAGE REQUIREMENTS.—For purposes of applying any statutory, regulatory, or administrative continuous coverage requirement, including under section 1307(g)(1), the Administrator shall consider any period during which a property was continuously covered by private flood insurance (as defined in section 102(b)(7) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a(b)(7))) to be a period of continuous coverage.”.

SA 3258. Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title II, add the following:

SEC. 24. PERMANENT REAUTHORIZATION OF THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 200302 of title 54, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “During the period ending September 30, 2018, there” and inserting “There”; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “through September 30, 2018”.

(b) PUBLIC ACCESS.—Section 200306 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) PUBLIC ACCESS.—An amount equal to the greater of not less than 1.5 percent of amounts made available for expenditure in any fiscal year under section 200303 and \$10,000,000 shall be used for projects that secure recreational public access to existing Federal public land for hunting, fishing, and other recreational purposes.”.

SA 3259. Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 2303(4)(A), strike clause (iii) and insert the following:

(iii) by striking “production.” and inserting “production, including grazing management practices, non-lethal predator deterrence, and agricultural management practices that reduce wildlife conflict.”;

SA 3260. Mr. KING (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. BOOZMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 6206(3)(D) and insert the following:

(D) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking “loan or” and inserting “grant, loan, or”; and

(ii) by striking “provide” and inserting “provide, or contract for the provision of;”;

SA 3261. Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 257, line 2, insert after the period the following: “Funds may not be used as described in the previous sentence until the date that is 30 days after the date on which Cuba holds free and fair elections for a new government—

“(1) with the participation of multiple independent political parties that have full access to the media;

“(2) that are conducted under the supervision of internationally recognized observers, such as the Organization of American States, the United Nations, and other election monitors; and

“(3) that are certified by the Secretary of State.”.

SA 3262. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 257, line 2, insert after the period the following: “Funds may not be used as described in the previous sentence in contravention of the National Security Presidential Memorandum entitled ‘Strengthening the Policy of the United States Toward Cuba’ issued by the President on June 16, 2017, and regulations implementing that memorandum, prohibiting transactions with entities owned, controlled, or operated by or on behalf of military intelligence or security services of Cuba.”.

SA 3263. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 43. NATIONAL NUTRITIONAL AND DIETARY INFORMATION AND GUIDELINES FOR CERTAIN WOMEN AND CHILDREN.

Section 301(a)(3) of the National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5341(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking the paragraph designation and heading and all that follows through “Not later” and inserting the following:

“(3) CERTAIN WOMEN AND CHILDREN.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later”;

(2) in subparagraph (A) (as so designated), by inserting “, women who may become pregnant, breastfeeding mothers,” after “pregnant women”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) TREATMENT.—The most recent guidelines published under subparagraph (A) shall—

“(i) supersede any previous Federal nutrition guidance relating to the population described in that subparagraph; and

“(ii) be promoted by each applicable Federal department or agency in carrying out any food, nutrition, or health program.”.

SA 3264. Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. KING, Mr. JONES, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mrs. FISCHER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

Subtitle D—Other Matters

SEC. 3401. STUDY OF NEWSPRINT INDUSTRY WELL-BEING.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Commerce shall conduct a study of the economic well-being, health, and vitality of the newsprint industry and the local newspaper publishing industry in the United States, which shall include an assessment of the following:

(1) The trends in demand for newsprint and traditional printed newspapers.

(2) The trends in demand for digital or on-line consumption of news.

(3) The costs of inputs in the production of traditional printed newspapers, including the use of newsprint.

(4) The effect of declining readership of traditional printed newspapers on the continued viability of the newsprint and newspaper publishing industries and the continued availability of coverage of local news, local sports, local government, and local disaster prevention and awareness.

(5) The trends in the pulp and paper industry of the United States and the effect of declining demand for newsprint on the health of the pulp and paper industry.

(6) Measures undertaken by printers and newspaper publishers to reduce costs in response to increased costs for newsprint in the United States, and whether such measures have harmed local news coverage or reduced employment in the newspaper and publishing industries.

(7) Whether measures undertaken by publishers and printers to reduce costs have harmed local businesses that advertise in local newspapers.

(8) The global production capacity for newsprint in light of the declining demand for newsprint.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall submit to the President and Congress a report on—

(1) the findings of the study required by subsection (a); and

(2) any recommendations that the Secretary considers appropriate.

(c) STAY OF DETERMINATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2) and notwithstanding any provision of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.), the Secretary of Commerce and the United States International Trade Commission may not give effect to an affirmative

determination in an antidumping or countervailing duty investigation relating to imports of uncoated groundwood paper conducted under that title until the President certifies to the Secretary and the Chairman of the Commission that the President—

(A) has received the report required by subsection (b); and

(B) has concluded that giving effect to the determination is in the economic interest of the United States.

(2) RATES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Until such time as the President issues the certification described in paragraph (1), the administering authority (as defined in section 771(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(1))) shall order a rate of zero for deposits posted pursuant to sections 703(d), 705(c)(1), 733(d), and 735(c)(1) of that Act (19 U.S.C. 1671b(d), 1671d(c)(1), 1673b(d), and 1673d(c)(1)) in an investigation described in paragraph (1).

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This paragraph shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act without regard to any later effective date of an order required by subparagraph (A).

(3) CANADA AND MEXICO.—Pursuant to article 1902 of the North American Free Trade Agreement and section 408 of the North America Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3438), this subsection applies to goods from Canada and Mexico.

(4) APPLICATION.—This subsection applies only to an antidumping or countervailing duty investigation that is ongoing as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 3265. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 5409(b)(2)(A)(i)(III), strike “and” at the end.

In section 5409(b)(2)(A)(i)(IV), strike “and” at the end.

In section 5409(b)(2)(A)(i), insert at the end the following:

(V) the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives;

(VI) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

(VII) the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives; and

(VIII) the Committee on the Budget of the Senate; and

SA 3266. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 9110 (relating to the Biomass Crop Assistance Program) and insert the following:

SEC. 9110. BIOMASS CROP ASSISTANCE PROGRAM REPEAL.

Section 9011 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8111) is repealed.

In section 9111, strike “9011 (7 U.S.C. 8111)” and insert “9010 (7 U.S.C. 8110)”.

SA 3267. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for

the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 5409(b)(2)(A)(i)(III), strike “and” at the end.

In section 5409(b)(2)(A)(i)(IV), strike “and” at the end.

In section 5409(b)(2)(A)(i), insert at the end the following:

(V) the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives;

(VI) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

(VII) the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives; and

(VIII) the Committee on the Budget of the Senate; and

SA 3268. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 9110 (relating to the Biomass Crop Assistance Program) and insert the following:

SEC. 9110. BIOMASS CROP ASSISTANCE PROGRAM REPEAL.

Section 9011 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8111) is repealed.

In section 9111, strike “9011 (7 U.S.C. 8111)” and insert “9010 (7 U.S.C. 8110)”.

SA 3269. Mr. KING (for himself, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 125. STATE MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING REGARDING INTERSTATE SHIPMENT OF STATE-INSPECTED POULTRY AND MEAT ITEMS.

(a) MEAT ITEMS.—Section 501 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 683) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “that is located in a State that has enacted a mandatory State meat product inspection law that imposes ante mortem and post mortem inspection, reinspection, and sanitation requirements that are at least equal to those under this Act” before the period at the end; and

(B) by striking paragraph (5);

(2) by striking subsections (b) through (e) and inserting the following:

“(b) STATE MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING REGARDING INTERSTATE SHIPMENT OF STATE-INSPECTED MEAT ITEMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including regulations), a State may enter into a memorandum of understanding with another State under which meat items from an eligible establishment in 1 State are sold in interstate commerce in the other State, in accordance with the requirements of paragraph (2).

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—To be eligible to enter into a memorandum of understanding

under paragraph (1), a State, acting through the appropriate State agency, shall receive a certification from the Secretary that—

“(A) the ante mortem and post mortem inspection, reinspection, and sanitation requirements of the State are at least equal to those under this Act; and

“(B) the State employs designated personnel to inspect meat items to be shipped by eligible establishments in interstate commerce.”;

(3) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (c);

(4) by striking subsections (g), (h), and (j); and

(5) by redesignating subsection (i) as subsection (d).

(b) POULTRY ITEMS.—Section 31 of the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 472) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (5);

(2) by striking subsections (b) through (g) and inserting the following:

“(b) STATE MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING REGARDING INTERSTATE SHIPMENT OF STATE-INSPECTED POULTRY ITEMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including regulations), a State may enter into a memorandum of understanding with another State under which poultry items from an eligible establishment in 1 State are sold in interstate commerce in the other State, in accordance with the requirements of paragraph (2).

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—To be eligible to enter into a memorandum of understanding under paragraph (1), a State, acting through the appropriate State agency, shall receive a certification from the Secretary that—

“(A) the ante mortem and post mortem inspection, reinspection, and sanitation requirements of the State are at least equal to those under this Act; and

“(B) the State employs designated personnel to inspect poultry items to be shipped by eligible establishments in interstate commerce.”;

(3) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (c); and

(4) by striking subsection (i).

SA 3270. Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 609, line 25, strike “services.” and insert “services, including applicants seeking to implement technology-enabled collaborative learning and capacity building models, as defined in section 2 of the Expanding Capacity for Health Outcomes Act (Public Law 114-270; 130 Stat. 1395).”.

SA 3271. Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. JONES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XII, add the following:

**Subtitle G—National FFA Organization's
Federal Charter Amendments Act**

SEC. 12701. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “National FFA Organization's Federal Charter Amendments Act”.

SEC. 12702. ORGANIZATION.

Section 70901 of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA”; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA”.

SEC. 12703. PURPOSES OF THE CORPORATION.

Section 70902 of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA”;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as paragraphs (7) and (8), respectively;

(3) by striking paragraphs (3), (4), (6), and (7);

(4) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (11);

(5) by redesignating paragraphs (8) and (9) as paragraphs (12) and (13), respectively;

(6) by inserting before paragraph (7), as redesignated by paragraph (2), the following:

“(1) to be an integral component of instruction in agricultural education, including instruction relating to agriculture, food, and natural resources;

“(2) to advance comprehensive agricultural education in the United States, including in public schools, by supporting contextual classroom and laboratory instruction and work-based experiential learning;

“(3) to prepare students for successful entry into productive careers in fields relating to agriculture, food, and natural resources, including by connecting students to relevant postsecondary educational pathways and focusing on the complete delivery of classroom and laboratory instruction, work-based experiential learning, and leadership development;

“(4) to be a resource and support organization that does not select, control, or supervise State association, local chapter, or individual member activities;

“(5) to develop educational materials, programs, services, and events as a service to State and local agricultural education agencies;

“(6) to seek and promote inclusion and diversity in its membership, leadership, and staff to reflect the belief of the FFA in the value of all human beings;”;

(7) in paragraph (7), as redesignated by paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “composed of students and former students of vocational agriculture in public schools qualifying for Federal reimbursement under the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act (20 U.S.C. 11-15, 16-28”;

(B) by inserting “as such chapters and associations carry out agricultural education programs that are approved by States, territories, or possessions” after “United States”;

(8) in paragraph (8), as redesignated by paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “to develop” and inserting “to build”;

(B) by striking “train for useful citizenship, and foster patriotism, and thereby” and inserting “and”; and

(C) by striking “aggressive rural and” and inserting “assertive”;

(9) by inserting after paragraph (8), as redesignated by paragraph (2), the following:

“(9) to increase awareness of the global and technological importance of agriculture, food, and natural resources, and the way agriculture contributes to our well-being;

“(10) to promote the intelligent choice and establishment of a career in fields relating to agriculture, food, and natural resources;”;

(10) in paragraph (11), as redesignated by paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking “to procure for and distribute to State” and inserting “to make available to State”;

(B) by inserting “, programs, services,” before “and equipment”; and

(C) by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA”;

(11) in paragraph (12), as redesignated by paragraph (5), by striking “State boards for vocational” and inserting “State boards and officials for career and technical”; and

(12) in paragraph (13), as redesignated by paragraph (5), by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA”.

SEC. 12704. MEMBERSHIP.

Section 70903 of title 36, United States Code is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA”; and

(B) by striking “as provided in the bylaws” and inserting “as provided in the constitution or bylaws of the FFA”; and

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) VOTING.—Except as provided in this chapter, the voting rights of members and the election process are as provided in the constitution or bylaws of the FFA.”.

SEC. 12705. GOVERNING BODY.

Section 70904 of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA” each place the term appears;

(B) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting the following:

“(2) The board—

“(A) shall consist of—

“(i) the Secretary of Education, or the Secretary of Education's designee who has experience in agricultural education, the FFA, or career and technical education; and

“(ii) other individuals—

“(I) representing the fields of education, agriculture, food, and natural resources; or

“(II) with experience working closely with the FFA; and

“(B) shall not include any individual who is a current employee of the National FFA Organization.

“(3) The number of directors, terms of office of the directors, and the method of selecting the directors, are as provided in the constitution or bylaws of the FFA.”; and

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking “bylaws” and inserting “constitution or bylaws of the FFA”; and

(ii) in the third sentence, by striking “chairman” and inserting “chair”;

(2) by striking subsection (b); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) OFFICERS.—The officers of the FFA, the terms of officers, and the election of officers, are as provided in the constitution or bylaws of the FFA, except that such officers shall include—

“(1) a national advisor;

“(2) an executive secretary; and

“(3) a treasurer.

“(c) GOVERNING COMMITTEE.—

“(1) The board shall designate a governing committee. The terms and method of selecting the governing committee members are as provided in the constitution or bylaws of the FFA, except that all members of the governing committee shall be members of the board of directors and at all times the governing committee shall be comprised of not less than 3 individuals.

“(2) When the board is not in session, the governing committee has the powers of the board subject to the board's direction and may authorize the seal of the FFA to be affixed to all papers that require it.

“(3) The board shall designate to such committee—

“(A) the chair of the board;

“(B) the executive secretary; and

“(C) the treasurer.”.

SEC. 12706. NATIONAL STUDENT OFFICERS.

Section 70905 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by striking subsections (a) through (d) and inserting the following:

“(a) COMPOSITION.—There shall be—

“(1) not less than 6 national student officers of the FFA, which shall include not less than 4 national student officers of the corporation, including a student president;

“(2) 4 student vice presidents (each representing regions as provided in the constitution or bylaws of the corporation); and

“(3) a student secretary.

“(b) ELECTION.—

“(1) The 6 national student officers of the FFA, shall be elected annually by a majority vote of official delegates assembled at the annual convention. Elections for not less than 4 national student officer vice presidents shall be based upon regional representation as further detailed in the constitution or bylaws of the FFA.

“(2) The voting rights of delegates and the process of electing the national student officers shall be as provided in the constitution or bylaws of the FFA.”.

SEC. 12707. POWERS.

Section 70906 of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “corporate”;

(3) in paragraph (4), by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA”;

(4) in paragraph (6), by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA”;

(5) by amending paragraph (8) to read as follows:

“(8) use FFA funds to give prizes, awards, loans, and grants to deserving members, chapters, and associations to carry out the purposes of the FFA;”;

(6) by amending paragraph (9) to read as follows:

“(9) produce publications, websites, and other media;”;

(7) in paragraph (10)—

(A) by striking “procure for and distribute to State” and inserting “make available to State”; and

(B) by striking “Future Farmers of America” and inserting “FFA”; and

(8) in paragraph (12), by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA”.

SEC. 12708. NAME, SEALS, EMBLEMS, AND BADGES.

Section 70907 of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA” each place the term appears;

(2) by striking “name” and inserting “names”;

(3) by striking “‘Future Farmers of America’” and inserting “‘Future Farmers of America’ and ‘National FFA Organization.’”; and

(4) by inserting “education” before “membership”.

SEC. 12709. RESTRICTIONS.

Section 70908 of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “corporation or a director, officer, or member as

such” and inserting “FFA or a director, officer, or member acting on behalf of the FFA”;

(3) in subsection (c), by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA” each place the term appears; and

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA”; and

(B) by striking “Directors who vote for or assent to making a loan to a director, officer, or employee, and officers who participate in making the loan, are jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of the loan until it is repaid.”.

SEC. 12710. RELATIONSHIP TO FEDERAL AGENCIES.

Section 70909 of title 36, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 70909. RELATIONSHIP TO FEDERAL AGENCIES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—On request of the board of directors, the FFA may collaborate with Federal agencies, including the Department of Education and the Department of Agriculture on matters of mutual interest and benefit.

“(b) AGENCY ASSISTANCE.—Those Federal agencies may make personnel, services, and facilities available to administer or assist in the administration of the activities of the FFA.

“(c) AGENCY COMPENSATION.—Personnel of the Federal agencies may not receive compensation from the FFA for their services, except that travel and other legitimate expenses as defined by the Federal agencies and approved by the board may be paid.

“(d) COOPERATION WITH STATE BOARDS.—The Federal agencies also may cooperate with State boards and other organizations for career and technical education to assist in the promotion of activities of the FFA.”.

SEC. 12711. HEADQUARTERS AND PRINCIPAL OFFICE.

Section 70910 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by striking “of the corporation shall be in the District of Columbia. However, the activities of the corporation are not confined to the District of Columbia but” and inserting “of the FFA shall be as provided in the constitution or bylaws of the FFA. The activities of the FFA”.

SEC. 12712. RECORDS AND INSPECTION.

Section 709011 of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “entitled to vote”; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA”.

SEC. 12713. SERVICE OF PROCESS.

Section 70912 of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA” and inserting “IN GENERAL”;

(B) by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA” each place the term appears;

(C) by striking “in the District of Columbia” before “to receive”; and

(D) by striking “Designation of the agent shall be filed in the office of the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA” each place the term appears; and

(B) by inserting “of the FFA” after “association or chapter”.

SEC. 12714. LIABILITY FOR ACTS OF OFFICERS OR AGENTS.

Section 70913 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA”.

SEC. 12715. DISTRIBUTION OF ASSETS IN LIQUIDATION OR FINAL LIQUIDATION.

Section 70914 of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA”; and

(2) by striking “vocational agriculture” and inserting “agricultural education”.

SA 3272. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 125. RELEASE OF INTEREST IN LAND, PINE TREE RESEARCH STATION, ARKANSAS.

(a) RELEASE OF INTEREST.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), after execution of the agreement described in subsection (b), the Secretary shall release the condition in the deed with respect to the land described in subsection (c) that the land shall be used for public purposes, and if at any time the land ceases to be so used, the land conveyed shall immediately revert to and become revested in the United States.

(2) CONDITION.—The release under paragraph (1) shall be subject to the condition that—

(A) proceeds from the sale of any land described in subsection (c) shall be reinvested by the Board of Trustees of the University of Arkansas to benefit the public research and extension programs of the University of Arkansas System Division of Agriculture; and

(B) if the proceeds are not used as described in subparagraph (A), the proceeds from the sale of the land described in subsection (c) shall be transferred to the United States.

(3) APPLICATION OF BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT.—Section 32(c) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U.S.C. 1011(c)) shall not apply to the release under paragraph (1).

(b) AGREEMENT.—The Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the Board of Trustees of the University of Arkansas, satisfactory to the Secretary of Agriculture, that requires that—

(1) the proceeds from a sale of any portion of the land described in subsection (c) shall inure to the benefit of the University of Arkansas System Division of Agriculture for use in the public research and extension programs of the University of Arkansas System Division of Agriculture, including facilities and operations for those programs; and

(2) the proceeds of a disposition described in paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) deposited and held in an account open to inspection by the Secretary; and

(B) if withdrawn from the account, used for the purpose described in paragraph (1).

(c) LAND DESCRIBED.—The land referred to in subsections (a) and (b) is the land conveyed, sold, and quitclaimed to the Board of Trustees of the University of Arkansas by the United States, through the Director of Lands of the Forest Service in accordance with section 32(c) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U.S.C. 1011(c)) on February 2, 1978, containing 11,849.90 acres from 23 different sections, with the deed recorded in the St. Francis County records in book 376, page 376 by the St. Francis County Circuit Clerk, and generally described as: “all

those certain tracts, or parcels of land embraced within the Forrest City (Pine Tree) Land Utilization Project, AK-LU-4, lying and being in the County of St. Francis, State of Arkansas, 5th Principal Meridian”.

SA 3273. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. HELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 281, strike line 19 and insert the following:

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (B);

(ii) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking clauses (i) and (ii) and inserting the following:

“(i) without good cause, fails to work or refuses to participate in an employment and training program under paragraph (4), a work program, or any combination of work, an employment and training program, and a work program for—

“(I) during any of fiscal years 2021 through 2025, a minimum of 20 hours per week, averaged monthly; and

“(II) during fiscal year 2026 and each fiscal year thereafter, a minimum of 25 hours per week, averaged monthly;”;

(II) by striking clause (vi);

(III) in clause (iv), by adding “or” after the semicolon at the end;

(IV) in clause (v)(II), by striking “30 hours per week; or” and inserting “the applicable hourly requirement under clause (i).”;

(V) by redesignating clauses (iii), (iv), and (v) as clauses (ii), (iii), and (iv), respectively; and

(VI) by striking the subparagraph designation and heading and all that follows through “individual—” in the matter preceding clause (i) and inserting the following:

“(A) DEFINITION OF WORK PROGRAM.—In this paragraph, the term ‘work program’ means—

“(i) a program under title I of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3111 et seq.);

“(ii) a program under section 236 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2296); and

“(iii) a program of employment and training (other than a program under paragraph (4)) that—

“(I) is operated or supervised by a State or political subdivision of a State; and

“(II) achieves compliance with applicable standards approved by—

“(aa) the chief executive officer of the State; and

“(bb) the Secretary.

“(B) GENERAL REQUIREMENT.—Subject to subparagraph (C), no physically and mentally fit individual aged not less than 18, and not more than 59, years shall be eligible to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program if the applicable State agency determines that the individual—”;

(iii) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) ONSET OF APPLICABILITY.—An individual described in subparagraph (B) shall be ineligible to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program under that subparagraph beginning on the date that is 30 days after the date on which the applicable State agency makes a determination of non-compliance under that subparagraph with respect to the individual.”;

(iv) in subparagraph (D)—

(I) in clause (iii)(I), by striking “subparagraph (A)” each place it appears and inserting “subparagraph (B)”;

(II) in clause (iv), by striking “subparagraph (A)(v)” and inserting “subparagraph (B)(iv)”; and

(III) by striking clauses (v) and (vi);

(v) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) TRANSITION PERIOD.—During each of fiscal years 2019 and 2020, a State agency shall continue to implement and enforce applicable work program and employment and training program requirements in accordance with this subsection, subsections (e) and (o) (other than paragraph (6)(F) of that subsection), and sections 7(i), 11(e)(19), and 16 (other than subparagraphs (A) through (D) of subsection (h)(1) of that section) (as those provisions were in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018).

“(G) ADDITIONAL FLEXIBILITY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—On receipt of an application from a State agency that demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the State agency is unable to implement and enforce applicable work program and employment and training program requirements in accordance with the requirements of this Act (as amended by the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018) that would otherwise be applicable to the work programs and employment and training programs of the State, the Secretary may—

“(I) for such additional period as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, permit the State agency to continue to implement and enforce those programs as described in subparagraph (F); or

“(II) subject to clause (ii), provide to the State agency a waiver of the requirement to enforce the those programs in accordance with the requirements of this Act (as amended by the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018) that would otherwise be applicable to the programs.

“(ii) CONDITION ON WAIVER.—For any fiscal year during which a waiver under clause (i)(II) is in effect with respect to a State agency, the Secretary shall not pay to the State agency the administrative cost payment under section 16(a).

“(H) INELIGIBILITY.—

“(i) NOTIFICATION OF FAILURE TO MEET WORK REQUIREMENTS.—The State agency shall issue a notice of adverse action to an individual by not later than 10 days after the date on which the State agency determines that the individual has failed to meet an applicable requirement under subparagraph (B).

“(ii) INITIAL VIOLATION.—The first instance in which an individual receives a notice of adverse action under clause (i), the individual shall remain ineligible to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program until the earliest of—

“(I) the date that is 1 year after the date on which the individual became ineligible;

“(II) the date on which the individual obtains employment sufficient to meet the applicable hourly requirements under subparagraph (B)(i); and

“(III) the date on which the individual is no longer subject to subparagraph (B).

“(iii) SUBSEQUENT VIOLATIONS.—The second, or any subsequent, instance in which an individual receives a notice of adverse action under clause (i), the individual shall remain ineligible to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program until the earliest of—

“(I) the date that is 3 years after the date on which the individual became ineligible;

“(II) the date on which the individual obtains employment sufficient to meet the applicable hourly requirements under subparagraph (B)(i); and

“(III) the date on which the individual is no longer subject to subparagraph (B).”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

On page 282, strike lines 24 and 25 and insert the following:

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) (as amended by subparagraphs (A) and (B)) the following:

On page 284, strike lines 5 through 11 and insert the following:

“(i) work or participate in an employment and training program under paragraph (4), a work program, or any combination of work, an employment and training program, and a work program for—

“(I) during any of fiscal years 2021 through 2025, a minimum of 20 hours per week, averaged monthly; and

“(II) during fiscal year 2026 and each fiscal year thereafter, a minimum of 25 hours per week, averaged monthly;

“(ii) participate in and comply with

On page 284, line 16, strike “(iv)” and insert “(ii)”.

On page 284, line 21, strike “50” and insert “59”.

Beginning on page 285, strike line 25 and all that follows through page 287, line 14, and insert the following:

“(E) ONSET OF APPLICABILITY.—An individual described in subparagraph (B) shall be ineligible to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program under that subparagraph beginning on the date that is 30 days after the date on which the applicable State agency makes a determination of non-compliance under that subparagraph with respect to the individual.

“(F) INELIGIBILITY.—

“(i) NOTIFICATION OF FAILURE TO MEET WORK REQUIREMENTS.—The State agency shall issue a notice of adverse action to an individual by not later than 10 days after the date on which the State agency determines that the individual has failed to meet an applicable requirement under subparagraph (B).

“(ii) INITIAL VIOLATION.—The first instance in which an individual receives a notice of adverse action under clause (i), the individual shall remain ineligible to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program until the earliest of—

“(I) the date that is 1 year after the date on which the individual became ineligible;

“(II) the date on which the individual obtains employment sufficient to meet the applicable hourly requirements under subparagraph (B)(i); and

“(III) the date on which the individual is no longer subject to subparagraph (B).

“(iii) SUBSEQUENT VIOLATIONS.—The second, or any subsequent, instance in which an individual receives a notice of adverse action under clause (i), the individual shall remain ineligible to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program until the earliest of—

“(I) the date that is 3 years after the date on which the individual became ineligible;

“(II) the date on which the individual obtains employment sufficient to meet the applicable hourly requirements under subparagraph (B)(i); and

“(III) the date on which the individual is no longer subject to subparagraph (B).

On page 287, line 15, strike “(F)” and insert “(G)”.

On page 288, line 24, strike “(E)” and insert “(F)”.

On page 291, line 13, strike “(G)” and insert “(H)”.

On page 291, strike line 17 and insert the following:

“(I) TRANSITION PERIOD.—During each of fiscal years 2019 and 2020, a State agency shall continue to implement and enforce applicable work program and employment and

training program requirements in accordance with this subsection, subsections (e) and (o) (other than paragraph (6)(F) of that subsection), and sections 7(i), 11(e)(19), and 16 (other than subparagraphs (A) through (D) of subsection (h)(1) of that section) (as those provisions were in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018).

“(J) ADDITIONAL FLEXIBILITY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—On receipt of an application from a State agency that demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the State agency is unable to implement and enforce applicable work program and employment and training program requirements in accordance with the requirements of this Act (as amended by the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018) that would otherwise be applicable to the work programs and employment and training programs of the State, the Secretary may—

“(I) for such additional period as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, permit the State agency to continue to implement and enforce those programs as described in subparagraph (I); or

“(II) subject to clause (ii), provide to the State agency a waiver of the requirement to enforce the those programs in accordance with the requirements of this Act (as amended by the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018) that would otherwise be applicable to the programs.

“(ii) CONDITION ON WAIVER.—For any fiscal year during which a waiver under clause (i)(II) is in effect with respect to a State agency, the Secretary shall not pay to the State agency the administrative cost payment under section 16(a).”; and

SA 3274. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 4104, add at the end the following:

(e) MOBILE TECHNOLOGIES.—Section 7(h)(14) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(h)(14)) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall authorize the use of mobile technologies for the purpose of accessing supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits.”;

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking the heading and inserting “DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS ON ACCESS OF BENEFITS THROUGH MOBILE TECHNOLOGIES”;

(B) by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

“(i) DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—Before authorizing the implementation of subparagraph (A) in all States, the Secretary shall approve not more than 5 demonstration project proposals submitted by State agencies that will pilot the use of mobile technologies for supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits access.”;

(C) in clause (ii)—

(i) in the heading, by striking “DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS” and inserting “PROJECT REQUIREMENTS”;

(ii) in the matter preceding subclause (I)—
(I) by striking “retail food store” the first place it appears and inserting “State agency”; and

(II) by striking “that includes—” and inserting “that—”; and

(iii) by striking subclauses (I), (II), (III), and (IV), and inserting the following:

“(I) provides recipients protections with respect to privacy, ease of use, household access to benefits, and support similar to the protections provided under existing methods;

“(II) ensures that all recipients, including recipients without access to mobile payment technology and recipients who shop across State borders, have a means of benefit access;

“(III) requires retail food stores, unless exempt under subsection (f)(2)(B), to bear the costs of acquiring and arranging for the implementation of point-of-sale equipment and supplies for the redemption of benefits that are accessed through mobile technologies, including any fees not described in paragraph (13);

“(IV) requires that foods purchased with benefits issued under this section through mobile technologies are purchased at a price not higher than the price of the same food purchased by other methods used by the retail food store, as determined by the Secretary;

“(V) ensures adequate documentation for each authorized transaction, adequate security measures to deter fraud, and adequate access to retail food stores that accept benefits accessed through mobile technologies, as determined by the Secretary;

“(VI) provides for an evaluation of the demonstration project, including an evaluation of household access to benefits; and

“(VII) meets other criteria as established by the Secretary.”;

(D) by striking clause (iii) and inserting the following:

“(iv) DATE OF PROJECT APPROVAL.—The Secretary shall solicit and approve the qualifying demonstration projects required under subparagraph (B)(i) not later than January 1, 2020.”; and

(E) by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

“(iii) PRIORITY.—The Secretary may prioritize demonstration project proposals that would—

“(I) reduce fraud;

“(II) encourage positive nutritional outcomes; and

“(III) meet such other criteria as determined by the Secretary.”; and

(3) in subparagraph (C)(i)—

(A) by striking “2017” and inserting “2022”; and

(B) by inserting “requires further study by way of an extended pilot period or” after “States” the second place it appears.

SA 3275. Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. PETERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VI, insert the following:

SEC. 63 . INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP ON RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish an interagency working group (referred to in this section as the “working group”)—

(1) to study the process and implementation of rural economic development grants and funding at agencies and departments within the Federal Government; and

(2) to develop a website to provide information about those grants and funding in a central location.

(b) MEMBERS.—The working group shall include—

(1) the Secretary; and

(2) the head of each Federal agency or department that provides rural economic development grants or funding.

(c) DUTIES.—The working group shall develop a common, single website to be used by each Federal agency or department participating in the working group that will—

(1) describe each Federal rural economic development program or grant; and

(2) allow an applicant to apply for those programs or grants on that single website.

SA 3276. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. GARDNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 9101, redesignate paragraphs (1) through (3) as paragraphs (2) through (4), respectively.

In section 9101, insert before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated) the following:

(1) in paragraph (3)(A), by inserting “ethanol derived from” after “other than”;

SA 3277. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 9106 and insert the following:

SEC. 9106. BIODESEL FUEL EDUCATION PROGRAM.

Section 9006(d) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8106(d)) is amended by striking “2018” each place it appears and inserting “2023”.

SA 3278. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 556, line 10, strike “and” at the end.

On page 556, line 14, strike the period at the end and insert “; and”.

On page 556, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

“(iii) that are located in a State with the highest age-adjusted drug overdose mortality rates, as determined by the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, with priority under this clause based on an ordinal ranking of States with the highest age-adjusted drug overdose mortality rates.

SA 3279. Mr. CASEY (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment

intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 125 . PROTECTION OF PETS.

(a) RESEARCH FACILITIES.—Section 7 of the Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. 2137) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 7. SOURCES OF DOGS AND CATS FOR RESEARCH FACILITIES.

“(a) DEFINITION OF PERSON.—In this section, the term ‘person’ means any individual, partnership, firm, joint stock company, corporation, association, trust, estate, pound, shelter, or other legal entity.

“(b) USE OF DOGS AND CATS.—No research facility or Federal research facility may use a dog or cat for research or educational purposes if the dog or cat was obtained from a person other than a person described in subsection (d).

“(c) SELLING, DONATING, OR OFFERING DOGS AND CATS.—No person, other than a person described in subsection (d), may sell, donate, or offer a dog or cat to any research facility or Federal research facility.

“(d) PERMISSIBLE SOURCES.—A person from whom a research facility or a Federal research facility may obtain a dog or cat for research or educational purposes under subsection (b), and a person who may sell, donate, or offer a dog or cat to a research facility or a Federal research facility under subsection (c), shall be—

“(1) a dealer licensed under section 3 that has bred and raised the dog or cat;

“(2) a publicly owned and operated pound or shelter that—

“(A) is registered with the Secretary;

“(B) is in compliance with section 28(a)(1) and with the requirements for dealers in subsections (b) and (c) of section 28; and

“(C) obtained the dog or cat from its legal owner, other than a pound or shelter;

“(3) a person that is donating the dog or cat and that—

“(A) bred and raised the dog or cat; or

“(B) owned the dog or cat for not less than 1 year immediately preceding the donation;

“(4) a research facility licensed by the Secretary; and

“(5) a Federal research facility licensed by the Secretary.

“(e) PENALTIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A person that violates this section shall be fined \$1,000 for each violation.

“(2) ADDITIONAL PENALTY.—A penalty under this subsection shall be in addition to any other applicable penalty.

“(f) NO REQUIRED SALE OR DONATION.—Nothing in this section requires a pound or shelter to sell, donate, or offer a dog or cat to a research facility or Federal research facility.”.

(b) FEDERAL RESEARCH FACILITIES.—Section 8 of the Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. 2138) is amended—

(1) by striking the section designation and all that follows through “No department” and inserting the following:

“SEC. 8. FEDERAL RESEARCH FACILITIES.

“Except as provided in section 7, no department”;

(2) by striking “research or experimentation or”;

(3) by striking “such purposes” and inserting “that purpose”.

(c) CERTIFICATION.—Section 28(b)(1) of the Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. 2158(b)(1)) is amended by striking “individual or entity”

and inserting “research facility or Federal research facility”.

SA 3280. Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 256, strike line 21 and all that follows through page 257, line 4, and insert the following:

“(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to any other amounts provided under this section,

SA 3281. Mr. ROUNDS (for himself, Mr. KING, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 125 . . . STATE MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING REGARDING INTERSTATE SHIPMENT OF STATE-INSPECTED POULTRY AND MEAT ITEMS.

(a) MEAT ITEMS.—Section 501 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 683) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “that is located in a State that has enacted a mandatory State meat product inspection law that imposes ante mortem and post mortem inspection, reinspection, and sanitation requirements that are at least equal to those under this Act” before the period at the end; and

(B) by striking paragraph (5);

(2) by striking subsections (b) through (e) and inserting the following:

“(b) STATE MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING REGARDING INTERSTATE SHIPMENT OF STATE-INSPECTED MEAT ITEMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including regulations), a State may enter into a memorandum of understanding with another State under which meat items from an eligible establishment in 1 State are sold in interstate commerce in the other State, in accordance with the requirements of paragraph (2).

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—To be eligible to enter into a memorandum of understanding under paragraph (1), a State, acting through the appropriate State agency, shall receive a certification from the Secretary that—

“(A) the ante mortem and post mortem inspection, reinspection, and sanitation requirements of the State are at least equal to those under this Act; and

“(B) the State employs designated personnel to inspect meat items to be shipped by eligible establishments in interstate commerce.”;

(3) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (c);

(4) by striking subsections (g), (h), and (j); and

(5) by redesignating subsection (i) as subsection (d).

(b) POULTRY ITEMS.—Section 31 of the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 472) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (5);

(2) by striking subsections (b) through (g) and inserting the following:

“(b) STATE MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING REGARDING INTERSTATE SHIPMENT OF STATE-INSPECTED POULTRY ITEMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including regulations), a State may enter into a memorandum of understanding with another State under which poultry items from an eligible establishment in 1 State are sold in interstate commerce in the other State, in accordance with the requirements of paragraph (2).

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—To be eligible to enter into a memorandum of understanding under paragraph (1), a State, acting through the appropriate State agency, shall receive a certification from the Secretary that—

“(A) the ante mortem and post mortem inspection, reinspection, and sanitation requirements of the State are at least equal to those under this Act; and

“(B) the State employs designated personnel to inspect poultry items to be shipped by eligible establishments in interstate commerce.”;

(3) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (c); and

(4) by striking subsection (i).

SA 3282. Mr. PERDUE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 125 . . . QUAIL.

Section 4(e) of the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 453(e)) is amended by inserting “including quail,” before “whether”.

SA 3283. Mr. PERDUE (for himself and Mr. GARDNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 125 . . . JURISDICTION OF THE COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION.

Section 2(a)(1)(A) of the Commodity Exchange Act (42 Stat. 998, chapter 369; 7 U.S.C. 2(a)(1)(A)) is amended by striking “pursuant to section 5 or a swap execution facility pursuant to section 5h or any other” and inserting “pursuant to section 5, a swap execution facility pursuant to section 5h, or a reporting entity that sets or reports reference prices for aluminum premiums, or any other”.

SA 3284. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for

the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 8401, insert the following:

SEC. 84 . . . INJUNCTIONS.

Section 106(c) of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6516(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) LIMITATION.—A court of competent jurisdiction may not enjoin an authorized hazardous fuel reduction project that is located in part or in whole on a wildland-urban interface based solely on a finding by the court that—

“(A) a categorical exclusion, in lieu of an environmental assessment, was improperly prepared for the authorized hazardous fuel reduction project;

“(B) an environmental assessment, in lieu of an environmental impact statement, was improperly prepared for the authorized hazardous fuel reduction project; or

“(C) any other procedural error was made with respect to the environmental analysis required for, or the implementation of, the authorized hazardous fuel reduction project.”.

SA 3285. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle F of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 86 . . . ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) PARTICIPANT.—The term “participant” means an individual or entity that files an objection or scoping comments on a draft environmental document with respect to a project that is subject to an objection at the project level under part 218 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).

(2) PILOT PROGRAM.—The term “pilot program” means the pilot program established under subsection (b).

(3) PROJECT.—The term “project” means a project described in subsection (c).

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service.

(b) ARBITRATION PILOT PROGRAM.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish within Region 1 of the Forest Service an arbitration pilot program as an alternative dispute resolution process in lieu of judicial review for projects described in subsection (c).

(c) DESCRIPTION OF PROJECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, at the sole discretion of the Secretary, may designate for arbitration projects that—

(A)(i) are developed through a collaborative process (within the meaning of section 603(b)(1)(C) of the Healthy Forest Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6591b(b)(1)(C)));

(ii) are carried out under the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program established under section 4003 of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (16 U.S.C. 7303); or

(iii) are identified in a community wildfire protection plan (as defined in section 101 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6511));

(B) have as a purpose—

- (i) hazardous fuels reduction; or
- (ii) mitigation of insect or disease infestation; and

(C) are located, in whole or in part, in a wildland-urban interface (as defined in section 101 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6511)).

(2) INCLUSION.—In designating projects for arbitration, the Secretary may include projects that receive categorical exclusions for purposes of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(d) LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF PROJECTS.—The Secretary may not designate for arbitration under the pilot program more than 2 projects per calendar year.

(e) ARBITRATORS.—

- (1) APPOINTMENT.—The Secretary shall develop and publish a list of not fewer than 15 individuals eligible to serve as arbitrators for the pilot program.
- (2) QUALIFICATIONS.—To be eligible to serve as an arbitrator under this subsection, an individual shall be—
 - (A) certified by—
 - (i) the American Arbitration Association; or
 - (ii) a State arbitration program; or
 - (B) a fully retired Federal or State judge.
 - (f) INITIATION OF ARBITRATION.—
 - (1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 7 days after the date on which the Secretary issues the final decision with respect to a project, the Secretary shall—
 - (A) notify each applicable participant and the Clerk of the United States District Court for the district in which the project is located that the project has been designated for arbitration in accordance with this section; and
 - (B) include in the decision document a statement that the project has been designated for arbitration.
 - (2) INITIATION.—
 - (A) IN GENERAL.—A participant may initiate arbitration regarding a project that has been designated for arbitration under this section in accordance with—
 - (i) sections 571 through 584 of title 5, United States Code; and
 - (ii) this paragraph.
 - (B) REQUIREMENTS.—A request to initiate arbitration under subparagraph (A) shall—
 - (i) be filed not later than the date that is 30 days after the date of the notification by the Secretary under paragraph (1); and
 - (ii) include an alternative proposal for the applicable project that describes each modification sought by the participant with respect to the project.
 - (C) NO JUDICIAL REVIEW.—A project for which arbitration is initiated under subparagraph (A) shall not be subject to judicial review.
 - (3) COMPELLED ARBITRATION.—
 - (A) MOTION TO COMPEL ARBITRATION.—
 - (i) IN GENERAL.—If a participant seeks judicial review of a final decision with respect to a project, the Secretary may file in the applicable court a motion to compel arbitration in accordance with this section.
 - (ii) FEES AND COSTS.—For any motion described in clause (i) for which the Secretary is the prevailing party, the applicable court shall award to the Secretary—
 - (I) court costs; and
 - (II) attorney's fees.
 - (B) ARBITRATION COMPELLED BY COURT.—If a participant seeks judicial review of a project, the applicable court shall compel arbitration in accordance with this section.
 - (g) SELECTION OF ARBITRATOR.—For each arbitration commenced under this section—
 - (1) the Secretary shall propose 3 arbitrators from the list published under subsection (e)(1); and

- (2) the applicable participant shall select 1 arbitrator from the list of arbitrators proposed under paragraph (1).
- (h) RESPONSIBILITIES OF ARBITRATOR.—
 - (1) IN GENERAL.—An arbitrator selected under subsection (e)—
 - (A) shall address all claims of each party seeking arbitration with respect to a project under this section; but
 - (B) may consolidate into a single arbitration all requests to initiate arbitration by all participants with respect to a project.
 - (2) SELECTION OF PROPOSALS.—An arbitrator shall make a decision with respect to each applicable request for initiation of arbitration under this section by—
 - (A) selecting the project, as approved by the Secretary;
 - (B) selecting an alternative proposal submitted by the applicable participant; or
 - (C) rejecting both projects described in subparagraphs (A) and (B).
 - (3) LIMITATIONS.—
 - (A) ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD.—The evidence before an arbitrator under this subsection shall be limited solely to the administrative record for the project.
 - (B) NO MODIFICATIONS TO PROPOSALS.—An arbitrator may not modify any proposal contained in a request for initiation of arbitration of a participant under this section.
 - (i) INTERVENTION.—A party may intervene in an arbitration under this section if, with respect to the project to which the arbitration relates, the party—
 - (1) meets the requirements of Rule 24(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (or a successor rule); or
 - (2) participated in the applicable collaborative process referred to in clause (i) or (ii) of subsection (c)(1)(A).
 - (j) SCOPE OF REVIEW.—In carrying out arbitration for a project, the arbitrator shall set aside the agency action, findings, and conclusions found to be arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law, within the meaning of section 706(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code.
 - (k) DEADLINE FOR COMPLETION OF ARBITRATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which a request to initiate arbitration is filed under subsection (f)(2), the arbitrator shall make a decision with respect to the request to initiate arbitration.
 - (1) EFFECT OF ARBITRATION DECISION.—A decision of an arbitrator under this section—
 - (1) shall not be considered to be a major Federal action;
 - (2) shall be binding; and
 - (3) shall not be subject to judicial review, except as provided in section 10(a) of title 9, United States Code.
 - (m) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—
 - (1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—
 - (A) be solely responsible for the professional fees of arbitrators participating in the pilot program; and
 - (B) use funds made available to the Secretary and not otherwise obligated to carry out subparagraph (A).
 - (2) ATTORNEY'S FEES.—No arbitrator may award attorney's fees in any arbitration brought under this section.
 - (n) REPORTS.—
 - (1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the pilot program is established, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, and publish on the website of Region 1 of the Forest Service, a report of not longer than 10 pages describing the implementation of the pilot program for the applicable year, including—
 - (A) the reasons for selecting certain projects for arbitration;
 - (B) an evaluation of the arbitration process, including any recommendations for improvements to the process;
 - (C) a description of the outcome of each arbitration; and
 - (D) a summary of the impacts of each outcome described in subparagraph (C) on the timeline for implementation and completion of the applicable project.
 - (2) GAO REVIEWS AND REPORTS.—
 - (A) INITIAL REVIEW.—Not later than 2 years after the date on which the pilot program is established, the Comptroller General of the United States shall review the implementation by the Secretary of the pilot program.
 - (B) REVIEW ON TERMINATION.—On termination of the pilot program under subsection (o), the Comptroller General of the United States shall review the implementation by the Secretary of the pilot program.
 - (C) REPORT.—On completion of the review described in subparagraph (A) or (B), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report describing the results of the applicable review.
 - (o) TERMINATION.—The pilot program shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date.
 - (p) EFFECT.—Nothing in this section affects the responsibility of the Secretary to comply with—
 - (1) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); or
 - (2) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

SA 3286. Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. LEE, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES REPEAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The final rule issued by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of the Army entitled "Clean Water Rule: Definition of 'Waters of the United States'" (80 Fed. Reg. 37054 (June 29, 2015)) is void.

(b) EFFECT.—Until such time as the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of the Army issue a final rule after the date of enactment of this Act defining the scope of waters protected under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) and that final rule goes into effect, any regulation or policy revised under, or otherwise affected as a result of, the rule voided by this section shall be applied as if the voided rule had not been issued.

SA 3287. Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023,

and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 12518 and insert the following:

SEC. 12518. STUDY OF MARKETPLACE FRAUD OF TRADITIONAL FOODS AND TRIBAL SEEDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on—

(1) the market impact of traditional foods, Tribally produced products, and products that use traditional foods;

(2) fraudulent foods that mimic traditional foods or Tribal seeds that are available in the commercial marketplace as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(3) the means by which authentic traditional foods and Tribally produced foods might be protected against the impact of fraudulent foods in the marketplace; and

(4) the availability and long-term viability of Tribal seeds, including an analysis of the storage, cultivation, harvesting, and commercialization of Tribal seeds.

(b) INCLUSIONS.—The study conducted under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a consideration of the circumstances under which fraudulent foods in the marketplace occur; and

(2) an analysis of Federal laws, including intellectual property laws and trademark laws, that might offer protections for Tribal seeds and traditional foods and against fraudulent foods.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of completion of the study, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report describing the results of the study under this section to—

(1) the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives;

(2) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives;

(3) the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate;

(4) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

(5) the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate.

(d) PRIVACY OF INFORMATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Comptroller General of the United States shall protect sensitive Tribal information gained through the study conducted under subsection (a), including information about Indian sacred places.

SA 3288. Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 576, line 24, insert “and family stability” before “, as”.

On page 576, after line 24, insert the following:

“(3) STRONGER OUTCOMES FOR FAMILIES.—In developing a strategic community investment plan under paragraph (1), the Secretary and rural communities are encouraged to develop plans with an emphasis on stronger outcomes for families and multigenerational poverty reduction.

On page 577, line 1, strike “(3)” and insert “(4)”.

On page 577, line 5, strike “(4)” and insert “(5)”.

On page 577, strike line 9 and insert the following:

“(6) DEFINITION OF MULTIGENERATIONAL POVERTY.—In this subsection, the term ‘multigenerational poverty’ means pervasive poverty transferred from parents to their children through structural and systemic factors.”.

SA 3289. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 598, strike line 24 and all that follows through page 599, line 3, and insert the following:

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) set aside not less than 15 percent for areas that are high-cost and geographically challenged, as determined by the Secretary; and

“(iv) set aside not less than 1 percent to be

SA 3290. Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MCCAIN, and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 121. REPEAL OF DUPLICATIVE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 2014.—Effective on the date of enactment of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9001 et seq.), section 12106 of that Act (Public Law 113–79; 128 Stat. 980) and the amendments made by that section are repealed.

(2) FOOD, CONSERVATION, AND ENERGY ACT OF 2008.—Effective on the date of enactment of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8701 et seq.), section 11016 of that Act (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 2130) and the amendments made by that section are repealed.

(b) APPLICATION.—The Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621 et seq.) and the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) shall be applied and administered as if—

(1) section 12106 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–79; 128 Stat. 980) and the amendments made by that section had not been enacted; and

(2) section 11016 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 2130) and the amendments made by that section had not been enacted.

SA 3291. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for

the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 881, strike lines 4 through 13 and insert the following:

“(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$80,000,000 for fiscal year 2019 and each fiscal year thereafter, to remain available until expended.

“(2) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—No funds under this section may be provided—

“(A) to entities with net sales of more than \$50,000,000; or

“(B) to support products with well-established product markets, as determined by the Secretary.

SA 3292. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. DAINES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle F of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 862. EXPEDITED FOREST MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COLLABORATIVE PROCESS.—The term “collaborative process” means a process relating to the management of National Forest System land or public land under which a project or forest management activity is developed and implemented by the Secretary concerned through collaboration with interested persons, as described in section 603(b)(1)(C) of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6591b(b)(1)(C)).

(2) COMMUNITY WILDFIRE PROTECTION PLAN.—The term “community wildfire protection plan” has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6511).

(3) FOREST MANAGEMENT ACTIVITY.—The term “forest management activity” means a project or activity carried out by the Secretary concerned on National Forest System land or public land consistent with the forest plan covering the National Forest System land or public land.

(4) FOREST PLAN.—The term “forest plan” means—

(A) a land use plan prepared by the Bureau of Land Management for public land pursuant to section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712); or

(B) a land and resource management plan prepared by the Forest Service for a unit of the National Forest System pursuant to section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604).

(5) RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The term “resource advisory committee” has the meaning given the term in section 201 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7121).

(6) SECRETARY CONCERNED.—The term “Secretary concerned” means—

(A) the Secretary, with respect to National Forest System land; and

(B) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to public land.

(b) ANALYSIS OF 2 ALTERNATIVES IN PROPOSED COLLABORATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In preparing an environmental assessment or environmental impact

statement under section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)) for a forest management activity described in paragraph (2), the Secretary concerned shall study, develop, and describe only the following 2 alternatives:

- (A) The forest management activity.
- (B) The alternative of no action.
- (2) FOREST MANAGEMENT ACTIVITY DESCRIBED.—A forest management activity referred to in paragraph (1) is a forest management activity—
 - (A) that is—
 - (i) developed through a collaborative process;
 - (ii) proposed by a resource advisory committee;
 - (iii) included in a selected proposal under the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program established under section 4003 of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (16 U.S.C. 7303);
 - (iv) conducted on land designated by the Secretary concerned (or a designee of the Secretary concerned) under section 602(b) of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6591a(b)), notwithstanding whether the forest management activity is initiated before September 30, 2018; or
 - (v) covered by a community wildfire protection plan; and
 - (B) the primary purpose of which is—
 - (I) hazardous fuel reduction;
 - (II) installation of fuel and fire breaks appropriate for the forest type;
 - (III) protection of a municipal water supply system (as defined in section 101 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6511));
 - (IV) improving wildlife habitat to meet management and conservation goals; or
 - (V) treatment of insect and disease outbreaks on land designated under section 602(b) of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6591a(b)); or
 - (i) a combination of 2 or more of the purposes described in subclauses (I) through (V) of clause (i).
 - (3) ELEMENTS OF NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE.—In studying, developing, and describing the alternative of no action under paragraph (1)(B), the Secretary concerned shall consider whether to evaluate—
 - (A) the effect of no action on—
 - (i) forest health;
 - (ii) habitat diversity;
 - (iii) wildfire potential;
 - (iv) insect and disease potential; and
 - (v) timber production; and
 - (B) the implications of a resulting decline in forest health, loss of habitat diversity, wildfire, or insect or disease infestation, given fire and insect and disease historic cycles, on—
 - (i) domestic water supply in the project area;
 - (ii) wildlife habitat loss; and
 - (iii) other economic and social factors.
 - (c) EXPANSION OF CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION FOR INSECT AND DISEASE INFESTATION.—Section 603 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6591b) is amended—
 - (1) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “described in subsection (b)”;
 - (2) by striking subsection (b);
 - (3) by redesignating subsections (c) through (g) as subsections (b) through (f), respectively; and
 - (4) in subsection (b) (as so redesignated)—
 - (A) in paragraph (1), by striking “3000” and inserting “10,000”; and
 - (B) in paragraph (2)—
 - (i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “or” at the end;
 - (ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “or III, outside the wildland-urban interface.”

and inserting “III, IV, or V, outside the wildland-urban interface; or”;

- (iii) by adding at the end the following:
 - “(C) designated under section 602(b).”
- (d) PILOT ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE PROCESS.—
 - (1) ARBITRATION.—
 - (A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service (referred to in this subsection as the “Secretary”), shall establish within the Forest Service a 10-year arbitration pilot program as an alternative dispute resolution process in lieu of judicial review for the projects described in paragraph (2).
 - (B) NOTIFICATION TO OBJECTORS.—On issuance of an appeal response to an objection filed with respect to a project subject to an objection at the project level under part 218 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act), the Secretary shall notify each applicable individual or entity that submitted the objection (referred to in this subsection as the “objector”) that any further appeal may be subject to arbitration in accordance with this subsection.
 - (C) MAXIMUM NUMBER OF ARBITRATIONS.—Under the pilot program under this subsection, the Secretary may not arbitrate more than 5 objections to projects in a fiscal year in each Region of the Forest Service.
 - (2) DESCRIPTION OF PROJECTS.—The Secretary, in coordination with the head of the applicable Region of the Forest Service, may designate any type of project under this section for arbitration under this subsection.
 - (3) ARBITRATORS.—
 - (A) APPOINTMENT.—The Secretary shall develop and publish a list of not fewer than 20 individuals eligible to serve as arbitrators for the pilot program under this subsection.
 - (B) QUALIFICATIONS.—In order to be eligible to serve as an arbitrator under this paragraph, an individual shall be currently recognized by the American Arbitration Association.
 - (4) INITIATION OF ARBITRATION.—
 - (A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 7 days after the date of receipt of a notice of intent to file suit challenging a project, the Secretary shall notify each applicable objector and the court of jurisdiction that the project has been designated for arbitration in accordance with this subsection.
 - (B) DEMAND FOR ARBITRATION.—
 - (i) IN GENERAL.—An objector that sought judicial review of a project that has been designated by the Secretary for arbitration under this subsection may file a demand for arbitration in accordance with—
 - (I) sections 571 through 584 of title 5, United States Code; and
 - (II) this subparagraph.
 - (ii) REQUIREMENTS.—A demand for arbitration under clause (i) shall—
 - (I) be filed not later than the date that is 30 days after the date of the notification by the Secretary under subparagraph (A); and
 - (II) include an alternative proposal to the applicable project that describes each modification sought by the objector with respect to the project.
 - (5) SELECTION OF ARBITRATOR.—
 - (A) IN GENERAL.—For each arbitration commenced under this subsection, the Secretary and each applicable objector shall agree on a mutually acceptable arbitrator from the list published under paragraph (3)(A).
 - (B) APPOINTMENT.—If no agreement is reached on a mutually acceptable arbitrator under subparagraph (A) by the date that is 21 days after the date on which demand for arbitration is filed, the Secretary shall appoint an arbitrator from the list published under paragraph (3)(A).
 - (6) RESPONSIBILITIES OF ARBITRATOR.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An arbitrator selected under paragraph (5)—

- (i) shall address each demand filed for arbitration with respect to a project under this subsection; but
- (ii) may consolidate into a single arbitration all demands for arbitration by all objectors with respect to a project.
- (B) SELECTION OF PROPOSALS.—Subject to subparagraph (C), an arbitrator shall make a decision regarding each applicable demand for arbitration under this subsection by selecting—
 - (i) the project, as approved by the Secretary; or
 - (ii) an alternative proposal submitted by the applicable objector.
- (C) SELECTION CRITERIA.—In selecting a proposal under subparagraph (B), an arbitrator shall consider—
 - (i) the applicable administrative record;
 - (ii) the consistency of a proposal with—
 - (I) the applicable forest plan; and
 - (II) applicable laws (including regulations); and
 - (iii) which proposal best meets the purpose and need described in the applicable environmental review documents for the project.
- (D) NO MODIFICATIONS TO PROPOSALS.—An arbitrator may not modify any proposal contained in a demand for arbitration of an objector under this subsection.
- (7) DEADLINE FOR COMPLETION OF ARBITRATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which a demand for arbitration is filed under paragraph (4)(B), the arbitration process shall be completed.
- (8) EFFECT OF ARBITRATION DECISION.—A decision of an arbitrator under this subsection—
 - (A) shall not be considered to be a major Federal action;
 - (B) shall be binding; and
 - (C) shall not be subject to judicial review, except as provided in section 10(a) of title 9, United States Code.
- (9) REPORT ON THE PILOT PROGRAM.—
 - (A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year before the date on which the pilot program terminates under paragraph (10), the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Energy and Natural Resources and Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate and the Committees on Natural Resources and Agriculture of the House of Representatives, and make publicly available, a report describing the implementation and results of the pilot program under this subsection.
 - (B) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The report under subparagraph (A) shall include recommendations of the Secretary relating to—
 - (i) whether the pilot program under this subsection should be extended, let expire, or made permanent;
 - (ii) the manner in which the pilot program under this subsection should be modified; and
 - (iii) if and how the scope of the pilot program under this subsection should be expanded.
- (10) TERMINATION OF PILOT PROGRAM.—The authority provided by this subsection terminates effective January 1, 2027.

SA 3293. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 125 . PROTECTION OF NATURAL RESOURCES FROM INVASIVE SPECIES.

(a) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this section is to ensure the effective management of Federal land, including National Monuments and National Heritage Areas, to protect from invasive species important natural resources, including—

- (1) soil;
- (2) vegetation;
- (3) archeological sites;
- (4) water resources; and
- (5) rare or unique habitats.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **CONTROL.**—The term “control”, with respect to an invasive species, means the eradication, suppression, or reduction of the population of the invasive species within the area in which the invasive species is present.

(2) **ECOSYSTEM.**—The term “ecosystem” means the complex of a community of organisms and the environment of the organisms.

(3) **ELIGIBLE STATE.**—The term “eligible State” means any of—

- (A) a State;
- (B) the District of Columbia;
- (C) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;
- (D) American Samoa;
- (E) Guam; and
- (F) the United States Virgin Islands.

(4) **INVASIVE SPECIES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “invasive species” means an alien species, the introduction of which causes, or is likely to cause, economic or environmental harm or harm to human health.

(B) **ASSOCIATED DEFINITION.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term “alien species”, with respect to a particular ecosystem, means any species (including the seeds, eggs, spores, or other biological material of the species that are capable of propagating the species) that is not native to the affected ecosystem.

(C) **INCLUSION.**—The terms “invasive species” and “alien species” include any terrestrial or aquatic species determined by the relevant tribal, regional, State, or local authority to meet the requirements of subparagraph (A) or (B), as applicable.

(5) **MANAGE; MANAGEMENT.**—The terms “manage” and “management”, with respect to an invasive species, mean the active implementation of any activity—

(A) to reduce or stop the spread of the invasive species; and

(B) to inhibit further infestations of the invasive species, the spread of the invasive species, or harm caused by the invasive species, including investigations regarding methods for early detection and rapid response, prevention, control, or management of the invasive species.

(6) **PREVENT.**—The term “prevent”, with respect to an invasive species, means—

(A) to hinder the introduction of the invasive species onto land or water; or

(B) to impede the spread of the invasive species within land or water by inspecting, intercepting, or confiscating invasive species threats prior to the establishment of the invasive species onto land or water of an eligible State.

(7) **SECRETARY CONCERNED.**—The term “Secretary concerned” means—

(A) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to Federal land administered by the Secretary of the Interior through—

- (i) the Bureau of Indian Affairs;
- (ii) the Bureau of Land Management;
- (iii) the Bureau of Reclamation;
- (iv) the National Park Service; or
- (v) the United States Fish and Wildlife Service;

(B) the Secretary, with respect to Federal land administered by the Secretary through the Forest Service; and

(C) the head or a representative of any other Federal agency the duties of whom require planning relating to, and the treatment of, invasive species on Federal land.

(8) **SPECIES.**—The term “species” means a group of organisms, all of which—

(A) have a high degree of physical and genetic similarity;

(B) generally interbreed only among themselves; and

(C) show persistent differences from members of allied groups of organisms.

(c) **FEDERAL EFFORTS TO CONTROL AND MANAGE INVASIVE SPECIES ON FEDERAL LAND.**—

(1) **CONTROL AND MANAGEMENT.**—Each Secretary concerned shall plan and carry out activities on land directly managed by the Secretary concerned to control and manage invasive species—

(A) to inhibit or reduce the populations of invasive species; and

(B) to effectuate restoration or reclamation efforts.

(2) **STRATEGIC PLAN.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Each Secretary concerned shall develop a strategic plan for the implementation of the invasive species program to achieve, to the maximum extent practicable, a substantive annual net reduction of invasive species populations or infested acreage on land managed by the Secretary concerned.

(B) **COORDINATION.**—Each strategic plan under subparagraph (A) shall be developed—

(i) in coordination with affected—

(I) eligible States;

(II) political subdivisions of eligible States; and

(III) federally recognized Indian tribes; and

(ii) in accordance with the priorities established by 1 or more Governors of the eligible States in which an ecosystem affected by an invasive species is located.

(C) **FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.**—In developing a strategic plan under this paragraph, the Secretary concerned shall take into consideration the economic and ecological costs of action or inaction, as applicable.

(d) **PROGRAM FUNDING ALLOCATIONS.**—

(1) **CONTROL AND MANAGEMENT.**—Of the amount appropriated or otherwise made available to each Secretary concerned for a fiscal year for programs that address or include invasive species management, the Secretary concerned shall use not less than 75 percent for on-the-ground control and management of invasive species, including through—

(A) the purchase of necessary products, equipment, or services to conduct that control and management;

(B) the use of integrated pest management options, including pesticides authorized for sale, distribution, or use under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136 et seq.);

(C) the use of biological control agents that are proven to be effective to reduce invasive species populations;

(D) the use of revegetation or cultural restoration methods designed to improve the diversity and richness of ecosystems; or

(E) the use of other effective mechanical or manual control methods.

(2) **INVESTIGATIONS, OUTREACH, AND PUBLIC AWARENESS.**—Of the amount appropriated or otherwise made available to each Secretary concerned for a fiscal year for programs that address or include invasive species management, the Secretary concerned may use not more than 15 percent for investigations, development activities, and outreach and public awareness efforts to address invasive species control and management needs.

(3) **ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.**—Of the amount appropriated or otherwise made available to each Secretary concerned for a fiscal year

for programs that address or include invasive species management, not more than 10 percent may be used for administrative costs incurred to carry out those programs, including costs relating to oversight and management of the programs, recordkeeping, and implementation of the strategic plan developed under subsection (c)(2).

(4) **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**—Not later than 60 days after the end of the second fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, each Secretary concerned shall submit to Congress a report—

(A) describing the use by the Secretary concerned during the 2 preceding fiscal years of funds for programs that address or include invasive species management; and

(B) specifying the percentage of funds expended for each of the purposes specified in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3).

(e) **PRUDENT USE OF FUNDS.**—

(1) **COST-EFFECTIVE METHODS.**—In selecting a method to be used to control or manage an invasive species as part of a specific control or management project, the Secretary concerned shall prioritize the use of the least-costly option, based on sound scientific data and other commonly used, cost-effective benchmarks, in an area to effectively control and manage invasive species.

(2) **COMPARATIVE ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT.**—To achieve compliance with paragraph (1), the Secretary concerned shall require a comparative economic assessment of invasive species control and management methods to be conducted.

(3) **CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—An invasive species control or management project or activity described in subparagraph (B) is categorically excluded from the requirement to prepare an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) during the period for which the Secretary concerned determines that the project or activity is otherwise conducted in accordance with applicable agency procedures, including any land and resource management plan or land use plan applicable to the area.

(B) **DESCRIPTION OF PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES.**—A project or activity referred to in subparagraph (A) is a project or activity that, as determined by the Secretary concerned—

(i) is, or will be, carried out on land or water that is—

(I) directly managed by the Secretary concerned; and

(II) located in a prioritized, high-risk area; and

(ii) involves the treatment of any land or waterway located within 1,000 feet of—

(I) any port of entry to the United States, including—

(aa) a water body or waterway;

(bb) a railroad line;

(cc) an airport; and

(dd) a roadside or highway;

(II) a water project;

(III) a utility or telephone infrastructure or right-of-way;

(IV) a campground;

(V) a National Heritage Area;

(VI) a National Monument;

(VII) a park or other recreational site;

(VIII) a school; or

(IX) any other similar, valuable infrastructure.

(4) **RELATION TO OTHER AUTHORITY.**—

(A) **OTHER INVASIVE SPECIES CONTROL, PREVENTION, AND MANAGEMENT AUTHORITIES.**—Nothing in this section precludes the Secretary concerned from pursuing or supporting, pursuant to any other provision of

law, any activity regarding the control, prevention, or management of an invasive species, including investigations to improve the control, prevention, or management of the invasive species.

(B) PUBLIC WATER SUPPLY SYSTEMS.—Nothing in this section authorizes the Secretary concerned to suspend any water delivery or diversion, or otherwise to prevent the operation of a public water supply system, as a measure to control, manage, or prevent the introduction or spread of an invasive species.

(f) USE OF PARTNERSHIPS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the requirements of this subsection, the Secretary concerned may enter into any contract or cooperative agreement with another Federal agency, an eligible State, a political subdivision of an eligible State, or a private individual or entity to assist with the control and management of an invasive species.

(2) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of a contract or cooperative agreement under paragraph (1), the Secretary concerned and the applicable Federal agency, eligible State, or private individual or entity shall enter into a memorandum of understanding that describes—

(i) the nature of the partnership between the parties to the memorandum of understanding; and

(ii) the control and management activities to be conducted under the contract or cooperative agreement.

(B) CONTENTS.—A memorandum of understanding under this paragraph shall contain, at a minimum, the following:

(i) A prioritized listing of each invasive species to be controlled or managed.

(ii) An assessment of the total acres or area infested by the invasive species.

(iii) An estimate of the expected total acres or area infested by the invasive species after control and management of the invasive species is attempted.

(iv) A description of each specific, integrated pest management option to be used, including a comparative economic assessment to determine the least-costly method.

(v) Any map, boundary, or Global Positioning System coordinates needed to clearly identify the area in which each control or management activity is proposed to be conducted.

(vi) A written assurance that each partner will comply with section 15 of the Federal Noxious Weed Act of 1974 (7 U.S.C. 2814).

(C) COORDINATION.—If a partner to a contract or cooperative agreement under paragraph (1) is an eligible State, political subdivision or entity, the memorandum of understanding under this paragraph shall include a description of—

(i) the means by which each applicable control or management effort will be coordinated; and

(ii) the expected outcomes of managing and controlling the invasive species.

(D) PUBLIC OUTREACH AND AWARENESS EFFORTS.—If a contract or cooperative agreement under paragraph (1) involves any outreach or public awareness effort, the memorandum of understanding under this paragraph shall include a list of goals and objectives for each outreach or public awareness effort that have been determined to be efficient to inform national, regional, State, or local audiences regarding invasive species control and management.

(3) INVESTIGATIONS.—The purpose of any invasive species-related investigation carried out under a contract or cooperative agreement under paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) to develop solutions and specific recommendations for control and management of invasive species; and

(B) specifically to provide faster implementation of control and management methods.

(g) COORDINATION WITH AFFECTED LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.—Each project and activity carried out under this section shall be coordinated with affected local governments, in accordance with section 202(c)(9) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712(c)(9)).

SA 3294. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. ENZI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 125. MODIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS FOR AGRICULTURE AND AGRICULTURAL PRODUCERS.

(a) PREDATORY AND OTHER WILD ANIMALS.—Section 1 of the Act of March 2, 1931 (7 U.S.C. 8351), is amended—

(1) in the second sentence, by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(b) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary”;

(2) in the first sentence, by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) ACTION BY FWS.—The Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall use the most expeditious procedure practicable to process and administer permits for take of—

“(1) a depredating eagle under the Act of June 8, 1940 (commonly known as the ‘Bald Eagle Protection Act’) (54 Stat. 250, chapter 278; 16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.), or sections 22.11 through 22.32 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations) (including depredation of livestock, wildlife, and species protected under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) or any other Federal management program); or

“(2) a migratory bird included on the list under section 10.13 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations) that is posing a conflict.”.

(b) USE OF AUTHORIZED PESTICIDES; DISCHARGES OF PESTICIDES; REPORT.—

(1) USE OF AUTHORIZED PESTICIDES.—Section 3(f) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) USE OF AUTHORIZED PESTICIDES.—Except as provided in subsection (s) of section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342), the Administrator or a State shall not require a permit under that Act for a discharge from a point source into navigable waters of—

“(A) a pesticide authorized for sale, distribution, or use under this Act; or

“(B) the residue of the pesticide, resulting from the application of the pesticide.”.

(2) DISCHARGES OF PESTICIDES.—Section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(s) DISCHARGES OF PESTICIDES.—

“(1) NO PERMIT REQUIREMENT.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a permit shall not be required by the Administrator or a State

under this Act for a discharge from a point source into navigable waters of—

“(A) a pesticide authorized for sale, distribution, or use under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136 et seq.); or

“(B) the residue of the pesticide, resulting from the application of the pesticide.

“(2) EXCEPTIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the following discharges of a pesticide or pesticide residue:

“(A) A discharge resulting from the application of a pesticide in violation of a provision of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136 et seq.) relevant to protecting water quality if—

“(i) the discharge would not have occurred without the violation; or

“(ii) the quantity of pesticide or pesticide residue in the discharge is greater than would have occurred without the violation.

“(B) Stormwater discharges subject to regulation under subsection (p).

“(C) The following discharges subject to regulation under this section:

“(i) Manufacturing or industrial effluent.

“(ii) Treatment works effluent.

“(iii) Discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel, including a discharge resulting from ballasting operations or vessel biofouling prevention.”.

(3) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (referred to in this section as the “Administrator”), in consultation with the Secretary, shall submit a report to the Committee on Environment and Public Works and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives that includes—

(A) the status of intra-agency coordination between the Office of Water and the Office of Pesticide Programs of the Environmental Protection Agency regarding streamlining information collection, standards of review, and data use relating to water quality impacts from the registration and use of pesticides;

(B) an analysis of the effectiveness of current regulatory actions relating to pesticide registration and use aimed at protecting water quality; and

(C) any recommendations on how the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136 et seq.) can be modified to better protect water quality and human health.

(c) FARMER IDENTITY PROTECTION.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) AGENCY.—The term “Agency” means the Environmental Protection Agency.

(B) LIVESTOCK OPERATION.—The term “livestock operation” includes any operation involved in the raising or finishing of livestock and poultry.

(2) PROCUREMENT AND DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.—

(A) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Administrator, any officer or employee of the Agency, or any contractor or cooperator of the Agency, shall not disclose the information of any owner, operator, or employee of a livestock operation provided to the Agency by a livestock producer or a State agency in accordance with the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) or any other law, including—

(i) names;

(ii) telephone numbers;

(iii) email addresses;

(iv) physical addresses;

(v) Global Positioning System coordinates;

(vi) financial information, including business records and production data; or

(vii) other identifying information regarding the location of the owner, operator, livestock, or employee.

(B) EFFECT.—Nothing in this subsection affects—

(i) the disclosure of information described in subparagraph (A) if—

(I) the information has been transformed into a statistical or aggregate form at the county level or higher without any information that identifies the agricultural operation or agricultural producer; or

(II) the livestock producer consents to the disclosure;

(ii) the authority of any State agency to collect information on livestock operations; or

(iii) the authority of the Agency to disclose the information on livestock operations to State or other Federal governmental agencies.

(C) CONDITION OF PERMIT OR OTHER PROGRAMS.—The approval of any permit, practice, or program administered by the Administrator shall not be conditioned on the consent of the livestock producer under subparagraph (B)(i)(II).

(d) PRIVACY OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCERS.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means—

(i) the Administrator; and

(ii) in the case of an action taken pursuant to a permit program approved under section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342), the head of the State agency administering the program.

(B) AERIAL SURVEILLANCE.—The term “aerial surveillance” means any surveillance from the air, including—

(i) surveillance conducted from manned or unmanned aircraft; or

(ii) the use of aerial or satellite images, regardless of whether the images are publicly available.

(C) AGRICULTURAL LAND.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The term “agricultural land” means land used primarily for agricultural production.

(ii) INCLUSIONS.—The term “agricultural land” includes—

(I) cropland;

(II) grassland;

(III) prairie land;

(IV) improved pastureland;

(V) rangeland;

(VI) cropped woodland;

(VII) marshes;

(VIII) reclaimed land;

(IX) fish or other aquatic species habitat;

(X) land used for—

(aa) agroforestry; or

(bb) the production of livestock; and

(XI) land that contains existing infrastructure used for—

(aa) the production of livestock; or

(bb) another agricultural operation.

(2) LIMITATION ON USE OF AERIAL SURVEILLANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), in exercising any authority under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), the Administrator may not conduct aerial surveillance of agricultural land.

(B) EXCEPTIONS.—The Administrator may conduct aerial surveillance of agricultural land under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) if the Administrator—

(i) has obtained the voluntary written consent of the owner or operator of the land to be surveilled in accordance with paragraph (3); or

(ii) has obtained a certification of reasonable suspicion in accordance with paragraph (4).

(3) VOLUNTARY WRITTEN CONSENT.—

(A) CONSENT REQUIRED.—In order to conduct aerial surveillance under paragraph (2)(B)(i), the Administrator shall obtain from the owner or operator of the land to be surveilled written consent to such surveillance.

(B) CONTENTS.—The Administrator shall ensure that any written consent required under subparagraph (A)—

(i) specifies the period during which the consent is effective, which may not exceed 1 year;

(ii) contains a specific description of the geographical area to be surveilled; and

(iii) on the request of the owner or operator of the land to be surveilled, contains limitations on the days and times during which the surveillance may be conducted.

(C) ASSURANCE OF VOLUNTARY CONSENT.—The Administrator—

(i) shall ensure that any written consent required under subparagraph (A) is granted voluntarily by the owner or operator of the land to be surveilled; and

(ii) may not threaten additional, more detailed, or more thorough inspections, or otherwise coerce or entice the owner or operator, in order to obtain written consent.

(4) CERTIFICATION OF REASONABLE SUSPICION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In order to conduct aerial surveillance under paragraph (2)(B)(ii), the Administrator shall obtain from a United States district court of competent jurisdiction (referred to in this paragraph as a “Court”) a certification of reasonable suspicion in accordance with this paragraph.

(B) CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—A Court may issue to the Administrator a certification of reasonable suspicion if—

(i) the Administrator submits to the Court an affidavit setting forth specific and articulable facts that would indicate to a reasonable person that a violation of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) exists in the area to be surveilled; and

(ii) the Court finds that the Administrator has shown reasonable suspicion that an owner or operator of agricultural land in the area to be surveilled has violated the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.).

(5) DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), or for the purposes of an investigation or prosecution by the Administrator as described in paragraph (6), the Administrator may not disclose information collected through aerial surveillance conducted under paragraph (2)(B).

(B) APPLICABILITY OF FOIA.—Section 552 of title 5, United States Code, shall not apply to any information collected through aerial surveillance conducted under paragraph (2)(B).

(C) RIGHT TO PETITION.—The owner or operator of land surveilled under this subsection has the right to petition for copies of the information collected through such surveillance.

(6) DESTRUCTION OF INFORMATION.—The Administrator shall destroy information collected through aerial surveillance conducted under paragraph (2)(B) not later than 30 days after collection, unless the information is pertinent to an active investigation or prosecution by the Administrator.

(7) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section expands the power of the Administrator to inspect, monitor, or conduct surveillance of agricultural land pursuant to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) or any other Federal law.

(e) REGULATIONS RELATING TO THE TAKING OF DOUBLE-CRESTED CORMORANTS.—

(1) FORCE AND EFFECT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), sections 21.47 and 21.48 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on January 1, 2016), shall have the force and effect of law.

(B) PUBLIC NOTICE.—The Secretary of the Interior (referred to in this subsection as the “Secretary”), acting through the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (referred to in this subsection as the “Director”), shall notify the public of the authority provided by subparagraph (A) in a manner determined to be appropriate by the Secretary.

(2) SUNSET.—The authority provided by paragraph (1)(A) shall terminate on the effective date of a regulation promulgated by the Director after the date of enactment of this Act to control depredation of double-crested cormorant populations.

(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection limits the authority of the Director to promulgate regulations relating to the taking of double-crested cormorants under any other law.

(f) APPLICABILITY OF SPILL PREVENTION, CONTROL, AND COUNTERMEASURE RULE.—Section 1049 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 1361 note; 128 Stat. 1257; 130 Stat. 1902) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “20,000” and inserting “42,000”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) an aggregate aboveground storage capacity greater than 10,000 gallons but less than 42,000 gallons; and”;

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) with an aggregate aboveground storage capacity of less than or equal to 10,000 gallons; and”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(D) by striking paragraph (4);

(2) in subsection (c)(2)(A)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking “1,000” and inserting “1,320”; and

(B) in clause (ii), by striking “2,500” and inserting “3,000”; and

(3) by striking subsection (d).

SA 3295. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. UDALL, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 275, strike line 21 and insert the following:

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “subparagraphs (B) and (C)” and inserting “subparagraph (B)”;

(B) by striking subparagraph (C);

(2) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the

On page 277, line 4, strike “(2)” and insert “(3)”.

On page 277, line 6, strike “(3)” and insert “(4)”.

SA 3296. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for

the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 126. COMPLIANCE WITH SMALL BUSINESS ACT.

Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) ensure that the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization of the Department of Agriculture achieves compliance with paragraphs (2), (15), and (17) of section 15(k) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(k)); or

(2) submit to Congress a report that describes—

(A) each instance in which the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization failed to achieve that compliance, if applicable;

(B) the reasons for the failure; and

(C) recommendations for amendments to applicable laws (including regulations) to provide to the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization appropriate flexibility or exceptions, if any.

SA 3297. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 125. HORSE SLAUGHTER PREVENTION.

(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

(1) to prohibit the slaughter of horses for human consumption;

(2) to prohibit the sale, possession, and trade of horseflesh for human consumption; and

(3) to prohibit the sale, possession, and trade of live horses for slaughter for human consumption.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) EUTHANASIA.—The term “euthanasia” means to kill an animal humanely by means that immediately render the animal unconscious, with this state remaining until the swift death of the animal.

(2) EXPORT.—The term “export” means to take from any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States to a place not subject to that jurisdiction, whether or not the taking constitutes an exportation within the meaning of the customs laws of the United States.

(3) HORSE.—The term “horse” means all members of the equid family, including horses, ponies, donkeys, mules, asses, and burros.

(4) HORSEFLESH.—The term “horseflesh” means the flesh of a dead horse, including the viscera, skin, hair, hide, hooves, and bones of the horse.

(5) HUMAN CONSUMPTION.—The term “human consumption” means ingestion by people as a source of food.

(6) IMPORT.—The term “import” means to bring into any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States from a place not subject to that jurisdiction, whether or not the bringing constitutes an importation within the meaning of the customs laws of the United States.

(7) PERSON.—The term “person” means—

(A) an individual, corporation, partnership, trust, association, or other private entity;

(B) an officer, employee, agent, department, or instrumentality of—

(i) the Federal Government; or

(ii) any State, municipality, or political subdivision of a State; or

(C) any other entity subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

(8) SLAUGHTER.—The term “slaughter” means the commercial slaughter of 1 or more horses with an intent to sell, barter, or trade horseflesh for human consumption.

(9) STATE.—The term “State” means—

(A) each of the several States of the United States;

(B) the District of Columbia;

(C) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

(D) Guam;

(E) American Samoa;

(F) the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands;

(G) the Federated States of Micronesia;

(H) the Republic of the Marshall Islands;

(I) the Republic of Palau;

(J) the United States Virgin Islands; and

(K) any other territory or possession of the United States.

(10) TRANSPORT.—The term “transport” means—

(A) to move by any means; or

(B) to receive or load onto a vehicle for the purpose of movement.

(11) UNITED STATES.—The term “United States” means the customs territory of the United States, as defined in general note 2 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

(c) PROHIBITED ACTS.—A person shall not—

(1) slaughter a horse for human consumption;

(2) import into, or export from, the United States—

(A) horseflesh for human consumption; or

(B) live horses intended for slaughter for human consumption;

(3) sell or barter, offer to sell or barter, purchase, possess, transport, deliver, or receive—

(A) horseflesh for human consumption; or

(B) live horses intended for slaughter for human consumption; or

(4) solicit, request, or otherwise knowingly cause any act prohibited under paragraph (1), (2), or (3).

(d) PENALTIES.—

(1) CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—A person that violates subsection (c) shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

(2) CIVIL PENALTIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other civil or criminal penalty that may be imposed under title 18, United States Code, or any other provision of law, if a person violates subsection (c), the Secretary shall—

(i) assess a civil penalty against the person of not less than \$2,500 but not more than \$5,000; and

(ii) confiscate all horses in the physical or legal possession of the person at the time of arrest, if the horses are intended for slaughter.

(B) REMISSION OR MITIGATION OF PENALTIES.—For good cause shown, the Secretary may remit or mitigate any civil penalty under this section.

(C) DEBARMENT.—The Secretary shall prohibit a person from importing, exporting, transporting, trading, or selling horses in the United States, if the Secretary finds that the person has engaged in a pattern or practice of actions that have resulted in a final judicial or administrative determination with respect to the assessment of criminal or civil penalties for violations of this section.

(3) NOTICE; HEARING.—No monetary penalty may be assessed against a person for a viola-

tion under this subsection unless the person is given notice and opportunity for a hearing with respect to the violation in accordance with section 554 of title 5, United States Code.

(4) SEPARATE OFFENSES.—

(A) LIVE HORSE.—Each live horse transported, traded, slaughtered, or possessed in violation of this section shall constitute a separate offense.

(B) HORSEFLESH.—Each 400 hundred pounds or less of horseflesh transported, traded, slaughtered, or possessed in violation of this section shall constitute a separate offense.

(e) ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall enforce this section directly or by agreement with any other Federal, State, or local agency.

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—Any person authorized by the Secretary to enforce this section—

(A) may execute any warrant or process issued by any officer or court of competent jurisdiction to enforce this section; and

(B) if so authorized, may, in addition to any other authority conferred by law—

(i) with or without warrant or other process, arrest any person committing (in the presence or view of the authorized person) a violation of this section (including a regulation promulgated under this section);

(ii) seize the cargo of any truck or other conveyance used or employed to violate this section (including a regulation promulgated under this section) or that reasonably appears to have been so used or employed; and

(iii) seize, whenever and wherever found, all horses and horseflesh possessed in violation of this section (including a regulation promulgated under this section) and dispose of the horses and horseflesh, in accordance with this subsection (including regulations promulgated under this section).

(3) PLACEMENT OF CONFISCATED HORSES.—

(A) TEMPORARY PLACEMENT.—After confiscation of a live horse under this section, an arresting authority shall work with animal welfare societies and animal control departments—

(i) to ensure the temporary placement of the horse with an animal rescue facility that is an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of that Code, while the person charged with violating this section is prosecuted; or

(ii) if placement at such a facility is not practicable, to temporarily place the horse with—

(I) a facility that has as its primary purpose the humane treatment of animals; or

(II) another suitable location, as determined by the Secretary or arresting authority.

(B) BONDS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The owner of a horse confiscated under this section may prevent permanent placement of the horse by the facility that has temporary custody of the horse by posting a bond with a court of competent jurisdiction in an amount the court determines is sufficient to provide for the necessary care and keeping of the horse for at least 60 days, including the day on which the horse was taken into custody.

(ii) TIMING.—The bond shall be filed with the court not later than 10 days after the horse is confiscated.

(iii) LACK OF BOND.—If a bond is not posted in accordance with this subparagraph, the custodial facility shall determine permanent placement of the horse in accordance with reasonable practices for the humane treatment of animals.

(iv) TREATMENT FOLLOWING BOND PERIOD.—

(I) NEW BOND.—If the animal has not yet been returned to the owner at the end of the

time for which expenses are covered by the bond and if the owner desires to prevent permanent placement of the animal by the custodial facility, the owner shall post a new bond with the court within 10 days after expiration of the prior bond.

(II) PERMANENT PLACEMENT.—If a new bond is not posted in accordance with subclause (I), the custodial facility shall determine permanent placement of the horse in accordance with reasonable practices for the humane treatment of animals.

(V) COSTS FOR PROVIDING CARE FOR HORSE DEDUCTED FROM BOND.—If a bond is posted in accordance with this subparagraph, the custodial facility may draw from the bond the actual reasonable costs incurred by the facility in providing the necessary care and keeping of the confiscated horse from the date of the initial confiscation of the horse to the date of final disposition of the horse in the criminal action charging a violation of this section.

(C) PERMANENT PLACEMENT.—Except as provided in paragraph (4), any horse confiscated pursuant to this section and not returned to the owner after confiscation shall be placed permanently with an animal rescue facility or other suitable facility as described in this section on—

(i) the conviction under this section of the owner of the horse;

(ii) the surrender of the horse by the owner;

(iii) the failure of the owner of the horse to post a bond as required under subparagraph (B); or

(iv) the inability of the Secretary to identify the owner.

(4) EUTHANASIA OF HORSES.—

(A) EMERGENCY CIRCUMSTANCES.—The Secretary or any law enforcement authority charged with enforcing this section may order or perform the immediate euthanasia of any horse in the field if the horse is injured beyond recovery and suffering irreversibly.

(B) HORSES BEYOND RECOVERY AND UNPLACEABLE.—The Secretary or any law enforcement authority charged with enforcing this section may order a licensed veterinarian to euthanize any confiscated horse if—

(i) the confiscated horse is injured, disabled, or diseased beyond recovery; or

(ii) placement at an animal rescue facility or other suitable facility, as described in this subsection, is not practicable within 90 days of any circumstance described in paragraph (3)(C).

(C) METHOD.—In euthanizing a horse under subparagraph (B), the Secretary, law enforcement authority charged with enforcing this section, or a licensed veterinarian conducting the euthanasia shall use a method of euthanasia rated “Acceptable” for horses in the most recent Report of the American Veterinary Medical Association’s Panel on Euthanasia.

(5) FUNDING OF ANIMAL RESCUE FACILITIES.—

(A) GRANTS.—Subject to the availability of appropriated funds, the Secretary shall make grants to animal rescue facilities described in paragraph (3)(A)(i) that have given adequate assurances to the Secretary that the facilities are willing to accept horses under this section.

(B) PENALTIES, FINES, AND FORFEITED PROPERTY.—Amounts received as penalties or fines under this section, and property forfeited under this section, shall be used for the care of any live horses seized from violators of this section and taken into the possession by the United States or placed with an animal rescue facility or other suitable location.

(f) REPORTS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and on an

annual basis thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on—

(1) actions taken by the Secretary and other Federal agencies to carry out this section; and

(2) the adequacy of resources to carry out this section.

(g) EXEMPTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (c) and paragraph (2), nothing in this section affects the regulation of horses by a State.

(2) LAW ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A State or local law enforcement or arresting authority may take such actions as are necessary under subsection (e) to enforce this section.

(B) ENFORCEMENT.—A person described in subsection (b)(7)(B) may engage in activities described in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (c) solely for the purposes of enforcing this section.

(h) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall promulgate such regulations as are necessary to carry out this section.

(i) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section takes effect on the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 3298. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 401. PROHIBITION.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “John Stringer Rainey Memorial Safeguard American Food Exports Act” or the “SAFE Act”.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) unlike cows, pigs, and other domesticated species, horses and other members of the equidae family are not raised for the purpose of human consumption;

(2) equines raised in the United States are frequently treated with substances that are not approved for use in horses intended for human consumption and equine parts are therefore unsafe within the meaning of section 409 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act;

(3) equines raised in the United States are frequently treated with drugs, including phenylbutazone, acepromazine, boldenone undecylenate, omeprazole, ketoprofen, xylazine, hyaluronic acid, nitrofurazone, polysulfated glycosaminoglycan, clenbuterol, tolazoline, and ponazuril, which are not approved for use in horses intended for human consumption and equine parts are therefore unsafe within the meaning of section 512 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; and

(4) consuming parts of an equine raised in the United States likely poses a serious threat to human health and the public should be protected from these unsafe products.

(c) PROHIBITIONS.—Section 301 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 331) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(eee) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section—

“(1) equine parts shall be deemed unsafe under section 409 of this Act;

“(2) equine parts shall be deemed unsafe under section 512 of this Act; and

“(3) the knowing sale or transport of equines or equine parts in interstate or foreign commerce for purposes of human consumption is hereby prohibited.”.

SA 3299. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 125. SLAUGHTER OF HORSES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall not—

(1) carry out any inspection of horses under section 3 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 603);

(2) carry out any inspection of horses under section 903 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 1901 note; Public Law 104-127); or

(3) implement or enforce section 352.19 of title 9, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation).

SA 3300. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 7405, insert the following:

SEC. 7406. INTER-REGIONAL RESEARCH PROJECT NUMBER 4.

Subsection (e) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 3157(e)) is amended by striking paragraph (7) and inserting the following:

“(7) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection \$50,000,000 for each fiscal year.”.

SA 3301. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. LEE, and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle F of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 86. APPLICATION OF THE ROADLESS AREA CONSERVATION RULE IN THE STATES OF ALASKA AND UTAH.

The Roadless Area Conservation Rule established under part 294 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), shall not apply to National Forest System land in the State of Alaska or the State of Utah.

SA 3302. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle F of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 86. APPLICATION OF THE ROADLESS AREA CONSERVATION RULE IN THE TONGASS NATIONAL FOREST.

The Roadless Area Conservation Rule established under part 294 of title 36, Code of

Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), shall not apply to National Forest System land in the Tongass National Forest in the State of Alaska.

SA 3303. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1203, strike lines 20 through 22 and insert the following:

(1) fully enforce the Buy American provisions applicable to domestic food assistance programs administered by the Food and Nutrition Service, including, for use in those domestic food assistance programs, the purchase of a fish or fish product that substantially contains—

(A) fish (including tuna) harvested within—

(i) a State;

(ii) the District of Columbia; or

(iii) the Exclusive Economic Zone of the United States, as described in Presidential Proclamation 5030 (48 Fed. Reg. 10605; March 10, 1983); or

(B) tuna harvested by a United States flagged vessel; and

SA 3304. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12628. ALTERNATIVE NATIONAL PER RESIDENT PAYMENT FOR RESIDENTS TRAINING IN RURAL TRAINING LOCATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1886 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(u) ALTERNATIVE NATIONAL PER RESIDENT PAYMENT AMOUNT FOR RESIDENTS TRAINING IN RURAL TRAINING LOCATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a national per resident payment (NPRP) amount for time spent by residents training in rural training locations in accordance with paragraph (2).

“(B) ELECTION.—For cost reporting periods beginning on or after the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, an applicable hospital (as defined in paragraph (6)(A)), may elect to receive the payment amount under this subsection for each full-time-equivalent resident in an approved medical residency training program that receives training in a rural training location in accordance with paragraph (2). An applicable hospital may make an election under the preceding sentence regardless of whether the applicable hospital is otherwise eligible for a payment or adjustment for indirect and direct graduate medical education costs under subsections (d)(5)(B) and (h) or section 1814(l), as applicable, with respect to such residents. If the applicable hospital is otherwise eligible for such a payment or ad-

justment, the national per resident payment amount under this subsection shall be in lieu of such payment or adjustment.

“(C) APPLICATION.—The provisions of this subsection, or the application of such provisions to an applicable hospital, shall not result in or otherwise effect the following:

“(i) The establishment of a limitation on the number of residents in allopathic or osteopathic medicine for purposes of subsections (d)(5)(B) and (h) with respect to an approved medical residency training program of an applicable hospital (or be taken into account in determining such a limitation during the cap building period of an applicable hospital).

“(ii) The determination of—

“(I) the additional payment amount under subsection (d)(5)(B); or

“(II) hospital-specific approved FTE resident amounts under subsection (h).

“(iii) The counting of any resident with respect to which the applicable hospital receives a national per resident payment under this subsection towards the application of the limitation described in clause (i) for purposes of subsections (d)(5)(B) and (h).

“(2) PAYMENT AMOUNT.—

“(A) BASE AMOUNT.—The national per resident payment amount, with respect to full-time equivalent residents training in rural training locations, for cost reporting periods beginning during the first year beginning on or after the date of enactment of this subsection shall be, based on the most recently available data with respect to cost reporting periods beginning during a preceding year (referred to in this subparagraph as the ‘base cost reporting period’), equal to the sum of the following:

“(i) DIRECT GME.—The amount that, out of all of the payment amounts (determined on a per resident basis) received by hospitals under subsection (h) for such base cost reporting period, is equal to the national 85th percentile of such payment amounts.

“(ii) INDIRECT GME.—The amount that, out of all of the additional payment amounts (determined on a per resident basis) received by hospitals under subsection (d)(5)(B) for such base cost reporting period, is equal to the national 85th percentile of such payment amounts.

“(B) UPDATING FOR SUBSEQUENT COST REPORTING PERIODS.—For each subsequent cost reporting period, the national per resident payment amount is equal to such amount determined under this paragraph for the previous cost reporting period updated, through the midpoint of the period, by projecting the estimated percentage change in the consumer price index during the 12-month period ending at that midpoint, with appropriate adjustments to reflect previous under- or over-estimations under this subparagraph in the projected percentage change in the consumer price index.

“(C) CLARIFICATION.—The national per resident payment amount shall not be discounted or otherwise adjusted based on the Medicare patient load (as defined in subsection (h)(3)(C)) of an applicable hospital or discharges in a diagnosis-related group.

“(3) ALLOCATION OF PAYMENTS.—In providing for payments under this subsection, the Secretary shall provide for an allocation of such payments between parts A and part B (and the trust funds established under the respective parts) as reasonably reflects the proportion of such costs associated with the provision of services under each respective part.

“(4) ELIGIBILITY FOR PAYMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An applicable hospital shall be eligible for payment of the national per resident payment amount under this subsection for time spent by a resident training

in a rural training location if the following requirements are met:

“(i) The resident spends the equivalent of at least 8 weeks over the course of their training in a rural training location.

“(ii) The hospital pays the salary and benefits of the resident for the time spent training in a rural training location.

“(B) TREATMENT OF TIME SPENT IN RURAL TRACKS.—An applicable hospital shall be eligible for payment of the national per resident payment amount under this subsection for all time spent by residents in an approved medical residency program (or separately defined track within a program) that provides 50 percent or more of the total residency training time in rural training locations (as defined in paragraph (6)(C)), regardless of where the training occurs and regardless of specialty.

“(5) DETERMINATION OF FULL-TIME-EQUIVALENT RESIDENTS.—The determination of full-time-equivalent residents for purposes of this subsection shall be made in the same manner as the determination of full-time-equivalent residents under subsection (h)(4).

“(6) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) APPLICABLE HOSPITAL.—The term ‘applicable hospital’ means a hospital or critical access hospital.

“(B) APPROVED MEDICAL RESIDENCY TRAINING PROGRAM; DIRECT GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION COSTS; RESIDENT.—The terms ‘approved medical residency training program’, ‘direct graduate medical education costs’, and ‘resident’ have the meanings given those terms in subsection (h)(5).

“(C) RURAL TRAINING LOCATION.—The term ‘rural training location’ means a location in which training occurs that, based on the 2010 census or any subsequent census adjustment, meets one or more of the following criteria:

“(i) The training occurs in a location that is a rural area (as defined in section 1886(d)(2)(D)).

“(ii) The training occurs in a location that has a rural-urban commuting area code equal to or greater than 4.0.

“(iii) The training occurs in a location that is within 10 miles of a sole community hospital (as defined in subsection (d)(5)(D)(iii)).

“(7) BUDGET NEUTRALITY REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall ensure that aggregate payments for direct medical education costs and indirect medical education costs under this title, including any payments under this subsection, for each year (effective beginning on or after the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection) are not greater than the aggregate payments for such costs that would have been made under this title for the year without the application of this subsection. For purposes of carrying out the budget neutrality requirement under the preceding sentence, the Secretary may make appropriate adjustments to the amount of such payments for direct graduate medical education costs and indirect medical education costs under subsections (h) and (d)(5)(B), respectively.”

(b) TREATMENT OF CRITICAL ACCESS HOSPITALS AND SOLE COMMUNITY HOSPITALS.—

(1) CRITICAL ACCESS HOSPITALS.—Section 1814(l) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395f(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) For cost reporting periods beginning on or after the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the following shall apply:

“(A) A critical access hospital may elect to be treated as a hospital or as a non-provider setting for purposes of counting resident time for indirect medical education costs and direct graduate medical education costs for the time spent by the resident in that

setting under subsections (d)(5)(B) and (h), respectively, of section 1886.

“(B) Medical education costs shall not be considered reasonable costs of a critical access hospital for purposes of payment under paragraph (1), to the extent that the critical access hospital or another hospital receives payment for such costs for the time spent by the resident in that setting pursuant to subsection (d)(5)(B), subsection (h), or subsection (u) of section 1886.”.

(2) **SOLE COMMUNITY HOSPITALS.**—Section 1886(d)(5)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(5)(D)) is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(vi) For cost reporting periods beginning on or after the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the hospital-specific payment amount determined under clause (i)(I) with respect to a sole community hospital shall not include medical education costs, to the extent that the sole community hospital receives payment for such costs for the time spent by the resident in that setting pursuant to subsection (u).”.

(C) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) Section 1886 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww) is amended—

(A) in subsection (d)(5)(B), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “The Secretary” and inserting “Subject to subsection (u), the Secretary”; and

(B) in subsection (h)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by inserting “subject to subsection (u)” after “1861(v).”; and

(ii) in paragraph (3), in the flush matter at the end, by striking “subsection (k)” and inserting “subsection (k) or subsection (u)”.

SEC. 12629. SUPPORTING NEW, EXPANDING, AND EXISTING RURAL TRAINING TRACK RESIDENCIES.

(a) **DIRECT GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION.**—Section 1886(h) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(h)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (F)(i)—

(i) by striking “130 percent” and inserting “for cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 1997, and before the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, 130 percent”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following: “For cost reporting periods beginning on or after the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, such rules shall provide that any full-time-equivalent resident in an approved medical residency program (or separately defined track within a program) that provides 50 percent or more of the total residency training time in rural training locations (as defined in subsection (u)(6)(C)), regardless of where the training occurs and regardless of specialty, shall not be taken into account for purposes of applying the limitation under this subparagraph.”; and

(B) in subparagraph (H)—

(i) in clause (i), in the second sentence, by inserting the following before the period: “, in accordance with the second sentence of clause (i) of such subparagraph”;

(ii) in clause (iv), by inserting the following before the period: “, in accordance with the second sentence of clause (i) of such subparagraph”;

(2) in paragraph (5), by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(L) **SPECIAL RULES REGARDING APPLICATION OF NATIONAL PER RESIDENT PAYMENT AMOUNT.**—For special rules regarding application of the national per resident payment amount under subsection (u), see paragraph (1)(C) of such subsection.”.

(b) **INDIRECT MEDICAL EDUCATION.**—Section 1886(d)(5)(B)(v) is amended—

(1) by striking “130 percent” and inserting “for cost reporting periods beginning on or

after October 1, 1997, and before the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, 130 percent”;

(2) by adding at the end the following: “For cost reporting periods beginning on or after the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, such rules shall provide that any full-time-equivalent resident in an approved medical residency program (or separately defined track within a program) that provides 50 percent or more of the total residency training time in rural training locations (as defined in subsection (u)(6)(C)), regardless of where the training occurs and regardless of specialty, shall not be taken into account for purposes of applying the limitation under this subparagraph. For special rules regarding application of the national per resident payment amount under subsection (u), see paragraph (1)(C) of such subsection.”.

SA 3305. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 360, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 363, line 9, and insert the following:

(c) **STATE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS.**—Section 16(d) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking the subsection heading and inserting “STATE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS.—”;

(2) in paragraph (1)(B)(ii), by striking “paragraph (3)” and inserting “paragraph (4)”;

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “AND THEREAFTER” and inserting “THROUGH 2017”;

(B) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “fiscal year 2005 and each fiscal year thereafter” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2005 through 2017”; and

(C) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “fiscal year 2005 and each fiscal year thereafter” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2005 through 2017”; and

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking “paragraph (3)” and inserting “paragraph (4)”;

(4) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (5) as paragraphs (4) through (6), respectively; and

(5) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) **FISCAL YEAR 2018 AND THEREAFTER.**—With respect to fiscal year 2018 and each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary shall establish, by regulation, performance criteria relating to—

“(A) actions taken to correct errors, reduce rates of error, and improve eligibility determinations; and

“(B) other indicators of effective administration determined by the Secretary.”.

SA 3306. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the De-

partment of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 324, strike lines 24 and 25 and insert the following:

(2) in subsection (h)—

(A) in paragraph (12)—

(i) in subparagraph (A) by striking “due to inactivity.” and inserting the following: “due to—

“(i) inactivity; or

“(ii) the death of all members of the household.”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “6” and inserting “3”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “household after a period of 12 months.” and inserting the following: “household—

“(i) after a period of 6 months; or

“(ii) on verification that all members of the household are deceased.”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (13) and inserting the following:

SA 3307. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title I, add the following:

SEC. 12___. REPORT ON LOANS FOR ORGANIC LOAN COMMODITIES.

Subtitle B of title I of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9031 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1211. REPORT ON LOANS FOR ORGANIC LOAN COMMODITIES.

“Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Farm Service Agency, shall submit to Congress a report that includes—

“(1) an assessment of the demand of producers for market assistance loans for loan commodities that are certified organic during the 2014 through 2018 crop years, organized by State and type of loan commodity;

“(2) an evaluation of the ability to adjust nonrecourse loan rates under section 1210 for loan commodities that are certified organic;

“(3) an analysis of the expected impact of the adjustment described in paragraph (2) on loan rates for loan commodities that are not certified organic;

“(4) an analysis on whether premiums associated with loan commodities that are certified organic are sufficiently significant to affect loan rates for loan commodities that are not certified organic;

“(5) an evaluation of the risks and benefits of developing a program to provide nonrecourse marketing assistance loans for loan commodities that are certified organic that includes a premium paid at the time that the loan is made;

“(6) an evaluation of the logistics of—

“(A) verifying the certification of loan commodities that are certified organic;

“(B) storing those commodities; and

“(C) handling commodities that are forfeited to maintain segregation of those commodities; and

“(7) any other relevant information, as determined by the Secretary.”.

SA 3308. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12519. STUDY ON THE AVAILABILITY OF AGRICULTURAL CREDIT IN INDIAN COUNTRY.

Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) conduct an in-depth analysis into the nature of agricultural credit access in Indian country (as defined in section 1151 of title 18, United States Code) and surrounding areas, and to Tribal communities, specifically examining—

(A) compliance with the Community Reinvestment Act of 1977 (12 U.S.C. 2901 et seq.) by banks lending within Indian country (as defined in section 1151 of title 18, United States Code) and surrounding areas, and to Tribal communities, for agricultural enterprises;

(B) real estate mortgage lending on Indian trust land;

(C) agricultural credit provided by commercial banks and lending institutions;

(D) compliance with section 184 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1715z–13a); and

(E) compliance with the authority for the approval of mortgages and deeds for individual Indian trust land owners under the Act entitled “An Act to authorize the execution of mortgages and deeds of trust on individual Indian trust or restricted land”, approved March 29, 1956 (25 U.S.C. 5135); and

(2) submit a report with all findings and recommended actions to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate, and the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate.

SA 3309. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 125 ____ . FEDERAL RESEARCH INVOLVING CATS AND DOGS.

Section 14 of the Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. 2144) is amended—

(1) by striking “sections 13(a), (f), (g), and (h)” each place it appears and inserting “subsections (a), (f), (g), and (h) of section 13”;

(2) in the second sentence, by striking “Any department” and inserting the following:

“(b) EXHIBITIONS.—Any department”;

(3) by striking the section designation and heading and all that follows through “Any department” in the first sentence and inserting the following:

“SEC. 14. STANDARDS FOR FEDERAL FACILITIES.

“(a) LABORATORIES.—Any department”;

and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) RESEARCH INVOLVING CATS AND DOGS.—The Secretary shall conduct a study of the practicability of providing for the adoption, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, of any cats and dogs that—

“(1) are, or have been, located at any research facility of the Department of Agriculture at which research, testing, or experimentation on cats or dogs is conducted; and

“(2) are no longer needed for that research, testing, or experimentation.”.

SA 3310. Mr. DURBIN (for Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. UDALL)) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. DURBIN to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING AND CERTAIN FEDERAL BENEFITS.

(a) EXCLUSION OF BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING.—Section 403(k) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) In determining eligibility to participate in any Federal program issuing benefits for nutrition assistance (including the Family Subsistence Supplemental Allowance program under section 402a of this title), the value of a housing allowance under this section shall be excluded from any calculation of income, assets, or resources.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 5(d) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (18), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (19)(B), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(20) any allowance under section 403 of title 37, United States Code.”.

SA 3311. Mr. DURBIN (for Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. DURBIN to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In subtitle D of title II, add at the end the following:

SEC. 24 ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO INCREASED COLLABORATION FOR CONSERVATION.

It is the sense of Congress that there should be increased coordination and collaboration with respect to conservation among the Department of Agriculture, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Corps of Engineers.

SA 3312. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title I, add the following:

SEC. 11 ____ . NONRECOURSE CONSERVATION AND BEGINNING FARMERS LOAN ASSISTANCE PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE COMMODITY.—The term “eligible commodity” means corn, soybeans, and wheat.

(2) QUALIFIED PRODUCER.—The term “qualified producer” means a producer eligible for a nonrecourse marketing loan under section 1201 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9031) that agrees to not apply for that loan for any eligible commodity in each of the 2019 through 2023 crop years.

(b) NONRECOURSE CONSERVATION AND BEGINNING FARMERS LOAN ASSISTANCE PILOT PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall establish a nonrecourse conservation and beginning farmers loan assistance pilot program (referred to in this section as the “pilot program”) to make available to qualified producers on a farm nonrecourse conservation assistance loans for each eligible commodity for each of the 2019 through 2023 crop years.

(c) ELIGIBLE PRODUCTION.—A qualified producer on a farm shall be eligible for a loan under the pilot program for any quantity of an eligible commodity produced on the farm.

(d) LOAN RATES FOR NONRECOURSE CONSERVATION ASSISTANCE LOANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), for purposes of each of the 2019 through 2023 crop years, the loan rate for a loan under the pilot program for an eligible commodity shall be—

(A) for beginning farmers and ranchers (as determined by the Secretary), 70 percent of the national average price received by producers during the 12-month marketing year for the eligible commodity for the 5 crop years immediately prior to the crop year in which the conservation assistance loan will be made, excluding—

(i) the crop year with the highest price; and

(ii) the crop year with the lowest price; and

(B) for qualified producers not described in subparagraph (A), 55 percent of the national average price received by producers during the 12-month marketing year for the eligible commodity for the 5 crop years immediately prior to the crop year in which the conservation assistance loan will be made, excluding—

(i) the crop year with the highest price; and

(ii) the crop year with the lowest price.

(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR COVER CROPS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a qualified producer who agrees to plant a cover crop on acres associated with the eligible commodity, the applicable loan rate under paragraph (1) shall be increased by an amount equal to \$0.20 per bushel.

(B) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO PLANT COVER CROP.—In the case of a qualified producer who is prevented from planting a cover crop due to weather or other natural events that interfered with the planting of a cover crop (as determined by the Secretary), the qualified producer shall be eligible for the loan rate described in subparagraph (A).

(e) TERMS OF LOANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of each eligible commodity, a loan under the pilot program shall have a term of 9 months beginning on the first day of the first month after the month in which the loan is made.

(2) EXTENSIONS PROHIBITED.—The Secretary may not extend the term of a loan under the pilot program for any eligible commodity.

(f) REPAYMENT OF LOANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall permit the qualified producers on a farm to repay a loan under the pilot program for an eligible commodity at a rate that is the lesser of—

(A) the loan rate established under subsection (d);

(B) a rate that is equal to the expected market price for the eligible commodity as calculated for crop insurance, as determined by the Secretary; and

(C) such other rate the Secretary determines will avoid or minimize potential loan forfeitures.

(2) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Secretary shall make such adjustments that the Secretary determines necessary—

(A) to avoid forfeiture or the accumulation of stocks of the commodities placed under a loan under the pilot program;

(B) to minimize the costs incurred by the Federal Government;

(C) to allow the commodity produced to be marketed freely and competitively, both domestically and internationally; and

(D) to minimize discrepancies in conservation loan benefits across State boundaries and across county boundaries.

(g) COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS.—As a condition of the receipt of a loan under the pilot program, the qualified producer shall, during the crop year in which the loan was provided—

(1) comply with applicable conservation requirements under subtitle B of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3811 et seq.) and applicable wetland protection requirements under subtitle C of title XII of that Act (16 U.S.C. 3821 et seq.);

(2) agree to use a reduced tillage method and nutrient management practices (as determined by the Secretary to be appropriate for soil health management) for the acres associated with the commodity covered by the loan; and

(3) in the case of a loan calculated under subsection (d)(2), agree to plant a cover crop on the acres associated with the eligible commodity, as determined by the Secretary to be appropriate.

(h) FARM SERVICE AGENCY REPORT.—The Administrator of the Farm Service Agency shall submit an annual report to the Secretary that includes the information with respect to the compliance requirements described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (g) with respect to each loan under the pilot program that was fully repaid in the preceding fiscal year.

SA 3313. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 43 . PREVENTING CHILDHOOD DIETARY EXPOSURE TO CHLORPYRIFOS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning with the 2018-2019 school year, the Secretary shall phase out all food that has been treated with, or has levels in excess of the threshold established by the Secretary under subsection (b)(1) of, chlorpyrifos residue in food—

(1) in school meals provided under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.);

(2) in school meals provided under the school breakfast program established by section 4 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1773); and

(3) provided by the Department of Defense Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) establish a threshold for chlorpyrifos for the food described in subsection (a) of not

more than .001 micrograms of chlorpyrifos per kilogram of food, as the Secretary determines to be necessary;

(2) provide guidance, in consultation with State and local educational agencies, to eliminate chlorpyrifos from meals provided by schools, which may include guidance or criteria related to food procurement or supply contract policies;

(3) periodically update the guidance described in paragraph (2); and

(4) provide technical assistance to State and local educational agencies to enforce the requirements of this section.

(c) REVIEW BY THE SECRETARY.—Not later than January 1, 2020, and every 2 years thereafter until January 1, 2028, the Secretary shall conduct a review to evaluate whether, based on reports provided by State and local educational agencies, any of the food described in subsection (a) exceeds the threshold for chlorpyrifos established by the Secretary under subsection (b)(1).

SA 3314. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 125 . PROHIBITION ON CONVENTIONAL ETHANOL.

(a) DEFINITION OF CONVENTIONAL ETHANOL.—In this section, the term “conventional ethanol” has the meaning given the term “conventional biofuel” in section 211(o)(1) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(1)).

(b) PROHIBITION.—The Secretary shall not use any funds authorized under this Act or an amendment made by this Act to provide a grant or other financial support to any individual or entity for the development and production of conventional ethanol.

SA 3315. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 254, line 18, strike “226(c)(4)” and insert “226(c)(3)”.

On page 254, strike lines 23 and 24 and insert the following:

“(a) FUNDING.—

“(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out section 222 \$200,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.

“(2) COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION.—In addition to the amounts made available under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall use, in accordance with subsection (b), the funds, facilities, and authorities of the

On page 255, line 5, strike “\$259,500,000” and insert “\$59,500,000”.

On page 255, strike lines 9 through 14 and insert the following:

“(1) FOREIGN MARKET DEVELOPMENT COOP.—On page 255, line 19, strike “(3)” and insert “(2)”.

On page 255, line 24, strike “(4)” and insert “(3)”.

On page 256, line 4, strike “(5)” and insert “(4)”.

On page 256, line 7, strike “(4)” and insert “(3)”.

On page 257, line 7, strike “subsection (c)(5)” and insert “subsection (c)(4)”.

SA 3316. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 125 . INVESTIGATIONS AND INSPECTIONS OF RESEARCH FACILITIES UNDER THE ANIMAL WELFARE ACT.

Section 16(a) of the Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. 2146(a)) is amended, in the second sentence, by striking “inspect each research facility at least once each year” and inserting “determine the frequency of inspections for research facilities through the risk-based inspection system process, consistent with the treatment of other regulated entities under this Act.”.

SA 3317. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

The provisions in the Act shall go into effect 4 days after enactment.

SA 3318. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

The provisions in this Act shall go into effect 1 day after enactment.

SA 3319. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

The provisions in the Act shall go into effect 2 days after enactment.

SA 3320. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

The provisions in the Act shall go into effect 3 days after enactment.

SA 3321. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title I, add the following:

SEC. 1602. ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN PRODUCERS.

(a) **DEFINITION OF QUALIFYING NATURAL DISASTER DECLARATION.**—In this section, the term “qualifying natural disaster declaration” means—

(1) a natural disaster declared by the Secretary under section 321(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1961(a)); or

(2) a major disaster or emergency designated by the President under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.).

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE.**—As soon as practicable after October 1, 2018, the Secretary shall make available assistance under section 196 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7333) to producers of an eligible crop (as defined in subsection (a)(2) of that section) that suffered losses in a county covered by a qualifying natural disaster declaration for production losses due to volcanic activity.

(c) **AMOUNT.**—The Secretary shall make assistance available under subsection (b) in an amount equal to the amount of assistance determined under section 196(d) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7333(d)), less any fees that are owed by producers under section 196(k) of that Act (7 U.S.C. 7333(k)).

SA 3322. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 61. CONSIDERATION OF FUNDING CHALLENGES.

Section 333A of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1983a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) **CONSIDERATION OF FUNDING CHALLENGES.**—In making a determination on an application for a loan, loan guarantee, or grant under this title, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, consider the funding challenges posed by any large quantity of Federal land in or near a community or county in which the project to be carried out using the loan, loan guarantee, or grant is located.”.

At the end of subtitle B of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 62. CONSIDERATION OF FUNDING CHALLENGES.

Section 4 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 904) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) **CONSIDERATION OF FUNDING CHALLENGES.**—In making a determination on an

application for a loan, loan guarantee, or grant under this Act, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, consider the funding challenges posed by any large quantity of Federal land in or near a community or county in which the project to be carried out using the loan, loan guarantee, or grant is located.”.

SA 3323. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . EXTENSION AND AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AT 1890 LAND-GRANT COLLEGES, INCLUDING TUSKEGEE UNIVERSITY.

(a) **EXTENSION.**—Section 1444 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3221) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

“(5) **FISCAL YEAR 2019, 2020, 2021, OR 2022.**—In addition to other amounts authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated for 1 of fiscal year 2019, 2020, 2021, or 2022 such sums as are necessary to ensure that an eligible institution receiving a distribution of funds under this section for that fiscal year receives not less than the amount of funds received by that eligible institution under this section for the preceding fiscal year.”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the undesignated matter following paragraph (2)(B)—

(i) by striking “paragraph (2) of this subsection” and inserting “this paragraph”; and

(ii) by striking “In computing” and inserting the following:

“(C) In computing”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking “Of the remainder” and inserting “Except as provided in paragraph (4), of the remainder”; and

(ii) by striking “(2) any funds” and inserting the following:

“(3) **ADDITIONAL AMOUNT.**—Any funds”;

(C) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “are allocated” and inserting “were allocated”; and

(ii) by striking “; and” and inserting “, as so designated as of that date.”;

(D) by striking “(b) Beginning” in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and all that follows through “any funds” in paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(b) **DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Funds made available under this section shall be distributed among eligible institutions in accordance with this subsection.

“(2) **BASE AMOUNT.**—Any funds”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) **SPECIAL AMOUNT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019, 2020, 2021, OR 2022.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subparagraph (B), for 1 of fiscal year 2019, 2020, 2021, or 2022, if the calculation under paragraph (3)(B) would result in a distribution of less than \$3,000,000 to an eligible institution that first received funds under this section after the date of enactment of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–79; 128 Stat. 649) for a

fiscal year, that institution shall receive a distribution of \$3,000,000 for that fiscal year.

“(B) **LIMITATION.**—Subparagraph (A) shall apply only if amounts are appropriated under subsection (a)(5) to ensure that an eligible institution receiving a distribution of funds under this section for fiscal year 2019, 2020, 2021, or 2022, as applicable, receives not less than the amount of funds received by that eligible institution under this section for the preceding fiscal year.”.

(b) **RESEARCH.**—Section 1445 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3222) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

“(6) **FISCAL YEAR 2019, 2020, 2021, OR 2022.**—In addition to other amounts authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated for 1 of fiscal year 2019, 2020, 2021, or 2022 such sums as are necessary to ensure that an eligible institution receiving a distribution of funds under this section for that fiscal year receives not less than the amount of funds received by that eligible institution under this section for the preceding fiscal year.”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) **SPECIAL AMOUNT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019, 2020, 2021, OR 2022.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to clause (ii), for 1 of fiscal year 2019, 2020, 2021, or 2022, if the calculation under subparagraph (C) would result in a distribution of less than \$3,000,000 to an eligible institution that first received funds under this section after the date of enactment of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–79; 128 Stat. 649), that institution shall receive a distribution of \$3,000,000 for that fiscal year.

“(ii) **LIMITATION.**—Clause (i) shall apply only if amounts are appropriated under subsection (a)(6) to ensure that an eligible institution receiving a distribution of funds under this section for fiscal year 2019, 2020, 2021, or 2022, as applicable, receives not less than the amount of funds received by that eligible institution under this section for the preceding fiscal year.”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “(B) Of funds” and inserting the following:

“(C) **ADDITIONAL AMOUNT.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (D), of funds”;

(iii) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “are allocated” and inserting “were allocated”;

(II) by inserting “, as so designated as of that date” before the period at the end; and

(III) by striking “(A) Funds” and inserting the following:

“(B) **BASE AMOUNT.**—Funds”; and

(iv) in the matter preceding subparagraph (B) (as so designated), by striking “(2) The” and all that follows through “follows:” and inserting the following:

“(3) **DISTRIBUTIONS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—After allocating amounts under paragraph (2), the remainder shall be allotted among the eligible institutions in accordance with this paragraph.”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “(1) Three per centum” and inserting the following:

“(2) **ADMINISTRATION.**—3 percent”; and

(C) in the matter preceding paragraph (2) (as so designated), by striking “(b) Beginning” and all that follows through “follows:” and inserting the following:

“(b) **DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Funds made available under this section shall be distributed among eligible institutions in accordance with this subsection.”.

SA 3324. Mrs. HYDE-SMITH (for herself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr.

COTTON, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BURR, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. JONES, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 26, line 16, strike “2020” and insert “2023”.

SA 3325. Mrs. HYDE-SMITH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title X, add the following:

SEC. 10 . REPORT ON REGULATION OF PLANT BIOSTIMULANTS.

(a) DEFINITION OF PLANT BIOSTIMULANT.—In this section, the term “plant biostimulant” means a substance or microorganism that, when applied to seeds, plants, or the rhizosphere, stimulates natural processes to enhance or benefit nutrient uptake, nutrient efficiency, tolerance to abiotic stress, or crop quality and yield.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the President and Congress a report that identifies potential regulatory and legislative reforms to ensure the expeditious and appropriate review, approval, uniform national labeling, and availability of plant biostimulant products to agricultural producers.

(c) CONSULTATION.—In preparing the report under subsection (b), the Secretary shall consult with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, States, industry stakeholders, and any other stakeholders that the Secretary determines to be necessary.

SA 3326. Mrs. HYDE-SMITH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 61 . EXPANDING ACCESS TO CREDIT FOR RURAL COMMUNITIES.

(a) CERTAIN PROGRAMS UNDER THE CONSOLIDATED FARM AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT.—Section 343(a)(13) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1991(a)(13)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in the heading, by striking “AND GUARANTEED”;

(B) by striking “and guaranteed”; and

(C) by striking “(1), (2), and (24)” and inserting “(1) and (2)”; and

(2) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by striking “and guaranteed”; and

(B) by striking “(21), and (24)” and inserting “and (21)”.

(b) RURAL BROADBAND PROGRAM.—Section 601(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 950bb(b)(3)(A)(ii)) is amended by inserting “in the case of a direct loan,” before “a city”.

SA 3327. Mrs. HYDE-SMITH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . DEFINITION OF RURAL AREA FOR PURPOSES OF THE HOUSING ACT OF 1949.

The second sentence of section 520 of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1490) is amended—

(1) by striking “or 2010 decennial census” and inserting “2010, or 2020 decennial census”;

(2) by striking “December 31, 2010,” and inserting “December 31, 2020,”; and

(3) by striking “year 2020” and inserting “year 2030”.

SA 3328. Mr. KING (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 125 . REPORT ON FUNDING FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE AND OTHER EXTENSION PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date on which the census of agriculture required to be conducted in calendar year 2017 under section 2 of the Census of Agriculture Act of 1997 (7 U.S.C. 2204g) is released, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the funding necessary to adequately address the needs of the National Institute of Food and Agriculture, activities carried out under the Smith-Lever Act (7 U.S.C. 341 et seq.), and research and extension programs carried out at an 1890 Institution (as defined in section 2 of the Agricultural Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7601)) or an institution designated under the Act of July 2, 1862 (commonly known as the “First Morrill Act”) (12 Stat. 503, chapter 130; 7 U.S.C. 301 et seq.), to provide adequate services for the growth and development of the economies of rural communities based on the changing demographic in the rural and farming communities in the various States.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In preparing the report under subsection (a), the Secretary shall focus on the funding needs of the programs described in subsection (a) with respect to carrying out activities relating to small and diverse farms and ranches, veteran farmers

and ranchers, value-added agriculture, direct-to-consumer sales, and specialty crops.

SA 3329. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. LANKFORD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 43 . REPORT ON FOOD DISTRIBUTION PROGRAMS REACHING UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study on the challenges that the food distribution program on Indian reservations established under section 4(b) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2013(b)) and other food distribution programs administered by the Secretary face in reaching underserved populations, with an emphasis on the homebound and the elderly, to better capture data on the population of people unable to physically travel to a distribution location for food.

SA 3330. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 63 . COUNCIL ON RURAL COMMUNITY INNOVATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) 16 percent of the population of the United States lives in rural counties.

(2) Strong, sustainable rural communities are essential to future prosperity and ensuring United States competitiveness in the years ahead.

(3) Rural communities supply the food, fiber, and energy of the United States, safeguard the natural resources of the United States, and are essential to the development of science and innovation.

(4) Though rural communities face numerous challenges, they also present enormous economic potential.

(5) The Federal Government has an important role to play in expanding access to the capital necessary for economic growth, promoting innovation, increasing energy resiliency and reliability, improving access to health care and education, and expanding outdoor recreational activities on public land.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to enhance the efforts of the Federal Government to address the needs of rural areas in the United States by—

(1) establishing a council to better coordinate Federal programs directed to rural communities;

(2) maximizing the impact of Federal investment to promote economic prosperity and quality of life in rural communities in the United States; and

(3) using innovation to resolve local and regional challenges faced by rural communities.

(c) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a Council on Rural Community Innovation and Economic Development (referred to in this section as the “Council”).

(d) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The membership of the Council shall be composed of the heads of the following executive branch departments, agencies, and offices:

- (A) The Department of Agriculture.
- (B) The Department of the Treasury.
- (C) The Department of Defense.
- (D) The Department of Justice.
- (E) The Department of the Interior.
- (F) The Department of Commerce.
- (G) The Department of Labor.
- (H) The Department of Health and Human Services.

(I) The Department of Housing and Urban Development.

- (J) The Department of Transportation.
- (K) The Department of Energy.
- (L) The Department of Education.
- (M) The Department of Veterans Affairs.
- (N) The Department of Homeland Security.
- (O) The Environmental Protection Agency.
- (P) The Federal Communications Commission.

(Q) The Office of Management and Budget.

(R) The Office of Science and Technology Policy.

(S) The Office of National Drug Control Policy.

- (T) The Council of Economic Advisers.
- (U) The Domestic Policy Council.
- (V) The National Economic Council.
- (W) The Small Business Administration.
- (X) The Council on Environmental Quality.
- (Y) The White House Office of Public Engagement.

(Z) The White House Office of Cabinet Affairs.

(AA) Such other executive branch departments, agencies, and offices as the President or the Secretary may, from time to time, designate.

(2) CHAIR.—The Secretary shall serve as the Chair of the Council.

(3) DESIGNEES.—A member of the Council may designate, to perform the Council functions of the member, a senior-level official who is—

(A) part of the department, agency, or office of the member; and

(B) a full-time officer or employee of the Federal Government.

(4) ADMINISTRATION.—The Council shall coordinate policy development through the rural development mission area.

(e) FUNDING.—The Secretary shall provide funding and administrative support for the Council to the extent permitted by law and within existing appropriations.

(f) MISSION AND FUNCTION OF THE COUNCIL.—The Council shall work across executive departments, agencies, and offices to coordinate development of policy recommendations—

(1) to maximize the impact of Federal investment of rural communities;

(2) to promote economic prosperity and quality of life in rural communities; and

(3) to use innovation to resolve local and regional challenges faced by rural communities.

(g) DUTIES.—The Council shall—

(1) make recommendations to the President, acting through the Director of the Domestic Policy Council and the Director of the National Economic Council, on streamlining and leveraging Federal investments in rural areas, where appropriate, to increase the impact of Federal dollars and create economic opportunities to improve the quality of life in rural areas in the United States;

(2) coordinate and increase the effectiveness of Federal engagement with rural stakeholders, including agricultural organiza-

tions, small businesses, education and training institutions, health-care providers, telecommunications services providers, electric service providers, transportation providers, research and land grant institutions, law enforcement, State, local, and tribal governments, and nongovernmental organizations regarding the needs of rural areas in the United States;

(3) coordinate Federal efforts directed toward the growth and development of rural geographic regions that encompass both metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas;

(4) identify and facilitate rural economic opportunities associated with energy development, outdoor recreation, and other conservation related activities; and

(5) identify common economic and social challenges faced by rural communities that could be served through—

(A) better coordination of existing Federal and non-Federal resources; and

(B) innovative solutions utilizing governmental and nongovernmental resources.

(h) EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The heads of executive departments and agencies shall assist and provide information to the Council, consistent with applicable law, as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Council.

(2) EXPENSES.—Each executive department or agency shall be responsible for paying any expenses of the executive department or agency for participating in the Council.

(i) REPORT ON RURAL SMART COMMUNITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the establishment of the Council, the Council shall submit to Congress a report describing efforts of rural areas to integrate “smart” technology into their communities to solve challenges relating to energy, transportation, health care, law enforcement, housing, or other relevant local issues, as determined by the Secretary.

(2) SMART RURAL COMMUNITIES.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include a description of efforts of rural communities to apply innovative and advanced technologies and related mechanisms (such as telecommunications, energy, transportation, housing, economic development)—

(A) to improve the health and quality of life of residents;

(B) to increase the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of civic operations and services, including public safety and other vital public functions;

(C) to promote economic growth;

(D) to enhance the use of electricity in the community and reduce pollution; and

(E) to create a more sustainable and resilient community.

(3) OTHER INCLUSIONS.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) an analysis of efforts to integrate “smart” technology into rural communities across the United States;

(B) an analysis of barriers and challenges faced by rural areas in integrating “smart” technology into their communities;

(C) an analysis of Federal efforts to assist rural areas with the development and integration of “smart” technology into rural communities;

(D) recommendations, if any, on how to improve coordination and deployment of Federal efforts to assist rural areas develop and integrate “smart” technology into their communities;

(E) recommendations, if any, on how rural areas developing “smart” communities can better leverage private sector resources; and

(F) guidelines that establish best practices for rural areas that desire to use “smart” technology to overcome local challenges.

(j) REVIEW OF PUBLIC BENEFIT TO RURAL COMMUNITIES ON THE CREATION OF RURAL SMART COMMUNITY DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On completion of the report under subsection (i)(1), the Council shall review the benefits of the creation of a rural smart community demonstration projects program for the purposes of coordinating Department of Agriculture rural development, housing, energy, and telecommunication programs, and other Federal programs specific to rural communities, to expand innovative technologies and address local challenges specific to rural communities.

(2) INCLUSIONS.—In the review under paragraph (1) the Council shall determine whether a rural smart community demonstration projects program would—

(A) demonstrate smart community technologies that can be adapted and repeated by other rural communities;

(B) encourage public, private, local, or regional best practices that can be replicated by other rural communities;

(C) encourage private sector innovation and investment in rural communities;

(D) promote a skilled workforce; and

(E) promote standards that allow for the measurement and validation of the cost savings and performance improvements associated with the installation and use of smart community technologies and practices.

(k) RURAL SMART COMMUNITY RESOURCE GUIDE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Council shall create, publish, and maintain a resource guide designed to assist States and other rural communities in developing and implementing rural smart community programs.

(2) INCLUSIONS.—A resource guide under paragraph (1) may include—

(A) a compilation of existing related Federal and non-Federal programs available to rural communities, including technical assistance, education, training, research and development, analysis, and funding;

(B) available examples of local rural communities engaging private sector entities to implement smart community solutions, including public-private partnership models that could be used to leverage private sector funding to solve similar local challenges;

(C) available examples of proven methods for local rural communities to facilitate integration of smart technologies with new and existing infrastructure and systems;

(D) best practices and lessons learned from demonstration projects, including return on investment and performance information to help other rural communities decide how to initiate integration of smart technologies; and

(E) such other topics as are requested by industry entities or local governments or determined to be necessary by the Council.

(3) UTILIZATION OF EXISTING GUIDES.—In creating, publishing, and maintaining the guide under paragraph (1), the Council shall consider Federal, State, and local guides already published relating to smart community goals, activities, and best practices—

(A) to prevent duplication of efforts by the Federal Government; and

(B) to leverage existing complementary efforts.

(4) RESOURCE GUIDE OUTREACH.—The Council shall conduct outreach to States, counties, communities, and other relevant entities—

(A) to provide interested stakeholders with the guide published under paragraph (1);

(B) to promote the consideration of smart community technologies and encourage States and local governments to contribute rural smart community program and activity information to the guide published under paragraph (1);

(C) to identify—

(i) barriers to rural smart community technology adoption; and

(ii) any research, development, and assistance that is needed that could be included in the guide published under paragraph (1);

(D) to respond to requests for assistance, advice, or consultation from rural communities; and

(E) for other purposes, as identified by the Council.

(5) **SUBSEQUENT RESOURCE GUIDES.**—The Council shall issue an update to the guide published under paragraph (1) every 5 years.

(1) **RURAL BROADBAND INTEGRATION WORKING GROUP.**—

(1) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(A) Access to high-speed broadband is no longer a luxury and is a necessity for United States families, businesses, and consumers.

(B) Affordable, reliable access to high-speed broadband is critical to United States economic growth and competitiveness.

(C) High-speed broadband enables the people of the United States to use the Internet in new ways, expands access to health services and education, increases the productivity of businesses, and drives innovation throughout the digital ecosystem.

(D) The private sector and Federal, State, and local governments have made substantial investments to expand broadband access in the United States, but more must be done to improve the availability and quality of high-speed broadband, particularly in areas lacking competitive choices.

(E) Today, more than 50,000,000 people of the United States cannot purchase a wired broadband connection at speeds that the Federal Communications Commission has defined as the minimum for adequate broadband service, and only 29 percent of people of the United States can choose from more than 1 service provider at that speed.

(F) As a result of the statistics described in subparagraph (E), the costs, benefits, and availability of high-speed broadband Internet are not evenly distributed, with considerable variation among States and between urban and rural areas.

(G) The Federal Government has an important role to play in developing coordinated policies to promote broadband deployment and adoption, including promoting best practices, breaking down regulatory barriers, and encouraging further investment, which will help deliver higher quality, lower cost broadband to more families, businesses, and communities and allow communities to benefit fully from those investments.

(2) **POLICY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—It is the policy of the Federal Government for executive departments and agencies having statutory authorities applicable to broadband deployment (referred to in this subsection as the “agencies”) to use all available and appropriate authorities—

(i) to identify and address regulatory barriers that may unduly impede either wired broadband deployment or the infrastructure to augment wireless broadband deployment;

(ii) to encourage further public and private investment in broadband networks and services;

(iii) to promote the adoption and meaningful use of broadband technology; and

(iv) to otherwise encourage or support broadband deployment, competition, and adoption in ways that promote the public interest.

(B) **PRIORITIES.**—In carrying out the policy under subparagraph (A), the agencies shall focus on—

(i) opportunities to promote broadband adoption and competition through incentives

to new entrants in the market for broadband services;

(ii) modernizing regulations;

(iii) accurately measuring real-time broadband availability and speeds;

(iv) increasing broadband access for underserved communities, including in rural areas;

(v) exploring opportunities to reduce costs for potential low-income users; and

(vi) other possible measures, including supporting State, local, and Tribal governments interested in encouraging or investing in high-speed broadband networks.

(C) **EFFECT.**—In carrying out the policy under subparagraph (A), the agencies shall ensure that existing and planned Federal, State, local, and Tribal government missions and capabilities for delivering services to the public, including those missions and capabilities relating to national security, public safety, and emergency response, are maintained.

(D) **COORDINATION.**—The agencies shall coordinate the policy under subparagraph (A) through the Rural Broadband Integration Working Group established under paragraph (3).

(3) **ESTABLISHMENT OF RURAL BROADBAND INTEGRATION WORKING GROUP.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—There is established the Rural Broadband Integration Working Group (referred to in this subsection as the “Working Group”).

(B) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The membership of the Working Group shall be composed of the heads, or their designees, of—

(i) the Department of Agriculture;

(ii) the Department of Commerce;

(iii) the Department of Defense;

(iv) the Department of State;

(v) the Department of the Interior;

(vi) the Department of Labor;

(vii) the Department of Health and Human Services;

(viii) the Department of Homeland Security;

(ix) the Department of Housing and Urban Development;

(x) the Department of Justice;

(xi) the Department of Transportation;

(xii) the Department of the Treasury;

(xiii) the Department of Energy;

(xiv) the Department of Education;

(xv) the Department of Veterans Affairs;

(xvi) the Environmental Protection Agency;

(xvii) the General Services Administration;

(xviii) the Small Business Administration;

(xix) the Institute of Museum and Library Services;

(xx) the National Science Foundation;

(xxi) the Council on Environmental Quality;

(xxii) the Office of Science and Technology Policy;

(xxiii) the Office of Management and Budget;

(xxiv) the Council of Economic Advisers;

(xxv) the Domestic Policy Council;

(xxvi) the National Economic Council; and

(xxvii) such other Federal agencies or entities as are determined appropriate in accordance with subparagraph (E).

(C) **CO-CHAIRS.**—The Secretary and the Secretary of Commerce shall serve as the Co-Chairs of the Working Group.

(D) **CONSULTATION; COORDINATION.**—

(i) **CONSULTATION.**—The Working Group shall consult, as appropriate, with other relevant agencies, including the Federal Communications Commission.

(ii) **COORDINATION.**—The Working Group shall coordinate with existing Federal working groups and committees involved with broadband.

(E) **MEMBERSHIP CHANGES.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the National Economic Council and the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall review, on a periodic basis, the membership of the Working Group to ensure that the Working Group—

(I) includes necessary Federal Government entities; and

(II) is an effective mechanism for coordinating among agencies on the policy described in paragraph (2).

(ii) **CHANGES.**—The Director of the National Economic Council and the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy may add or remove members of the Council, as appropriate, based on the review under clause (i).

(4) **FUNCTIONS OF THE WORKING GROUP.**—

(A) **CONSULTATION.**—As permitted by law, the members of the Working Group shall consult with State, local, Tribal, and territorial governments, telecommunications companies, utilities, trade associations, philanthropic entities, policy experts, and other interested parties to identify and assess regulatory barriers described in paragraphs (1)(G) and (2)(A)(i) and opportunities described in clauses (i) and (v) of paragraph (2)(B) to determine possible actions relating to those barriers and opportunities.

(B) **POINT OF CONTACT.**—Not later than 15 days after the date of enactment of this Act, each member of the Working Group shall—

(i) designate a representative to serve as the main point of contact for matters relating to the Working Group; and

(ii) notify the Co-Chairs of the Working Group of that designee.

(C) **SURVEY.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the members of the Working Group shall submit to the Working Group a comprehensive survey of—

(I) Federal programs, including the allocated funding amounts, that currently support or could reasonably be modified to support broadband deployment and adoption; and

(II) all agency-specific policies and rules with the direct or indirect effect of facilitating or regulating investment in or deployment of wired and wireless broadband networks.

(ii) **EXCLUSION.**—Spectrum allocation decisions affecting broadband deployment and other policies relating to spectrum allocation—

(I) are excluded from—

(aa) the survey under clause (i); and

(bb) the matters of the Working Group; and

(II) shall continue in accordance with the Presidential Memorandum of June 14, 2013 (Expanding America’s Leadership in Wireless Innovation).

(D) **LIST OF ACTIONS.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the members of the Working Group shall submit to the Working Group an initial list of actions that each of the agencies could take to identify and address regulatory barriers, incentivize investment, promote best practices, align funding decisions, and otherwise support wired broadband deployment and adoption.

(E) **REPORT.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 150 days after the date of enactment of this Act, after not fewer than 2 meetings of the full Working Group, the Working Group shall submit to the President, acting through the Director of the National Economic Council, a coordinated, agreed-to, and prioritized list of recommendations of the Working Group on actions that agencies can take to support broadband deployment and adoption.

(ii) **INCLUSIONS.**—The recommendations under clause (i) shall include—

(I) a list of priority actions and rulemakings; and

(II) timelines to complete the priority actions and rulemakings under subclause (I).

(m) GENERAL PROVISIONS.—

(1) EFFECT.—Nothing in this section—

(A) impairs or otherwise affects—

(i) the authority granted by law to a department or agency, or the head thereof;

(ii) the functions of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget relating to budgetary, administrative, or legislative proposals; or

(iii) the authority of the Federal Communications Commission concerning spectrum allocation decisions;

(B) requires the disclosure of classified information, law enforcement sensitive information, or other information that shall be protected in the interests of national security; or

(C) creates any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity by any party against the United States, any Federal department, agency, or entity, any officer, employee, or agent, of the United States, or any other person.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—This section shall be implemented consistent with applicable law and subject to the availability of appropriations.

SA 3331. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle F of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 86 . . . VACANT GRAZING ALLOTMENTS MADE AVAILABLE TO CERTAIN GRAZING PERMIT HOLDERS.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF GRAZING ALLOTMENTS.—The Secretary concerned shall, to the maximum extent practicable, make vacant grazing allotments available to a holder of a grazing permit or lease issued by such Secretary if the lands covered by the permit or lease are unusable because of a natural disaster (including a drought or wildfire), court-issued injunction, or conflict with wildlife, as determined by the Secretary concerned.

(b) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The terms and conditions contained in a permit or lease for a vacant grazing allotment made available pursuant to subsection (a) shall be the terms and conditions of the most recent permit or lease that was applicable to such allotment.

(c) COURT-ISSUED INJUNCTIONS.—A court may not issue any order enjoining the use of any allotment for which a permit or lease has been issued by the Secretary concerned and continues in effect unless the Secretary concerned can make a vacant grazing allotment available to the holder of such permit or lease.

(d) ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT UNDER THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT.—Activities carried out by the Secretary concerned pursuant to subsection (a) are a category of actions hereby designated as being categorically excluded from the preparation of an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement under section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332).

SA 3332. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment in-

tended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 4104, add at the end the following:

(e) MOBILE TECHNOLOGIES.—Section 7(h)(14) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(h)(14)) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall authorize the use of mobile technologies for the purpose of accessing supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits.”;

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking the heading and inserting “DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS ON ACCESS OF BENEFITS THROUGH MOBILE TECHNOLOGIES”;

(B) by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

“(i) DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—Before authorizing the implementation of subparagraph (A) in all States, the Secretary shall approve not more than 5 demonstration project proposals submitted by State agencies that will pilot the use of mobile technologies for supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits access.”;

(C) in clause (ii)—

(i) in the heading, by striking “DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS” and inserting “PROJECT REQUIREMENTS”;

(ii) in the matter preceding subclause (I)—

(I) by striking “retail food store” the first place it appears and inserting “State agency”; and

(II) by striking “that includes—” and inserting “that—”; and

(iii) by striking subclauses (I), (II), (III), and (IV), and inserting the following:

“(I) provides recipients protections with respect to privacy, ease of use, household access to benefits, and support similar to the protections provided under existing methods;

“(II) ensures that all recipients, including recipients without access to mobile payment technology and recipients who shop across State borders, have a means of benefit access;

“(III) requires retail food stores, unless exempt under subsection (f)(2)(B), to bear the costs of acquiring and arranging for the implementation of point-of-sale equipment and supplies for the redemption of benefits that are accessed through mobile technologies;

“(IV) requires that foods purchased with benefits issued under this section through mobile technologies are purchased at a price not higher than the price of the same food purchased by other methods used by the retail food store, as determined by the Secretary;

“(V) ensures adequate documentation for each authorized transaction, adequate security measures to deter fraud, and adequate access to retail food stores that accept benefits accessed through mobile technologies, as determined by the Secretary;

“(VI) provides for an evaluation of the demonstration project, including an evaluation of household access to benefits;

“(VII) requires that the demonstration project is voluntary for all retail food stores and that all recipients are able to use benefits in nonparticipating retail food stores; and

“(VIII) meets other criteria as established by the Secretary.”;

(D) by striking clause (iii) and inserting the following:

“(iv) DATE OF PROJECT APPROVAL.—The Secretary shall solicit and approve the qualifying demonstration projects required under subparagraph (B)(i) not later than January 1, 2020.”; and

(E) by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

“(iii) PRIORITY.—The Secretary may prioritize demonstration project proposals that would—

“(I) reduce fraud;

“(II) encourage positive nutritional outcomes; and

“(III) meet such other criteria as determined by the Secretary.”; and

(3) in subparagraph (C)(i)—

(A) by striking “2017” and inserting “2022”; and

(B) by inserting “requires further study by way of an extended pilot period or” after “States” the second place it appears.

SA 3333. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle F of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 86 . . . STATE-SUPPORTED PLANNING OF FOREST MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term “eligible entity” means—

(A) a State or political subdivision of a State that contains National Forest System land;

(B) a publicly chartered utility serving 1 or more States or political subdivisions of a State;

(C) a rural electric company; and

(D) any other entity determined by the Secretary to be appropriate for participation in the Fund.

(2) FOREST MANAGEMENT ACTIVITY.—The term “forest management activity” means a project or activity carried out by the Secretary on National Forest System land in accordance with the applicable forest plan.

(3) FOREST PLAN.—The term “forest plan” means a land and resource management plan prepared by the Forest Service for a unit of the National Forest System pursuant to section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604).

(4) FUND.—The term “Fund” means the State-Supported Forest Management Fund established by subsection (b).

(5) NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM.—The term “National Forest System” has the meaning given the term in section 11(a) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1609(a)).

(6) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund, to be known as the “State-Supported Forest Management Fund”, to cover the cost of planning (giving priority to compliance with section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2))), carrying out, and monitoring certain forest management activities on National Forest System land.

(c) CONTENTS.—The Fund shall consist of such amounts as may be—

(1) contributed by an eligible entity for deposit in the Fund;

(2) appropriated to the Fund; or

(3) generated by forest management activities planned or carried out using amounts in the Fund, as provided in subsection (f).

(d) GEOGRAPHICAL AND USE LIMITATIONS.—Except for the revenue generated by a forest management activity as provided in subsection (f)(2), in making a contribution under subsection (c)(1), an eligible entity, in consultation with the Secretary, may—

(1) specify the National Forest System land for which the contribution may be expended; and

(2) limit the types of forest management activities for which the contribution may be expended.

(e) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—Except as provided in subsection (f), in such amounts as may be provided in advance in appropriation Acts, the Secretary may use amounts in the Fund to plan, carry out, and monitor any forest management activity on National Forest System land that is—

(1) developed through a collaborative process;

(2) proposed by a resource advisory committee; or

(3) covered by a community wildfire protection plan.

(f) USE OF REVENUES.—

(1) REVENUE FROM TIMBER SALE CONTRACTS.—Except as provided in subsection (g), for a forest management activity described in subsection (e) carried out using a timber sale contract under section 14 of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a), any revenue generated from the sale of timber under the contract shall—

(A) be deposited in the Fund; and

(B) be available, without further appropriation, until expended.

(2) REVENUE FROM GOOD NEIGHBOR AGREEMENTS.—For a forest management activity described in subsection (e) carried out by a State using a subcontract in accordance with a State law applicable to contracting under a good neighbor agreement under section 8206 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (16 U.S.C. 2113a), any revenue generated from the sale of timber by the State shall—

(A) be deposited in the Fund; and

(B) be available, without further appropriation, until expended, except that the amount of revenue in excess of the appraised value of the timber shall be used to pay the State for the costs of performing the authorized restoration services under the good neighbor agreement.

(g) RELATION TO OTHER LAWS.—

(1) REVENUE SHARING.—Subject to subsection (f), revenues generated by a forest management activity carried out using amounts from the Fund shall be considered to be monies received from the National Forest System.

(2) KNUTSON-VANDEMBERG ACT.—The Act of June 9, 1930 (commonly known as the “Knutson-Vandenberg Act”) (16 U.S.C. 576 et seq.), shall apply to a forest management activity carried out using amounts in the Fund.

(h) TERMINATION OF FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The authority to initiate planning for a forest management activity described in subsection (e) shall terminate 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) EFFECT.—On the termination of the authority to use the Fund under paragraph (1), or pursuant to any other law, any unobligated contribution remaining in the Fund that is attributable to a contribution under subsection (c)(1) shall be returned to the eligible entity that made the contribution.

SA 3334. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for

the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 881, strike lines 4 through 13 and insert the following:

“(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$80,000,000 for fiscal year 2019 and each fiscal year thereafter, to remain available until expended.

“(2) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—No funds under this section may be provided—

“(A) to entities with net sales of more than \$50,000; or

“(B) to support products with well-established product markets, as determined by the Secretary.

SA 3335. Mr. PERDUE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 63. STUDY ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT LOAN PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to establish a plan that, with respect to the Rural Energy for America Program under section 9007 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8107) and the business and industry loan program under section 310B(g) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1932(g)), results in the costs of subsidies for the loans guaranteed under each program to equal zero or a negative number.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than September 30, 2019, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the study conducted and the plan established under subsection (a).

SA 3336. Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 729, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

(1) in subsection (d)(2), by striking “representatives” in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) and all that follows through the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting “a diverse array of public and private sector members representing agriculture in the State in which the eligible entity is located.”;

On page 729, line 14, strike “(1) in” and insert “(2) in”.

On page 729, line 16, strike “(2)” and insert “(3)”.

On page 729, line 17, strike “(3)” and insert “(4)”.

On page 729, line 19, strike “(4)” and insert “(5)”.

SA 3337. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 4113 and insert the following:

SEC. 4113. ASSISTANCE FOR COMMUNITY FOOD PROJECTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) according to the Wisconsin HOPE Lab, at least 36 percent of 4-year college and university students and 42 percent of 2-year community college students have experienced food insecurity in 2018;

(2) hunger threatens the health, cognitive ability, and economic security of students;

(3) institutions of higher education should strive to collect edible surplus food from campus-operated dining facilities and distribute that food to students experiencing hunger instead of throwing that food away; and

(4) institutions of higher education should partner with local organizations such as regional food banks to reduce hunger and support the operation of food pantries on campus.

(b) ASSISTANCE.—Section 25 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2034) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (3) as paragraphs (2) through (4), respectively;

(B) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(1) COMMUNITY COLLEGE.—The term ‘community college’ means a junior or community college (as defined in section 312(f) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1058(f)))”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ‘institution of higher education’ has the meaning given the term in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)).”;

(2) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (B) by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (C) by striking “fiscal year 2015 and each fiscal year thereafter.” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2015 through 2018; and”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2019 and each fiscal year thereafter.”;

(3) in subsection (c), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “an institution of higher education, a community college,” before “or a private”.

SA 3338. Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike sections 4103 through 4116 and insert the following:

SEC. 4103. WORK REQUIREMENTS FOR ABLE-BODIED ADULTS WITHOUT DEPENDENTS; WORK ACTIVATION PROGRAM FOR ADULTS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN.

(a) **DECLARATION OF POLICY.**—Section 2 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011) is amended by adding at the end the following: “Congress further finds that it should also be the purpose of the supplemental nutrition assistance program to increase employment, to encourage healthy marriage, and to promote prosperous self-sufficiency, which means the ability of households to maintain an income above the poverty level without services and benefits from the Federal Government.”.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—

(1) **FOOD.**—Section 3(k) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012(k)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, except that a food, food product, meal, or other item described in this subsection shall be considered a food under this Act only if it is an essential (as determined by the Secretary)”.

(2) **SUPERVISED JOB SEARCH.**—Section 3 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsections (t) through (v) as subsections (u) through (w), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subsection (s) the following:

“(t) **SUPERVISED JOB SEARCH.**—The term ‘supervised job search’ means a job search program that has the following characteristics:

“(1) The job search occurs at an official location where the presence and activity of the recipient can be directly observed, supervised, and monitored.

“(2) The entry, time onsite, and exit of the recipient from the official job search location are recorded in a manner that prevents fraud.

“(3) The recipient is expected to remain and undertake job search activities at the job search center.

“(4) The quantity of time the recipient is observed and monitored engaging in job search at the official location is recorded for purposes of compliance with the work and work activation requirements of sections 6(o) and 30.”.

(3) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 27(a)(2) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2036(a)(2)) is amended in subparagraphs (C) and (E) by striking “3(u)(4)” each place it appears and inserting “3(v)(4)”.

(c) **WORK REQUIREMENT FOR ABLE-BODIED ADULTS WITHOUT DEPENDENTS.**—Section 6(o) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(o)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “not less than 3 months (consecutive or otherwise)” and inserting “more than 1 month”;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking “or” at the end;

(C) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) participate in supervised job search for at least 8 hours per week.”;

(2) in paragraph (4), by adding at the end the following:

“(C) **TERMINATION.**—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to any fiscal year that begins after the effective date of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018.”;

(3) in paragraph (6)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “15-PERCENT” and inserting “5-PERCENT”;

(B) in subparagraph (A)(ii)(IV), by striking “3 months” and inserting “1 month”; and

(C) in subparagraph (D), by striking “15 percent” and inserting “5 percent”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) **PROMOTING WORK.**—As a condition of receiving supplemental nutrition assistance program funds under this Act, a State agency shall provide each individual subject to the work requirement of this subsection with the opportunity to participate in an activity selected by the State from among the options described in subparagraphs (B), (C), and (E) of paragraph (2).

“(9) **PENALTIES FOR INADEQUATE STATE PERFORMANCE.**—If a State agency fails to fully comply with this section, including the requirement to terminate the benefits of individuals who fail to fulfill the work requirements described in paragraph (2) during a fiscal quarter, the funding allotment of the State for the supplemental nutrition assistance program shall be reduced by 10 percent for the quarter that begins 180 days after the first day of the quarter in which the non-compliance occurred.”.

SEC. 4104. IMPROVEMENTS TO ELECTRONIC BENEFIT TRANSFER SYSTEM.

(a) **PROHIBITED FEES.**—Section 7 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016) is amended—

(1) in subsection (f)(2)(C), in the subparagraph heading, by striking “INTERCHANGE” and inserting “PROHIBITED”; and

(2) in subsection (h), by striking paragraph (13) and inserting the following:

“(13) **PROHIBITED FEES.**—

“(A) **DEFINITION OF SWITCHING.**—In this paragraph, the term ‘switching’ means the routing of an intrastate or interstate transaction that consists of transmitting the details of a transaction electronically recorded through the use of an EBT card in 1 State to the issuer of the card in—

“(i) the same State; or

“(ii) another State.

“(B) **PROHIBITION.**—

“(i) **INTERCHANGE FEES.**—No interchange fee shall apply to an electronic benefit transfer transaction under this subsection.

“(ii) **OTHER FEES.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—No fee charged by a benefit issuer (including any affiliate of a benefit issuer), or by any agent or contractor when acting on behalf of such benefit issuer, to a third party relating to the switching or routing of benefits to the same benefit issuer (including any affiliate of the benefit issuer) shall apply to an electronic benefit transfer transaction under this subsection.

“(II) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The prohibition under subclause (I) shall be effective through fiscal year 2022.”.

(b) **EBT PORTABILITY.**—Section 7(f)(5) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(f)(5)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) **OPERATION OF INDIVIDUAL POINT OF SALE DEVICE BY FARMERS’ MARKETS AND DIRECT MARKETING FARMERS.**—A farmers’ market or direct marketing farmer that is exempt under paragraph (2)(B)(i) shall be allowed to operate an individual electronic benefit transfer point of sale device at more than 1 location under the same supplemental nutrition assistance program authorization, if—

“(i) the farmers’ market or direct marketing farmer provides to the Secretary information on location and hours of operation at each location; and

“(ii)(I) the point of sale device used by the farmers’ market or direct marketing farmer is capable of providing location information of the device through the electronic benefit transfer system; or

“(II) if the Secretary determines that the technology is not available for a point of sale device to meet the requirement under subclause (I), the farmers’ market or direct marketing farmer provides to the Secretary any other information, as determined by the Sec-

retary, necessary to ensure the integrity of transactions processed using the point of sale device.”.

(c) **EVALUATION OF STATE ELECTRONIC BENEFIT TRANSFER SYSTEMS.**—Section 7(h) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(h)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(15) **GAO EVALUATION AND STUDY OF STATE ELECTRONIC BENEFIT TRANSFER SYSTEMS.**—

“(A) **EVALUATION.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Comptroller General of the United States (referred to in this paragraph as the ‘Comptroller General’) shall evaluate for each electronic benefit transfer system of a State agency selected in accordance with clause (ii)—

“(I) any type of fee charged—

“(aa) by the benefit issuer (or an affiliate, agent, or contractor of the benefit issuer) of the State agency for electronic benefit transfer-related services, including electronic benefit transfer-related services that did not exist before February 7, 2014; and

“(bb) to any retail food stores, including retail food stores that are exempt under subsection (f)(2)(B)(i) for electronic benefit transfer-related services;

“(II) in consultation with the Secretary and the retail food stores within the State, any electronic benefit transfer system outages affecting the EBT cards of the State agency;

“(III) in consultation with the Secretary, any type of entity that—

“(aa) provides electronic benefit transfer equipment and related services to the State agency, any benefit issuers of the State agency, or any retail food stores within the State;

“(bb) routes or switches transactions through the electronic benefit transfer system of the State agency; or

“(cc) has access to transaction information in the electronic benefit transfer system of the State agency; and

“(IV) in consultation with the Secretary, any emerging entities, services, or technologies in use with respect to the electronic benefit transfer system of the State agency.

“(ii) **SELECTION CRITERIA.**—The Comptroller General shall select for evaluation under clause (i)—

“(I) with respect to each benefit issuer that provides electronic benefit transfer-related services to 1 or more State agencies, not fewer than 1 electronic benefit transfer system provided by that benefit issuer; and

“(II) any electronic benefit transfer system of a State agency that has experienced significant or frequent outages during the 2-year period preceding the date of enactment of this paragraph.

“(B) **STUDY.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report based on the evaluation carried out under subparagraph (A) that includes—

“(i) a description of the types of entities that—

“(I) provide electronic benefit transfer equipment and related services to State agencies, benefit issuers, and retail food stores;

“(II) route or switch transactions through electronic benefit transfer systems of State agencies; or

“(III) have access to transaction information in electronic benefit transfer systems of State agencies;

“(ii) a description of emerging entities, services, and technologies in use with respect to electronic benefit transfer systems of State agencies; and

“(iii) a summary of—

“(I) the types of fees charged—

“(aa) by benefit issuers (or affiliates, agents, or contractors of benefit issuers) of State agencies for electronic benefit transfer-related services, including whether the types of fees existed before February 7, 2014; and

“(bb) to any retail food stores, including retail food stores that are exempt under subsection (f)(2)(B)(i) for electronic benefit transfer-related services;

“(II)(aa) the causes of any electronic benefit transfer system outages affecting EBT cards; and

“(bb) potential solutions to minimize the disruption of outages to participating households.

“(16) REVIEW OF EBT SYSTEMS REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) REVIEW.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall review for each electronic benefit transfer system of a State agency selected under clause (i)—

“(I) any contracts or other agreements between the State agency and the benefit issuer of the State agency to determine—

“(aa) the customer service requirements of the benefit issuer, including call center requirements; and

“(bb) the consistency and compatibility of data provided by the benefit issuer to the Secretary for appropriate oversight of possible fraudulent transactions; and

“(II) the use of third-party applications that access the electronic benefit transfer system to provide electronic benefit transfer account information to participating households.

“(ii) SELECTION CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall select for the review under clause (i) not fewer than 5 electronic benefit transfer systems of State agencies, of which—

“(I) with respect to each benefit issuer that provides electronic benefit transfer-related services to 1 or more State agencies, not fewer than 1 shall be provided by that benefit issuer; and

“(II) not more than 4 shall have experienced significant or frequent outages during the 2-year period preceding the date of enactment of this paragraph.

“(B) REGULATIONS AND GUIDANCE.—Based on the study conducted by the Comptroller General of the United States under paragraph (15)(B) and the review conducted by the Secretary under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall promulgate such regulations or issue such guidance as the Secretary determines appropriate—

“(i) to prohibit the imposition of any fee that is inconsistent with paragraph (13);

“(ii) to minimize electronic benefit system outages;

“(iii) to update procedures to handle electronic benefit transfer system outages that minimize disruption to participating households and retail food stores while protecting against fraud and abuse;

“(iv) to develop cost-effective customer service standards for benefit issuers, including benefit issuer call centers or other customer service options equivalent to call centers, that would ensure adequate customer service for participating households;

“(v) to address the use of third-party applications that access electronic benefit transfer systems to provide electronic benefit transfer account information to participating households, including by establishing safeguards consistent with sections 9(c) and 11(e)(8) to protect the privacy of data relat-

ing to participating households and approved retail food stores; and

“(vi) to improve the reliability of electronic benefit transfer systems.

“(C) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that includes a description of the effects, if any, on an electronic benefit transfer system of a State agency from the use of third-party applications that access the electronic benefit transfer system to provide electronic benefit transfer account information to participating households.”

(d) APPROVAL OF RETAIL FOOD STORES.—Section 9 of the Food and Nutrition Act (7 U.S.C. 2018) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in the fourth sentence, by striking “No retail food store” and inserting the following:

“(D) VISIT REQUIRED.—No retail food store”;

(B) in the third sentence, by striking “Approval” and inserting the following:

“(C) CERTIFICATE.—Approval”;

(C) in the second sentence—

(i) by striking “food; and (D) the” and inserting the following: “food;

“(iv) any information, if available, about the ability of the anticipated or existing electronic benefit transfer equipment and service provider of the applicant to provide sufficient information through the electronic benefit transfer system to minimize the risk of fraudulent transactions; and

“(v) the”;

(ii) by striking “concern; (C) whether” and inserting the following: “concern;

“(iii) whether”;

(iii) by striking “applicant; (B) the” and inserting the following: “applicant;

“(ii) the”;

(iv) by striking “following: (A) the nature” and inserting the following: “following:

“(i) the nature”;

(v) in the matter preceding clause (i) (as so designated), by striking “In determining” and inserting the following:

“(B) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—In determining”;

(D) in the first sentence, by striking “(a)(1) Regulations” and inserting the following:

“(a) AUTHORIZATION TO ACCEPT AND REDEEM BENEFITS.—

“(1) APPLICATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Regulations”;

(2) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

“(4) ELECTRONIC BENEFIT TRANSFER EQUIPMENT AND SERVICE PROVIDERS.—Before implementing clause (iv) of paragraph (1)(B), the Secretary shall issue guidance for retail food stores on how to select electronic benefit transfer equipment and service providers that are able to meet the requirements of that clause.”; and

(3) in subsection (c), in the first sentence, by inserting “records relating to electronic benefit transfer equipment and related services, transaction and redemption data provided through the electronic benefit transfer system,” after “purchase invoices.”

SEC. 4105. RETAIL INCENTIVES.

Section 9 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2018) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) INCENTIVES.—

“(1) DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE INCENTIVE FOOD.—In this subsection, the term ‘eligible incentive food’ means food that is—

“(A) identified for increased consumption by the most recent Dietary Guidelines for Americans published under section 301 of the

National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5341); and

“(B) a fruit, a vegetable, low-fat dairy, or a whole grain.

“(2) REGULATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations to clarify the process by which an approved retail food store may seek a waiver to offer an incentive that may be used only for the purchase of eligible incentive food at the point of purchase to a household purchasing food with benefits issued under this Act.

“(B) REGULATIONS.—The regulations under subparagraph (A) shall establish a process under which an approved retail food store, prior to carrying out an incentive program under this subsection, shall provide to the Secretary information describing the incentive program, including—

“(i) the types of incentives that will be offered;

“(ii) the types of foods that will be incentivized for purchase; and

“(iii) an explanation of how the incentive program intends to support meeting dietary intake goals.

“(3) NO LIMITATION ON BENEFITS.—A waiver granted under this subsection shall not be used to carry out any activity that limits the use of benefits under this Act or any other Federal nutrition law.

“(4) EFFECT.—Regulations promulgated under this subsection shall not affect any requirements under section 4405 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 7517) or section 4304 of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, including the eligibility of a retail food store to participate in a project funded under those sections.

“(5) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate an annual report describing the types of incentives approved under this subsection.”

SEC. 4106. REQUIRED ACTION ON DATA MATCH INFORMATION.

Section 11(e) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (24), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (25), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(26) that for a household participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program, the State agency shall pursue clarification and verification, if applicable, of information relating to the circumstances of the household received from data matches for the purpose of ensuring an accurate eligibility and benefit determination, only if the information—

“(A) appears to present significantly conflicting information from the information that was used by the State agency at the time of certification of the household;

“(B) is obtained from data matches carried out under subsection (q), (r), or (w); or

“(C)(i) is fewer than 60 days old relative to the current month of participation of the household; and

“(ii) if accurate, would have been required to be reported by the household based on the reporting requirements assigned to the household by the State agency under section 6(c).”

SEC. 4107. INCOME VERIFICATION.

Section 17 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(m) PILOT PROJECTS FOR IMPROVING EARNED INCOME VERIFICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Under such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers to be

appropriate, the Secretary shall establish a pilot program (referred to in this subsection as the ‘pilot program’) under which not more than 8 States may carry out pilot projects to test strategies to improve the accuracy or efficiency of the process for verification of earned income at certification and recertification of applicant households for the supplemental nutrition assistance program.

“(2) CONTRACT OPTIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the pilot program, prior to soliciting applications for pilot projects from State agencies, the Secretary shall—

“(i) assess the availability of up-to-date earned income information from different commercial data service providers; and

“(ii) make a determination regarding the overall cost-effectiveness to the Department of Agriculture and the State agencies administering the supplemental nutrition assistance program of—

“(I) the Secretary entering into a contract with a commercial data service provider to provide to State agencies carrying out pilot projects up-to-date earned income information for verification of the earned income at certification and recertification of applicant households for the supplemental nutrition assistance program;

“(II) the Secretary entering into an agreement with the Secretary of Health and Human Services to allow State agencies carrying out pilot projects to verify earned income information at certification and recertification of applicant households for the supplemental nutrition assistance program in the State using up-to-date earned income information from a commercial data service provider under the electronic interface developed by the State and used by the State Medicaid agency to verify income eligibility for the State Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.); or

“(III) a State agency carrying out a pilot project entering into a contract with a commercial data service provider to obtain up-to-date earned income information to verify the earned income at certification and recertification of applicant households for the supplemental nutrition assistance program in the State.

“(B) AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO CONTRACTS.—If determined appropriate by the Secretary, the Secretary may, based on the cost-effectiveness determination described in subparagraph (A)(i)—

“(i) enter into a contract described in subclause (I) of that subparagraph;

“(ii) enter into an agreement described in subclause (II) of that subparagraph; or

“(iii) allow each State agency carrying out a pilot project to enter into a contract described in subclause (III) of that subparagraph, on the condition that the Federal share of the cost of the contract shall not exceed 75 percent of the total cost of the contract.

“(C) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the results of the assessment and determination under subparagraph (A).

“(3) PILOT PROJECTS.—

“(A) APPLICATION.—A State agency seeking to carry out a pilot project under the pilot program shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, including—

“(i) an identification of the 1 or more proposed changes to the process for verifying earned income used by the State agency;

“(ii) a description of how the proposed changes under clause (i) would meet the purpose described in paragraph (1); and

“(iii) a plan to evaluate how the proposed changes under clause (i) would improve the accuracy or efficiency of the verification of earned income at certification and recertification of applicant households for the supplemental nutrition assistance program in the State.

“(B) SELECTION CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall select to carry out pilot projects State agencies that, as determined by the Secretary—

“(i) do not have access to up-to-date earned income information for the verification of earned income at certification and recertification of applicant households for the supplemental nutrition assistance program in the State;

“(ii) would be able to access and use, for the verification of earned income at certification and recertification of applicant households for the supplemental nutrition assistance program in the State, up-to-date earned income information used to determine eligibility for another Federal assistance program; or

“(iii) have cost-effective, innovative approaches to verifying earned income that would improve the accuracy or efficiency of the verification of earned income at certification and recertification of applicant households for the supplemental nutrition assistance program in the State.

“(4) GRANTS.—The Secretary may make grants to a State agency to carry out a pilot project.

“(5) EFFECT ON OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—A pilot project carried out under this subsection shall not alter the eligibility requirements under section 5 or the reporting requirements under section 6(c).

“(6) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the pilot program terminates under paragraph (8), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the results of the pilot projects carried out under the pilot program.

“(7) FUNDING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Out of funds made available under section 18(a)(1), on October 1, 2018, the Secretary shall make available \$10,000,000 to carry out this subsection, to remain available until expended.

“(B) COSTS.—The Secretary shall allocate not more than 10 percent of the amounts made available under subparagraph (A) to carry out subparagraphs (A) and (C) of paragraph (2) and paragraph (6).

“(8) TERMINATION.—The pilot program shall terminate not later than September 30, 2022.”

SEC. 4108. PILOT PROJECTS TO IMPROVE HEALTHY DIETARY PATTERNS RELATED TO FLUID MILK IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 17 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026) (as amended by section 4107) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(n) PILOT PROJECTS TO IMPROVE HEALTHY DIETARY PATTERNS RELATED TO FLUID MILK CONSUMPTION AMONG PARTICIPANTS OR HOUSEHOLDS IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM THAT UNDER-CONSUME FLUID MILK.—

“(1) DEFINITION OF FLUID MILK.—In this subsection, the term ‘fluid milk’ means cow milk, without flavoring or sweeteners, consistent with the most recent Dietary Guidelines for Americans published under section 301 of the National Nutrition Monitoring and

Related Research Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5341), that is packaged in liquid form.

“(2) PILOT PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall carry out, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers to be appropriate, pilot projects to develop and test methods that would increase the purchase of fluid milk, in a manner consistent with the most recent Dietary Guidelines for Americans published under section 301 of the National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5341), by individuals or households participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program that under-consume fluid milk by providing an incentive for the purchase of fluid milk at the point of purchase to a household purchasing food with supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits.

“(3) GRANTS OR COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary may enter into competitively awarded cooperative agreements with, or provide grants to, a government agency or nonprofit organization for use in accordance with projects that meet the strategic goals of this subsection, including allowing the government agency or nonprofit organization to award subgrants to retail food stores authorized under this Act.

“(B) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to receive a cooperative agreement or grant under this paragraph, a government agency or nonprofit organization shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

“(C) SELECTION CRITERIA.—Pilot projects shall be evaluated against publicly disseminated criteria that shall include—

“(i) incorporation of a scientifically based strategy that is designed to improve diet quality through the increased purchase of fluid milk for participants or households in the supplemental nutrition assistance program that under-consume fluid milk;

“(ii) a commitment to a pilot project that allows for a rigorous outcome evaluation, including data collection; and

“(iii) other criteria, as determined by the Secretary.

“(D) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds provided under this paragraph shall not be used for any project that limits the use of benefits under this Act.

“(E) DURATION.—Each pilot project carried out under this subsection shall be in effect for not more than 24 months.

“(4) PROJECTS.—Pilot projects carried out under paragraph (2) shall include projects to determine whether incentives for the purchase of fluid milk by individuals or households participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program that under-consume fluid milk result in—

“(A) improved nutritional outcomes for participating individuals or households;

“(B) changes in purchasing and consumption of fluid milk among participating individuals or households; or

“(C) diets more closely aligned with healthy eating patterns consistent with the most recent Dietary Guidelines for Americans published under section 301 of the National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5341).

“(5) EVALUATION AND REPORTING.—

“(A) EVALUATION.—

“(i) INDEPENDENT EVALUATION.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide for an independent evaluation of projects selected under this subsection that measures the impact of the pilot program on health and nutrition as described in paragraphs (2) through (4).

“(II) REQUIREMENT.—The independent evaluation under subclause (I) shall use rigorous

methodologies, particularly random assignment or other methods that are capable of producing scientifically valid information regarding which activities are effective.

“(ii) COSTS.—The Secretary may use funds provided to carry out this subsection to pay costs associated with monitoring and evaluating each pilot project.

“(B) REPORTING.—Not later than 90 days after the last day of fiscal year 2019 and each fiscal year thereafter until the completion of the last evaluation under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that includes a description of—

“(i) the status of each pilot project;

“(ii) the results of the evaluation completed during the previous fiscal year; and

“(iii) to the maximum extent practicable—

“(I) the impact of the pilot project on appropriate health, nutrition, and associated behavioral outcomes among households participating in the pilot project;

“(II) baseline information relevant to the stated goals and desired outcomes of the pilot project; and

“(III) equivalent information about similar or identical measures among control or comparison groups that did not participate in the pilot project.

“(C) PUBLIC DISSEMINATION.—In addition to the reporting requirements under subparagraph (B), evaluation results shall be shared broadly to inform policy makers, service providers, other partners, and the public to promote wide use of successful strategies.

“(6) FUNDING.—

“(A) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection \$20,000,000, to remain available until expended.

“(B) APPROPRIATIONS IN ADVANCE.—Only funds appropriated under subparagraph (A) in advance specifically to carry out this subsection shall be available to carry out this subsection.”.

SEC. 4109. INTERSTATE DATA MATCHING TO PREVENT MULTIPLE ISSUANCES.

Section 11 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(w) NATIONAL ACCURACY CLEARINGHOUSE.—

“(1) DEFINITION OF INDICATION OF MULTIPLE ISSUANCE.—In this subsection, the term ‘indication of multiple issuance’ means an indication, based on a computer match, that benefits are being issued to an individual under the supplemental nutrition assistance program from more than 1 State simultaneously.

“(2) ESTABLISHMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish an interstate data system, to be known as the ‘National Accuracy Clearinghouse’, to prevent the simultaneous issuance of benefits to an individual by more than 1 State under the supplemental nutrition assistance program.

“(B) DATA MATCHING.—The Secretary shall require that States make available to the National Accuracy Clearinghouse only such information as is necessary for the purpose described in subparagraph (A).

“(C) DATA PROTECTION.—The information made available by States under subparagraph (B)—

“(i) shall be used only for the purpose described in subparagraph (A); and

“(ii) shall not be retained for longer than is necessary to accomplish that purpose.

“(3) ISSUANCE OF INTERIM FINAL REGULATIONS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations

(which shall include interim final regulations) to carry out this subsection that—

“(A) incorporate best practices and lessons learned from the pilot program under section 4032(c) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 2036c(c));

“(B) require a State to take appropriate action, as determined by the Secretary, with respect to each indication of multiple issuance or indication that an individual receiving benefits in 1 State has applied to receive benefits in another State, while ensuring timely and fair service to applicants for, and participants in, the supplemental nutrition assistance program;

“(C) limit the information submitted through or retained by the National Accuracy Clearinghouse to information necessary to accomplish the purpose described in paragraph (2)(A);

“(D) establish safeguards to protect—

“(i) the information submitted through or retained by the National Accuracy Clearinghouse, including by limiting the period of time that information is retained to the period necessary to accomplish the purpose described in paragraph (2)(A); and

“(ii) the privacy of information that is submitted through or retained by the National Accuracy Clearinghouse, which shall include—

“(I) prohibiting any contractor who has access to information that is submitted through or retained by the National Accuracy Clearinghouse from using that information for purposes not directly related to the purpose described in paragraph (2)(A); and

“(II) other safeguards, consistent with subsection (e)(8);

“(E) establish a process by which a State shall—

“(i) not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, conduct a computer match using the National Accuracy Clearinghouse;

“(ii) after the first computer match under clause (i), conduct computer matches on an ongoing basis, as determined by the Secretary;

“(iii) identify and take appropriate action, as determined by the Secretary, with respect to each indication of multiple issuance or indication that an individual receiving benefits in 1 State has applied to receive benefits in another State; and

“(iv) protect the identity and location of a vulnerable individual (including a victim of domestic violence) that is an applicant to or participant of the supplemental nutrition assistance program; and

“(F) include other rules and standards, as determined by the Secretary.”.

SEC. 4110. QUALITY CONTROL

(a) RECORDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 11(a)(3)(B) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020(a)(3)(B)) is amended in the matter preceding clause (i) by inserting “and systems containing those records” after “subparagraph (A)”.

(2) COST SHARING FOR COMPUTERIZATION.—Section 16(g)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(g)(1)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (E), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (F)(ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) would be accessible by the Secretary for inspection and audit under section 11(a)(3)(B); and”.

(b) QUALITY CONTROL SYSTEM.—Section 16(c)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(c)(1)) is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) QUALITY CONTROL SYSTEM INTEGRITY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, the Secretary shall issue interim final regulations that—

“(I) ensure that the quality control system established under this subsection produces valid statistical results;

“(II) provide for oversight of contracts entered into by a State agency for the purpose of improving payment accuracy;

“(III) ensure the accuracy of data collected under the quality control system established under this subsection; and

“(IV) to the maximum extent practicable, for each fiscal year, evaluate the integrity of the quality control process of not fewer than 2 State agencies, selected in accordance with criteria determined by the Secretary.

“(ii) DEBARMENT.—In accordance with the nonprocurement debarment procedures under part 417 of title 2, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), the Secretary shall bar any person that, in carrying out the quality control system established under this subsection, knowingly submits, or causes to be submitted, false information to the Secretary.”.

(c) ELIMINATION OF STATE BONUSES FOR ERROR RATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 16(d) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(d)) is amended—

(A) by striking the subsection heading and inserting “STATE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AND BONUSES.—”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “subparagraph (B)(ii)” and inserting “clauses (ii) and (iii) of subparagraph (B)”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “With respect” and all that follows through the end of clause (i) and inserting the following:

“(i) PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT.—With respect to fiscal year 2005 and each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary shall measure the performance of each State agency with respect to the criteria established under subparagraph (A)(i).”; and

(II) in clause (ii), by striking “(ii) subject to paragraph (3),” and inserting the following:

“(ii) PERFORMANCE BONUSES FOR FISCAL YEARS 2005 THROUGH 2017.—With respect to each of fiscal years 2005 through 2017, subject to paragraph (3), the Secretary shall”; and

(III) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) PERFORMANCE BONUSES FOR FISCAL YEARS 2018 AND THEREAFTER.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—With respect to fiscal year 2018 and each fiscal year thereafter, subject to subclause (II) and paragraph (3), the Secretary shall award performance bonus payments in the following fiscal year, in a total amount of \$6,000,000 for each fiscal year, to State agencies that meet standards for high or most improved performance established by the Secretary under subparagraph (A)(ii) for the measure of application processing timeliness.

“(II) PERFORMANCE BONUS PAYMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018 PERFORMANCE.—The Secretary shall award performance bonus payments in a total amount of \$6,000,000 to State agencies in fiscal year 2019 for fiscal year 2018 performance, in accordance with subclause (I).”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 16(i)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(i)(1)) is amended by striking “(as defined in subsection (d)(1))”.

SEC. 4111. REQUIREMENT OF LIVE-PRODUCTION ENVIRONMENTS FOR CERTAIN PILOT PROJECTS RELATING TO COST SHARING FOR COMPUTERIZATION.

Section 16(g)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(g)(1)) (as amended by section 4110(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (F), by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subclauses (I) and (II), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (G) as clauses (i) through (vii), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(3) in the matter preceding clause (i) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking “paragraphs (2) and (3)” and inserting “paragraph (2)”; and

(B) by striking “in the planning” and inserting the following: “in the—

“(A) planning”;

(4) in clause (v) (as so redesignated) of subparagraph (A) (as so designated), by striking “implementation, including through pilot projects in limited areas for major systems changes as determined under rules promulgated by the Secretary, data from which” and inserting the following: “implementation, including a requirement that—

“(I) such testing shall be accomplished through pilot projects in limited areas for major systems changes (as determined under rules promulgated by the Secretary);

“(II) each pilot project described in subclause (I) that is carried out before the implementation of a system shall be conducted in a live-production environment; and

“(III) the data resulting from each pilot project carried out under this clause”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) operation of 1 or more automatic data processing and information retrieval systems that the Secretary determines may continue to be operated in accordance with clauses (i) through (vii) of subparagraph (A).”.

SEC. 4112. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 18(a)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2027(a)(1)) is amended in the first sentence by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 4113. ASSISTANCE FOR COMMUNITY FOOD PROJECTS.

Section 25(b)(2) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2034(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B) by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C) by striking “fiscal year 2015 and each fiscal year thereafter.” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2015 through 2018; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2019 and each fiscal year thereafter.”.

SEC. 4114. NUTRITION EDUCATION STATE PLANS.

Section 28(c) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2036a(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “Except as provided in subparagraph (C), a” and inserting “A”;

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(iii) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (iv); and

(iv) by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

“(iii) describe how the State agency shall use an electronic reporting system that measures and evaluates the projects; and”;

and

(B) by striking subparagraph (C);

(2) in paragraph (3)(B), in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “, the Director of the National Institute of Food and Agriculture,” before “and outside stakeholders”;

(3) in paragraph (5), by inserting “the expanded food and nutrition education pro-

gram or” before “other health promotion”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) REPORT.—The State agency shall submit to the Secretary an annual evaluation report in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary.”.

SEC. 4115. WORK ACTIVATION PROGRAM FOR ADULTS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN.

The Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 30. WORK ACTIVATION PROGRAM FOR ADULTS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANT.—The term ‘eligible participant’ means an individual who, during a particular month, is—

“(A) a parent in a household with dependent children;

“(B) at least 19, and not more than 55, years of age;

“(C) not disabled;

“(D) a member of a household in which 1 or more parents or children receive supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits in the month;

“(E) a member of a household that received supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits for more than 3 months in the year; and

“(F) employed less than 100 hours in the month.

“(2) MARRIED COUPLE HOUSEHOLD.—The term ‘married couple household’ means a household that includes 2 eligible participants who are married to each other and have dependent children.

“(3) SUCCESSFUL ENGAGEMENT IN WORK ACTIVATION.—The term ‘successful engagement in work activation’ means—

“(A) in the case of an individual who is eligible and required to participate in interim work activation, performance during the month that fulfills the activity and hour requirements of subsection (c);

“(B) in the case of an individual who is required to participate in full work activation, performance during the month that fulfills the activity and hour requirements of subsection (d); and

“(C) in the case of an individual who meets the eligibility criteria described in subsection (e)(1), performance that fulfills the activity and hour requirements of that subsection.

“(4) WORK AND WORK PREPARATION ACTIVITIES.—The term ‘work and work preparation activities’ means—

“(A) unsubsidized employment;

“(B) subsidized private sector employment;

“(C) subsidized public sector employment;

“(D) work experience (including work associated with the refurbishing of publicly assisted housing) if sufficient private sector employment is not available;

“(E) on-the-job training;

“(F) job readiness assistance;

“(G) a community service program;

“(H) vocational educational training (not to exceed 1 year with respect to any individual);

“(I) job skills training directly related to employment;

“(J) education directly related to employment, in the case of a recipient who has not received a high school diploma or a certificate of high school equivalence;

“(K) satisfactory attendance at secondary school or in a course of study leading to a certificate of general equivalence, in the case of a recipient who has not completed secondary school or received such a certificate;

“(L) the provision of child care services to an individual who is participating in a community service program;

“(M) workfare under section 20; and

“(N) supervised job search.

“(b) WORK ACTIVATION PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of receiving supplemental nutrition assistance program funds under this Act, a State agency shall be required to operate a work activation program for eligible participants.

“(2) SPECIAL RULES FOR MARRIED COUPLE HOUSEHOLDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of eligible participants who are spouses in a married couple household—

“(i) the work activation requirement of this section shall apply only if the sum of the combined current employment of both spouses is less than 100 hours per month; and

“(ii) both spouses shall be considered to have achieved successful engagement in the work activation program if either spouse fulfills the work activation requirements described in subsection (c), (d), or (e)(1).

“(B) TOTAL REQUIRED HOURS.—The total combined number of hours of required work and work preparation activities for both spouses in a married couple household shall not be greater than the total number of hours required for a single head of household.

“(C) REQUIREMENT.—In carrying out this section, a State agency shall ensure that, for any month—

“(i) the proportion that—

“(I) the number of married couple households that are required to participate in work activation under this section in a month; bears to

“(II) the number of all households that are required to participate in work activation under this section in the same month; is not greater than—

“(ii) the proportion that—

“(I) the number of all married couple households with eligible participants in the month; bears to

“(II) the number of all households with eligible participants in the same month.

“(c) SHORT-TERM INTERIM WORK ACTIVATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A State agency may require eligible participants who meet the criteria in paragraph (2) to engage in—

“(A) interim work activation as described in this subsection; or

“(B) full work activation as described in subsection (d).

“(2) ELIGIBILITY.—A State agency may require an eligible participant to participate in interim work activation instead of full work activation if the eligible participant has not engaged in work activation under this section in the preceding 3 years.

“(3) REQUIRED JOB SEARCH.—A participant in interim work activation shall be required—

“(A) to participate in supervised job search for at least 6 hours per week; and

“(B) to engage in such additional activities as the State agency may require.

“(4) TIME LIMIT ON INTERIM WORK ACTIVATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible participant shall not participate in interim work activation for more than 3 months.

“(B) ADDITIONAL TIME.—After an eligible participant has participated in interim work activation for 3 months, the State agency shall require the eligible participant—

“(i) to maintain at least 100 hours of employment per month; or

“(ii) to participate in full work activation.

“(d) FULL WORK ACTIVATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of receiving supplemental nutrition assistance program funds under this Act, a State agency

shall require all or part of the eligible participants in the State to engage in full work activation under this section.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—An eligible participant who is required to participate in full work activation in a month shall be required to engage in 1 or more work and work preparation activities for an average of 100 hours per month.

“(3) LIMITATION.—Of the total number of required hours described in paragraph (2), not fewer than 20 hours per week shall be attributable to an activity described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), (H), (L), (M), or (N) of subsection (a)(4).

“(4) PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY SERVICE OR WORKFARE.—At least 10 percent of the eligible participants that a State requires to participate in full work activation under this section shall be required to participate in activities described in subparagraph (D), (G), or (M) of subsection (a)(4).

“(5) WORK ACTIVATION NOT EMPLOYMENT.—Other than unsubsidized employment described in subsection (a)(4)(A), participation in work and work preparation activities under this section shall not be—

“(A) considered to be employment; or
“(B) subject to any law pertaining to wages, compensation, hours, or conditions of employment under any law administered by the Secretary of Labor.

“(6) ADDITIONAL REQUIRED ACTIVITY.—Except as provided in subsection (g), nothing in this section prevents a State from requiring more than 100 hours per month of participation in work and work preparation activities.

“(e) LIMITATIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—

“(1) SINGLE TEEN HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD OR MARRIED TEEN WHO MAINTAINS SATISFACTORY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE.—For purposes of determining monthly participation rates under this section, an eligible participant who is married or a head of household and who has not attained 20 years of age shall be considered to have completed successful engagement in work activation for a month if the eligible participant—

“(A) maintains satisfactory attendance at secondary school or the equivalent during the month; or

“(B) participates in education directly related to employment for an average of at least 20 hours per week during the month.

“(2) LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF PERSONS WHO MAY BE TREATED AS ENGAGED IN WORK ACTIVATION BY REASON OF PARTICIPATION IN EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES.—For purposes of determining monthly participation rates under this section, not more than 30 percent of the number of individuals in a State who are treated as having completed successful engagement in work activation for a month may be individuals who are determined to be engaged in work activation for the month by reason of participation in vocational educational training.

“(f) STATE OPTION FOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENT EXEMPTIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For any fiscal year, a State agency, at the option of the State agency, may—

“(A) exempt a household that includes a child who has not attained 12 months of age from engaging in work activation; and

“(B) disregard that household in determining the monthly participation rates under this section until the child has attained 12 months of age.

“(2) EXCLUSION.—For purposes of determining monthly participation rates under this section, a household that includes a child who has not attained 6 years of age shall be considered to be successfully engaged in work activation for a month if a member of the household receiving supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits is engaged in work activation for an average of at least 20 hours per week during the month.

“(g) PENALTIES AGAINST INDIVIDUALS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), if an eligible participant in a household receiving assistance under the State program funded under this section fails to complete successful engagement in work activation in accordance with this section, the State agency shall—

“(A) in accordance with paragraph (2), reduce the amount of assistance otherwise payable to the entire household pro rata (or more, at the option of the State agency) with respect to the month immediately after any month in which the eligible participant fails to perform; or
“(B) terminate the assistance entirely.

“(2) PRO RATA REDUCTION.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(A), the amount of the pro rata reduction shall equal the product obtained by multiplying—

“(A) the normal monthly amount of assistance to the entire household that would have been received if not for the reduction under paragraph (1)(A); by

“(B) the proportion that—
“(i) the hours of required work and work preparation activities performed by the eligible participant during the month; bears to

“(ii) the number or hours of work and work preparation activities the State agency required the eligible participant to perform in accordance with this section.

“(3) EXCEPTION.—A State may not reduce or terminate assistance under the State program funded under this section or any other State program funded with qualified State expenditures (as defined in section 409(a)(7)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 609(a)(7)(B))) based on a refusal of an eligible participant to engage in work and work preparation activities required under this section if—

“(A) the eligible participant is a single custodial parent caring for a child who has not attained 6 years of age; and

“(B) the eligible participant proves that the eligible participant has a demonstrated inability (as determined by the State agency) to obtain needed child care, due to—

“(i) unavailability of appropriate child care within a reasonable distance from the home or work site of the eligible participant; or

“(ii) unavailability of all affordable child care arrangements, including formal child care and all informal child care by a relative or under other arrangements.

“(h) LIMITATION ON HOURS OF REQUIRED PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY SERVICE OR WORKFARE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The maximum number of hours during a month that an eligible participant shall be required under this section to work in a community service program or a workfare program under section 20 shall not exceed the quotient obtained by dividing—

“(A) the total dollar cost of all means-tested benefits received by the household for that month, as determined under paragraph (2); by

“(B) the Federal minimum wage.
“(2) TOTAL DOLLAR COST OF ALL MEANS-TESTED BENEFITS DEFINED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the total dollar cost of all means-tested benefits shall equal the sum of the dollar cost of all benefits received by the household from—

“(i) the supplemental nutrition assistance program;

“(ii) the State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) or any other State program funded with qualified State expenditures (as defined in section 409(a)(7)(B)(i) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 609(a)(7)(B)(i))); and

“(iii) any assistance provided to a household, landlord, or public housing agency (as defined in section 3(b)(6) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)(6))) to subsidize the rental payment for a dwelling unit, including assistance provided for public housing dwelling units under section 3 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a) and assistance provided under section 8 of that Act (42 U.S.C. 1437f).

“(B) VALUE OF BENEFITS DURING SANCTION.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), if the dollar value of 1 or more benefits received by a household in a month has been reduced under subsection (g) or another sanction requirement, the calculated dollar value of the sanctioned benefits shall equal the dollar value of the benefit that would have been received if the benefit had not been reduced by the sanction.

“(3) ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES.—Nothing in this subsection prevents a State agency from requiring an eligible participant to engage in activities not described in paragraph (1) for additional hours during the month.

“(i) WORK ACTIVATION PARTICIPATION GOALS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of receiving supplemental nutrition assistance program funds under this Act, except as provided in paragraph (2), a State agency shall achieve for each quarter of the fiscal year with respect to all eligible participants receiving assistance under the State program funded under this section for that fiscal year at least the participation rate specified in the following table:

	The quarterly participation rate shall be at least:
2019	20 percent
2020	35 percent
2021	50 percent
2022	65 percent
2023	80 percent.

“(2) ADJUSTMENT IF RECESSIONARY PERIOD.—If the average national unemployment rate during a quarter of a fiscal year,

as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, is more than 8 percent, the participation goal for the

immediately succeeding quarter shall equal the product obtained by multiplying—

“(A) the applicable quarterly participation rate under paragraph (1); by

“(B) 0.8.

“(j) CALCULATION OF WORK ACTIVATION PARTICIPATION RATES.—

“(1) DEFINITION OF SANCTIONED RECIPIENT.—In this subsection, the term ‘sanctioned recipient’ means any eligible participant who—

“(A) was required to participate in work activation in a month;

“(B) failed to perform the assigned work and work preparation activities so as to meet the relevant hourly requirements in subsection (c), (d), or (e)(2); and

“(C) was sanctioned by a reduced benefit payment in the subsequent month under subsection (g).

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The work activation participation rate for a State for any quarter of a fiscal year shall equal the average of the monthly participation rates for the State during the 3 months of that quarter.

“(3) MONTHLY PARTICIPATION RATE.—For purposes of paragraph (2), the monthly participation rate shall equal the ratio of all countable participants to all eligible participants in the month, as determined under paragraph (4).

“(4) RATIO OF ALL COUNTABLE PARTICIPANTS TO ALL ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS.—Subject to paragraph (5), the ratio of all countable participants to all eligible participants in a month equals the proportion that—

“(A) the sum obtained by adding—

“(i) all eligible participants who—

“(I) were required by the State to engage in interim work activation, full work activation, or education under subsection (e)(1) during the month; and

“(II) fulfilled the criteria for successful engagement in work activation for that activity during the month; and

“(ii) all sanctioned recipients for that month; bears to

“(B) the average number of eligible participants in the State in that month.

“(5) MULTIPLE ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS.—A married couple household consisting of more than 1 eligible participant shall be counted as a single eligible participant for purposes of calculating the participation rate under this subsection.

“(k) PENALTIES FOR INADEQUATE STATE PERFORMANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning in the first quarter of fiscal year 2020 and for each subsequent quarter of fiscal year 2020 and of each subsequent fiscal year, each State shall count the monthly average number of countable participants under this section.

“(2) REDUCTION IN FUNDING.—If the monthly average number of countable participants in a State of a fiscal year is not sufficient to fulfill the relevant work activation participation goal under subsection (i) during that quarter, the supplemental nutrition assistance program funding for the State under this Act shall be reduced for the fiscal quarter that begins 180 days after the first day of the quarter in which the inadequate performance occurred in accordance with paragraph (3).

“(3) FUNDING IN PENALIZED QUARTER.—The total amount of funding a State shall receive for all households with eligible participants for a quarter for which funding is reduced under paragraph (2) shall equal the product obtained by multiplying—

“(A) the total amount of funding that the State would have received in the preceding quarter for all households with eligible participants if no reduction had been in place; by

“(B) the ratio of all countable participants to all eligible participants (as determined under subsection (j)(4)) for the quarter that

began 180 days before the first day of the quarter for which funding is reduced.

“(1) FUNDING TO ADMINISTER WORK ACTIVATION.—

“(1) TANF FUNDING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 2019 and each subsequent fiscal year, a State that receives supplemental nutrition assistance program funds under this Act may use during that fiscal year to carry out the work activation program of the State under this section—

“(i) any of the Federal funds available to the State through the State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) in that fiscal year; and

“(ii) any of the funds from State sources allocated to the operation of the program described in clause (i).

“(B) EFFECT.—Any State that uses State funds allocated to the State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) to administer the work activation program of that State under this section may treat those funds as qualified State expenditures (as defined in section 409(a)(7)(B)(i) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 609(a)(7)(B)(i))) for purposes of meeting the requirements of section 409(a)(7) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 609(a)(7)) in that fiscal year.

“(2) WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT FUNDING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 2019 and each subsequent fiscal year, a State that receives Federal funds under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.) may use up to 50 percent of those funds during that fiscal year to carry out the work activation program of the State under this section.

“(3) SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 2019 and each subsequent fiscal year, a State that receives Federal funds under this Act for an employment and training program under section 6(d) may use those funds during that fiscal year to carry out the work activation program of the State under this section.”.

SEC. 4116. EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) STATE PLAN.—Section 202A(b) of the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 7503(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) at the option of the State agency, describe a plan of operation for 1 or more projects in partnership with 1 or more emergency feeding organizations located in the State to harvest, process, and package donated commodities received under section 203D(d); and

“(6) describe a plan, which may include the use of a State advisory board established under subsection (c), that provides emergency feeding organizations or eligible recipient agencies within the State an opportunity to provide input on the commodity preferences and needs of the emergency feeding organization or eligible recipient agency.”.

(b) STATE AND LOCAL SUPPLEMENTATION OF COMMODITIES.—Section 203D of the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 7507) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) PROJECTS TO HARVEST, PROCESS, AND PACKAGE DONATED COMMODITIES.—

“(1) DEFINITION OF PROJECT.—In this subsection, the term ‘project’ means the harvesting, processing, or packaging of unharvested, unprocessed, or unpackaged

commodities donated by agricultural producers, processors, or distributors for use by emergency feeding organizations under subsection (a).

“(2) FEDERAL FUNDING FOR PROJECTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C) and paragraph (3), using funds made available under paragraph (5), the Secretary may provide funding to States to pay for the costs of carrying out a project.

“(B) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of a project under subparagraph (A) shall not exceed 50 percent of the total cost of the project.

“(C) ALLOCATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Each fiscal year, the Secretary shall allocate to States that have submitted under section 202A(b)(5) a State plan describing a plan of operation for a project the funds made available under subparagraph (A) based on a formula determined by the Secretary.

“(ii) REALLOCATION.—If the Secretary determines that a State will not expend all of the funds allocated to the State for a fiscal year under clause (i), the Secretary shall reallocate the unexpended funds to other States that have submitted under section 202A(b)(5) a State plan describing a plan of operation for a project during that fiscal year or the subsequent fiscal year, as the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(iii) REPORTS.—Each State to which funds are allocated for a fiscal year under this subparagraph shall, on a regular basis, submit to the Secretary financial reports describing the use of the funds.

“(3) PROJECT PURPOSES.—A State may only use Federal funds received under paragraph (2) for a project the purposes of which are—

“(A) to reduce food waste at the agricultural production, processing, or distribution level through the donation of food;

“(B) to provide food to individuals in need; and

“(C) to build relationships between agricultural producers, processors, and distributors and emergency feeding organizations through the donation of food.

“(4) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may encourage a State agency that carries out a project using Federal funds received under paragraph (2) to enter into cooperative agreements with State agencies of other States under section 203B(d) to maximize the use of commodities donated under the project.

“(5) FUNDING.—Out of funds not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Secretary to carry out this subsection \$4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, to remain available until the end of the subsequent fiscal year.”.

(c) FOOD WASTE.—Section 203D of the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 7507) (as amended by subsection (b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) FOOD WASTE.—The Secretary shall issue guidance outlining best practices to minimize the food waste of the commodities donated under subsection (a).”.

(d) EMERGENCY FOOD PROGRAM INFRASTRUCTURE GRANTS.—Section 209(d) of the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 7511a(d)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

(e) AVAILABILITY OF COMMODITIES FOR THE EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—Section 27(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2036(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”; and

(B) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”;

(ii) in clause (iii), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(iii) in clause (iv), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(v) for fiscal year 2019, \$23,000,000;

“(vi) for fiscal year 2020, \$35,000,000;

“(vii) for fiscal year 2021, \$35,000,000;

“(viii) for fiscal year 2022, \$35,000,000; and

“(ix) for fiscal year 2023, \$35,000,000; and”;

and

(C) in subparagraph (E)—

(i) by striking “2019” and inserting “2024”;

(ii) by striking “(D)(iv)” and inserting “(D)(ix)”;

(iii) by striking “June 30, 2017” and inserting “June 30, 2023”.

SEC. 4117. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) Section 3 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by striking “(7)(i)” and inserting “(7)(h)”;

(2) in subsection (i), by striking “(7)(i)” and inserting “(7)(h)”;

(3) in subsection (o)(1)(A), by striking “(r)(1)” and inserting “(q)(1)”.

(b) Section 5(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014(a)) is amended by striking “(3)(n)(4)” each place it appears and inserting “(3)(m)(4)”.

(c) Section 8 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2017) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e)(1), by striking “(3)(n)(5)” and inserting “(3)(m)(5)”;

(2) in subsection (f)(1)(A), by striking “(3)(n)(5)” and inserting “(3)(m)(5)”.

(d) Section 9(c) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2018(c)) is amended in the third sentence by striking “to any used by” and inserting “to, and used by.”

(e) Section 10 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2019) is amended in the first sentence—

(1) by striking “or the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation” each place it appears; and

(2) by striking “(3)(p)(4)” and inserting “(3)(o)(4)”.

(f) Section 11 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020) is amended—

(1) by striking “(3)(t)(1)” each place it appears and inserting “(3)(s)(1)”;

(2) by striking “(3)(t)(2)” each place it appears and inserting “(3)(s)(2)”.

(g) Section 18(e) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2027(e)) is amended in the first sentence by striking “(7)(f)” and inserting “(7)(e)”.

(h) Section 25(a)(1)(B)(i)(I) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2034(a)(1)(B)(i)(I)) is amended by striking “service;” and inserting “service”.

SA 3339. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title XII, add the following:

SEC. ____ . REAUTHORIZATION OF RURAL EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES TRAINING AND EQUIPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Supporting and Improving Rural EMS Needs Act of 2018” or the “SIREN Act of 2018”.

(b) **AMENDMENTS.**—Section 330J of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254c-15) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “in rural areas” and inserting “in rural areas or to residents of rural areas”;

(2) by striking subsections (b) through (f) and inserting the following:

“(b) **ELIGIBILITY; APPLICATION.**—To be eligible to receive grant under this section, an entity shall—

“(1) be—

“(A) an emergency medical services agency operated by a local or tribal government (including fire-based and non-fire based); or

“(B) an emergency medical services agency that is described in section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code; and

“(2) submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

“(c) **USE OF FUNDS.**—An entity—

“(1) shall use amounts received through a grant under subsection (a) to—

“(A) train emergency medical services personnel as appropriate to obtain and maintain licenses and certifications relevant to service in an emergency medical services agency described in subsection (b)(1);

“(B) conduct courses that qualify graduates to serve in an emergency medical services agency described in subsection (b)(1) in accordance with State and local requirements;

“(C) fund specific training to meet Federal or State licensing or certification requirements; and

“(D) acquire emergency medical services equipment; and

“(2) may use amounts received through a grant under subsection (a) to—

“(A) recruit and retain emergency medical services personnel, which may include volunteer personnel;

“(B) develop new ways to educate emergency health care providers through the use of technology-enhanced educational methods; or

“(C) acquire personal protective equipment for emergency medical services personnel as required by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

“(d) **GRANT AMOUNTS.**—Each grant awarded under this section shall be in an amount not to exceed \$200,000.

“(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘emergency medical services’—

“(A) means resources used by a public or private nonprofit licensed entity to deliver medical care outside of a medical facility under emergency conditions that occur as a result of the condition of the patient; and

“(B) includes services delivered (either on a compensated or volunteer basis) by an emergency medical services provider or other provider that is licensed or certified by the State involved as an emergency medical technician, a paramedic, or an equivalent professional (as determined by the State).

“(2) The term ‘rural area’ means—

“(A) a nonmetropolitan statistical area;

“(B) an area designated as a rural area by any law or regulation of a State; or

“(C) a rural census tract of a metropolitan statistical area (as determined under the most recent rural urban commuting area code as set forth by the Office of Management and Budget).

“(f) **MATCHING REQUIREMENT.**—The Secretary may not award a grant under this section to an entity unless the entity agrees that the entity will make available (directly or through contributions from other public or private entities) non-Federal contributions toward the activities to be carried out under the grant in an amount equal to 15 percent of the amount received under the grant.”; and

(3) in subsection (g)(1), by striking “2002 through 2006” and inserting “2019 through 2023”.

SA 3340. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . IDENTIFICATION FOR CARD USE.

Section 7(h)(9) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(h)(9)) is amended—

(1) in the paragraph heading, by striking “OPTIONAL PHOTOGRAPHIC IDENTIFICATION” and inserting “IDENTIFICATION FOR CARD USE”;

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(3) by inserting before clause (i) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(A) **LISTED BENEFICIARIES.**—A State agency shall require that an electronic benefit card lists the names of—

“(i) the head of the household;

“(ii) each adult member of the household; and

“(iii) each adult that is not a member of the household that is authorized to use that card.

“(B) **PHOTOGRAPHIC IDENTIFICATION REQUIRED.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided under clause (ii), any individual listed on an electronic benefit card under subparagraph (A) shall be required to show photographic identification at the point of sale when using the card.

“(ii) **HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD.**—A head of a household is not required to show photographic identification under clause (i) if the electronic benefit card contains a photograph of that individual under subparagraph (C)(i).

“(C) **OPTIONAL PHOTOGRAPHIC IDENTIFICATION.**—

(4) in subparagraph (C) (as so designated)—

(A) in clause (i) (as so redesignated), by striking “1 or more members of a” and inserting “the head of the”; and

(B) in clause (ii) (as so redesignated)—

(i) by striking “subparagraph (A)” and inserting “clause (i)”;

(ii) by inserting “subject to subparagraph (B)(i)” after “the card”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) **VISUAL VERIFICATION.**—Any individual that is shown photographic identification or an electronic benefit card containing a photograph, as applicable, under subparagraph (B) shall visually confirm that the photograph on the identification or the electronic benefit card, as applicable, is a clear and accurate likeness of the individual using the electronic benefit card.”.

SA 3341. Mr. BENNET (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 62. LOANS FOR CARBON DIOXIDE CAPTURE AND UTILIZATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 901 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 19 the following:

“SEC. 20. LOANS FOR CARBON DIOXIDE CAPTURE AND UTILIZATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including regulations), in carrying out any program under this Act under which the Secretary provides a loan or loan guarantee, the Secretary may provide such a loan or loan guarantee to facilities employing commercially demonstrated technologies for carbon dioxide capture and utilization.”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 3 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 903) is amended—

(1) by striking “There are” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b)(2), there are”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) LOANS FOR CARBON DIOXIDE CAPTURE AND UTILIZATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out section 20.

“(2) SEPARATE APPROPRIATIONS.—The sums appropriated under paragraph (1) shall be separate and distinct from the sums appropriated under subsection (a).”.

SA 3342. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike paragraph (1) of section 9103 and insert the following:

(1) in subsection (b)(3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “produces an advanced biofuel; and” and inserting the following: “produces any 1 or more, or a combination, of—

“(i) an advanced biofuel;
“(ii) a renewable chemical; or
“(iii) a biobased product;”;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “produces an advanced biofuel.” and inserting the following: “produces any 1 or more, or a combination, of—

“(i) an advanced biofuel;
“(ii) a renewable chemical; or
“(iii) a biobased product; and”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) a technology for the capture, compression, or utilization of carbon dioxide that is produced at a biorefinery producing an advanced biofuel, a renewable chemical, or a biobased product.”; and

SA 3343. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. CATEGORICAL ELIGIBILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the fourth sentence, by striking “Assistance” and inserting the following:

“(4) APPLICATIONS FOR PARTICIPATION.—Assistance”;

(B) in the second sentence—

(i) by striking “Act, shall be eligible” and all that follows through “Except” in the third sentence and inserting the following: “Act.

“(3) ADDITIONAL ELIGIBILITY.—Except”;

(ii) by striking “Act, or aid” and inserting the following: “Act.

“(D) Households in which each member receives aid”;

(iii) by striking “supplemental security” and inserting the following: “with an income eligibility limit of not greater than 130 percent of the poverty line (as defined in subsection (c)(1)).

“(B) Households in which each member is elderly or disabled and receives cash assistance or ongoing and substantial services under a State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), with an income eligibility limit of not greater than 200 percent of the poverty line (as defined in subsection (c)(1)).

“(C) Households in which each member receives supplemental security”;

(iv) by striking “households in which each member receives benefits” and inserting the following: “the following households shall be eligible to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program:

“(A) Households in which each member receives cash assistance or ongoing and substantial services”; and

(v) by striking “Notwithstanding” and inserting the following:

“(2) CATEGORIES OF ELIGIBILITY.—Notwithstanding”; and

(C) in the first sentence, by striking “(a) Participation” and inserting the following:

“(a) ELIGIBILITY FOR PARTICIPATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Participation”; and

(2) in subsection (j)—

(A) by striking “or who receives benefits” and inserting “cash assistance or ongoing and substantial services”; and

(B) by striking “the Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) to have” and inserting “that Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), with an income eligibility limit of not greater than 130 percent of the poverty line (as defined in subsection (c)(1)), or who is elderly or disabled and receives cash assistance or ongoing and substantial services under a State program funded under that part, with an income eligibility limit of not more than 200 percent of the poverty line (as defined in subsection (c)(1)), to have”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect October 1, 2020.

SA 3344. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike subtitle A of title IV and insert the following:

Subtitle A—Nutrition Assistance Block Grant Program**SEC. 4001. NUTRITION ASSISTANCE BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—For each of fiscal years 2019 through 2028, the Secretary shall establish a nutrition assistance block grant program under which the Secretary shall make annual grants to each participating State that establishes a nutrition assistance program in the State and submits to the Secretary annual reports under subsection (d).

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—As a requirement of receiving grants under this section, the Governor of each participating State shall certify that the State nutrition assistance program includes—

(1) work requirements;
(2) mandatory drug testing;
(3) verification of citizenship or proof of lawful permanent residency of the United States; and

(4) limitations on the eligible uses of benefits that are at least as restrictive as the limitations in place for the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) as of [May 31, 2012].

(c) AMOUNT OF GRANT.—For each fiscal year, the Secretary shall make a grant to each participating State in an amount equal to the product of—

(1) the amount made available under section 4002 for the applicable fiscal year; and

(2) the proportion that—

(A) the number of legal residents in the State whose income does not exceed 100 percent of the poverty line (as defined in section 673 of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902), including any revision required by that section) applicable to a family of the size involved; bears to

(B) the number of such individuals in all participating States for the applicable fiscal year, based on data for the most recent fiscal year for which data is available.

(d) ANNUAL REPORT REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than January 1 of each year, each State that receives a grant under this section shall submit to the Secretary a report that shall include, for the year covered by the report—

(A) a description of the structure and design of the nutrition assistance program of the State, including the manner in which residents of the State qualify for the program;

(B) the cost the State incurs to administer the program;

(C) whether the State has established a rainy day fund for the nutrition assistance program of the State; and

(D) general statistics about participation in the nutrition assistance program.

(2) AUDIT.—Each year, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(A) conduct an audit on the effectiveness of the nutritional assistance block grant program and the manner in which each participating State is implementing the program; and

(B) not later than June 30, submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report describing—

(i) the results of the audit; and

(ii) the manner in which the State will carry out the supplemental nutrition assistance program in the State, including eligibility and fraud prevention requirements.

(e) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A State that receives a grant under this section may use the grant in any manner determined to be appropriate by the State to provide nutrition assistance to the legal residents of the State.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Grant funds made available to a State under this section shall—

(A) remain available to the State for a period of 5 years; and

(B) after that period, shall—

(i) revert to the Federal Government to be deposited in the Treasury and used for Federal budget deficit reduction; or

(ii) if there is no Federal budget deficit, be used to reduce the Federal debt in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury considers appropriate.

SEC. 4002. FUNDING.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

(1) for fiscal year 2019, \$33,750,000,000;

(2) for fiscal year 2020, \$34,500,000,000;

(3) for fiscal year 2021, \$35,800,000,000;

(4) for fiscal year 2022, \$37,100,000,000;

(5) for fiscal year 2023, \$38,800,000,000;

(6) for fiscal year 2024, \$40,000,000,000;

(7) for fiscal year 2025, \$42,000,000,000;

(8) for fiscal year 2026, \$43,200,000,000;

(9) for fiscal year 2027, \$45,000,000,000; and

(10) for fiscal year 2028, \$46,300,000,000.

(b) ADJUSTMENT TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—Section 251(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(G) NUTRITION ASSISTANCE BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM.—If a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a fiscal year is enacted that specifies an amount for the nutrition assistance block grant program established under section 4001(a) of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, then the adjustments for that fiscal year shall be the additional new budget authority provided in that bill or joint resolution for that block grant program.”

SEC. 4003. REPEALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Effective September 30, 2018, the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) is repealed.

(b) REPEAL OF MANDATORY FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, effective September 30, 2018, the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) (as in effect prior to that date) shall cease to be a program funded through direct spending (as defined in section 250(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900(c)) prior to the amendment made by paragraph (2)).

(2) DIRECT SPENDING.—Effective September 30, 2018, section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900(c)(8)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by adding “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “; and” at the end and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (C).

(3) ENTITLEMENT AUTHORITY.—Effective September 30, 2018, section 3(9) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 622(9)) is amended—

(A) by striking “means—” and all that follows through “the authority to make” and inserting “means the authority to make”;

(B) by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (B).

(4) OTHER DIRECT SPENDING.—Effective September 30, 2018, section 1026(5) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 691e(5)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by adding “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “; and” at the end and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (C).

(c) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAW.—Any reference in this Act, an amendment made by this Act, or any other Act to the supple-

mental nutrition assistance program shall be considered to be a reference to the nutrition assistance block grant program under this subtitle.

SEC. 4004. BASELINE.

Notwithstanding section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 907), the baseline shall assume that, on and after September 30, 2018, no benefits shall be provided under the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) (as in effect prior to that date).

SA 3345. Mr. PERDUE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 669, strike lines 10 through 13 and insert the following:

“(1) MANDATORY FUNDING.—Of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary shall make available to carry out this section \$19,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2023.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mrs. BLUNT. Mr. President, I have 8 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 27, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the nomination of Lieutenant General Stephen R. Lyons, USA, to be general and Commander, United States Transportation Command, Department of Defense.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 27, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled “How to Reduce Health Care Cost: Understanding the Cost of Health Care in America.”

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 27, 2018, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Medicaid Fraud and Overpayments: Problems and Solutions.”

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 27, 2018, at 10:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “FAST-41 and the Federal Permitting Improvement Steering Council: Progress to date and Next Steps.”

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 27, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Examining the Eligibility Requirements for the Radiation Exposure Compensation Program to Ensure all Downwinders Receive Coverage.”

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 27, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing on the nomination of Robert L. Wilkie, of North Carolina, to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 27, 2018, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST, COMPETITION POLICY AND CONSUMER RIGHTS

The Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 27, 2018, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled “Protecting our Elections: Examining Shell Companies and Virtual Currencies as Avenues for Foreign Interference.”

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following individuals with the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be granted floor privileges for the duration of debate on the farm bill: detailee Chu-Yuan Hwang and interns Lane Coberly, Hannah Taylor, and Clara Wicoff.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Alexis Young, an intern in my office, be granted floor privileges for the duration of today's session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two members of my staff, Lauren Tavar and Ariana Spawn, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the consideration of the farm bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 28,
2018

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., June 28; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two

leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed. Finally, I ask that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:09 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, June 28, 2018, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PETTY OFFICER VERONICA AILLIM
ALCAZAR

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Petty Officer Veronica Aillim Alcazar of Winslow Township, in New Jersey's First Congressional District.

Petty Officer Alcazar was a graduate of Camden County Technical Schools at Pennsauken, NJ Campus and graduated with the Class of 2010. She proudly served in the United States Navy since her enlistment in 2012.

Petty Officer Alcazar was the loving daughter of Consuelo "Connie" Alcazar and Jessie Lopez, beloved sister of Elizette Peralta, Dean Alcazar and Rosemary Alcazar, cherished granddaughter of William and Emerita Alcazar and Ernestina Lopez, adored niece of Alexander and Vianey Alcazar and William and Lucie Alcazar, loving cousin of Ethan and William III, and fiancée of Aamir Awad Muhammad.

Petty Officer Alcazar is by all accounts an American hero who selflessly served her country. Her service to the United States Armed Forces, sacrifice on behalf of the freedom of the United States of America and noble legacy will always be remembered. I ask you to join me in honoring the memory of this great American.

THANKING VETERAN ANNA LOUISE
RICHARDS KOENNING FOR
HER SERVICE DURING WWII

HON. BRIAN BABIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my gratitude to a great woman for her military service, Mrs. Anna "Andy" Louise Richards Koenning. Andy is a 96-year-old Lieutenant Junior Grade veteran of World War II. During her service in the United States Navy, from 1945 to 1946, her efforts were instrumental in ensuring the safety of our nation's aircraft.

Andy was born in Ogden, Kansas in 1922. One of 8 siblings, she quickly learned the values of hard work and persistence. She spent time working for Beech Aircraft before joining the United States Navy in 1945 after being persuaded to pursue the opportunity by a close friend.

During her year of service, Andy traveled by train from Kansas to New York for basic training. She served by assisting other female cadets through their daily routine. Following this, she returned by train to Corpus Christi, Texas, where she spent time manufacturing tools and airline materials. It was here where she

worked alongside a predominantly male team that gave her the nickname "Andy", as well as where she met her husband, Eddie Lee Koenning. She was honorably discharged in 1946.

Andy currently resides in Deer Park, Texas, and thoroughly enjoys fishing and watching the Houston Astros. She and her husband have five daughters: Peggy Jones, Bobbie Koenning, Patty Mayes, Debbie Bragg, and Kathy Preston.

I thank Mrs. Koenning for her selfless military service to this great nation.

OATH OF CITIZENSHIP ON JULY 4,
2018

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and sincerity that I take this time to congratulate the fifty individuals who will take their oath of citizenship on July 4, 2018. In true patriotic fashion, on the day of our great Nation's celebration of independence, a naturalization ceremony will take place, welcoming new citizens of the United States of America. This memorable occasion, coordinated by the League of Women Voters of the Calumet Area and presided over by Magistrate Judge Andrew Rodovich, will be held at The Pavilion at Wolf Lake in Hammond, Indiana.

America is a country founded by immigrants. From its beginning, settlers have come from countries around the world to the United States in search of better lives for their families. The oath ceremony is a shining example of what is so great about the United States of America—that people from all over the world can come together and unite as members of a free, democratic nation. These individuals realize that nowhere else in the world offers a better opportunity for success than here in America.

On July 4, 2018, the following people, representing many nations throughout the world, will take their oaths of citizenship in Hammond, Indiana: Issam Marzouki, Jose Antonio Guzman Gonzalez, Bilin Yu, Gonzalo Vargas Lopez, Anna Anatolevna Olekminskaya, Onecima Duarte, Dominic Gikonyo Mburu, Jose Roberto Juarez Diaz, Masauko Joseph Chimayi, Krzysztof Twardus, Carryl Joice Ignacio Kyle, Christina Berthier, Griselda Montanez Serrano, Tchinga Harvey Ndalama, Jose de Jesus Zamora Pulido, Maria del Socorro Lopez, Heng Fu, Francis Josue Silfa Sena, Edgar Israel Castro Alvarez, Mona Samir Abdelhalim Mohamed, Solomon Ellieojor Egbeama, Justyna Maria Oldham, Arman Bautista Villanueva, Ivana Twardus, Tai Trong Hoang, Clasido Aguilar, Adewale Sterling Ajibade, Lily Chen Banks, Sergio E. Castro, Gerardo del Real, Berenice Flores, Antonia Garcia, Olga Abril Gibson Cabrera,

Cesar Gonzalez, Mohamed Latif, Yogesh Maniar, Romelia Medina, Victor Manuel Mendoza, Alexander Jose Midence, Leticia S. Morris, Jane Wairimu Muchiri, Nicolas Nieto, Erika Valentina Palmerin, Heron Rodriguez, Porfirio Samaniego, Jacobo Sarabia, Angelina Serrano, Fatima Sheremetyeva, Abdou Rahmane Tamba, and Ben Van Vuong.

Although each individual has sought to become a citizen of the United States for his or her own reasons, be it for education, occupation, or to offer their loved ones better lives, each is inspired by the fact that the United States of America is, as Abraham Lincoln described it, a country ". . . of the people, by the people, and for the people." They realize that the United States is truly a free nation. By seeking American citizenship, they have made the decision that they want to live in a place where, as guaranteed by the First Amendment of the Constitution, they can practice religion as they choose, speak their minds without fear of punishment, and assemble in peaceful protest should they choose to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in congratulating these fifty individuals who will become citizens of the United States of America on July 4, 2018, the anniversary of our Nation's independence. They, too, will be American citizens, guaranteed the inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We, as a free and democratic nation, congratulate them and welcome them.

TRIBUTE TO RON McMASTER

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Californian Ron McMaster on his retirement after 38 years of outstanding contributions to American music.

In the heart of my Congressional district, near the famous intersection of Hollywood and Vine, stands the iconic Capitol Records Tower. It's fitting that many think the landmark building looks like a stack of records, as the building has produced some of our country's most notable and treasured recordings—from the Beach Boys to Pat Benatar and the Blue Note catalog. For 38 years, legendary vinyl mastering engineer Ron McMaster has called that Tower home and, thanks to his unique artistic talent, helped to make it the epicenter of the American Sound.

From his Audio Mastering studio on the ground floor, Ron McMaster takes studio recordings and—using a distinctive blend of math, science, technology, art, a touch of magic and years of unparalleled expertise—delicately fashions the masters used to create vinyl records, CD's and commercial online music products. If you've listened to the Beach Boys, Don McLean, Frank Sinatra, the Rolling Stones, the Red Hot Chili Peppers, Chet

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Baker, David Guetta, Radiohead, and countless others, you've witnessed his genius.

T—Bone Burnett, who worked with McMaster on the 2007 Grammy winning collaboration between Allison Krauss and Robert Plant, called Ron “the final aesthetic arbiter of the work. Ron, and the people who do what they do, are creative artists. They're closer to creative artists than technicians.”

Ron has been nominated for Grammy awards in recognition of his artistic excellence. He's a member of the Los Angeles Chapter of The Recording Academy and widely recognized as one of the world's preeminent jazz mastering engineers.

McMaster's magical touch will be missed, but his legacy is cemented in the countless records he helped create. I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Ron McMaster for his contribution to the American Soundtrack and wishing him all the best on his well-earned retirement.

RED ROCKS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the team from Red Rocks Community College on becoming a finalist for a fourth year in a row in the National Science Foundation's Community College Innovation Challenge. This program serves as an innovative way for community college students to partner with local industries to create pioneering STEM-based solutions for real world issues.

The Red Rocks team addressed the important challenge of helping the 250,000 Americans suffering with an anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) injury each year by designing BraceX, a low-cost solution to help patients stay mobile during recovery. BraceX is intended to reduce weight-bearing at the knee joint by using a passive spring system that bypasses the knee by transferring the weight to other parts of the leg during the walking cycle, helping patients quickly recover and return to their independence.

I congratulate the Red Rocks Team of Bradley Helliwell, Keegan Salankey, Logan Beford, Justin Nichols, Justin Troche, and their faculty advisor Liz Cox for their success. I applaud this group for their dedication to this important project and their leadership and commitment to STEM education. I am proud of the work Red Rocks Community College does every day and I look forward to seeing what the school and these students accomplish in the years to come.

COMMENDATION OF COL. JAMES G. PANGELINAN

HON. GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO SABLAN

OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons I have worked to increase the number of young people from the Mariana Islands who

can attend the U.S. military academies is because I believe the Marianas offer a wealth of talent that can add to the strength of our military.

A case in point is West Point graduate James G. Pangelinan, who just hit 22 years of active duty service on June 1 and who graduated from the Army War College on June 8 with a master of arts in strategic studies and distinguished graduate honors. At the same time Pangelinan was promoted to the rank of colonel. He is the first person from the Marianas to graduate from West Point and, I understand, the first from our islands to graduate from the Army War College.

I would like to review COL Pangelinan's distinguished career to date. Upon graduation from West Point with a bachelor of science degree in English literature and philosophy, he received his commission and began service. According to information from the U.S. Army, Pangelinan first was assigned as a rifle platoon leader and company executive officer in the 1st Battalion, 23rd Infantry Regiment at Fort Lewis, Washington from 1997–99. He next served as an assistant operations officer with the Ranger Training Brigade at Fort Benning, Georgia from 2000–02. While assigned to Schofield Barracks, Hawaii from 2002–06, he served as a brigade and battalion assistant operations officer, commanded a rifle company in the 1st Battalion, 14th Infantry Regiment, and deployed to Iraq in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

From 2006–08, Pangelinan was an Opposition Forces commander with the Battle Command Training Program at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. He deployed to Afghanistan, serving as a strategist in the NATO Training Mission Afghanistan in Kabul. From 2011–13, he served as the battalion executive officer of the 1st Battalion, 12th Infantry Regiment, Fort Carson, Colorado and deployed to Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. From 2013–14, Pangelinan served as the Brigade Rear Detachment commander of the 4th Infantry Brigade Combat Team, 4th Infantry Division. He commanded the 2nd Battalion, 58th Infantry Regiment at Fort Benning from 2014–16. Following battalion command, COL Pangelinan served on the Army Staff in the G–3/5/7 where he was responsible for the publication and execution of the Army Campaign Plan 2017.

Throughout this time Pangelinan continued his academic pursuits, earning a master of military art and science from the School of Advanced Military Studies and a Master of Arts in Security Studies from Kansas State University both in 2010.

Pangelinan's awards and decorations include the Bronze Star, Meritorious Service Medal, Army Commendation Medal, Joint Service Achievement Medal, Army Achievement Medal, Ranger Tab, Parachutist Badge, Air Assault Badge, Pathfinder Badge, Combat Infantryman Badge, and Expert Infantryman Badge. He is the son of Dulce Pangelinan and Edward D.L.G. Pangelinan, who was the lead negotiator of the Covenant to Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America and who was the first person elected to represent the Marianas here in Washington.

COL Pangelinan begins a two-year stint in the Republic of Korea on the staff of U.S. Forces Korea in July to continue a career his

family and the Mariana Islands can all be proud of.

I salute COL James G. Pangelinan for his many achievements and thank him for his service.

IN APPRECIATION OF THE SERVICE OF WILSAR JOHNSON

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Wilsar Johnson for her dedicated service to the House of Representatives. As the Judiciary Committee's Democratic Digital Director, she kept us current through extensive social media engagement, creative branding, and storytelling.

Wilsar is a first generation Sierra Leonean-American immigrant and is also a proud recipient of the Diversity Visa Lottery program. Wilsar spent her formative years in Camden, New Jersey, and is a graduate of Georgian Court University.

As the Judiciary Committee's Democratic Digital Director, she kept us current through extensive social media engagement, creative branding and storytelling. She oversaw the minority's social media platforms and multimedia portfolio, including video production, live broadcasts, graphic design and photography. Wilsar is a founding Member of the first ever Congressional Democratic Digital Communications Staff Association, where she provides coaching and professional development to other Hill staff.

In addition to the Judiciary Committee, Wilsar has served in the offices of Representatives KAREN BASS of California, Rush Holt of New Jersey, and BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN of New Jersey.

Wilsar's charismatic attitude and dedication have made her an integral member of our team. I thank her for her service and wish her the best of luck as she starts a new journey in the upper body.

IN RECOGNITION OF CINDY MCCOWN

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Cindy McCown, a champion against hunger and for food security in our region. In her 34 years of work for the Second Harvest Food Bank of Santa Clara and San Mateo counties, Cindy has seen first-hand that nutritious food is an essential ingredient to a healthy and productive life. In fact, Cindy created many of the programs that have made nutritious food accessible to tens of thousands of children, families and seniors in Northern California.

Cindy rose through the ranks at the food bank and over the years built strong relationships with policy makers to create a more robust hunger-safety net. I count myself as one of those lucky policy makers who had the honor to work with Cindy on key legislation, such as the Farm Bill. It was Cindy who convinced me to take the Food Stamp challenge

in 2011. This profound and humbling experience changed my perspective on hunger and food dependence forever. I've also sorted food with Cindy at the food bank to get a more complete understanding of its role in feeding and supporting our residents. For almost 90,000 residents in my Congressional District, SNAP and the food bank are literally a life line.

Cindy's passion for food justice started early in her life. Originally from Spokane, Washington, Cindy's father, a psychiatrist, moved the family to San Luis Obispo to accept a job at Atascadero State Hospital when Cindy was in kindergarten. She earned her undergraduate and graduate degrees in nutrition from California Polytechnic State University. During college, she did a nine-months internship teaching nutrition to migrant children in the agricultural town of Oceana. That experience made her see up close just how challenging it is to afford healthy and nutritious food when you are poor.

In 1984 the Second Harvest Food Bank had a job opening for a community nutritionist and Cindy jumped at the opportunity. Back then, the food bank was located in an old bottling plant and had an annual budget of less than \$1 million. Today, the organization has three facilities, including a dedicated produce distribution center, and an annual budget of \$42 million. Cindy grew and grew with the relatively new concept of a food bank. She led efforts to better organize the food distribution and to bring it closer to the people who needed it. She created partnerships with non-profit organizations and more than 900 distribution sites in almost every zip code. She also came up with the idea for a multilingual hotline to connect callers to the closest food. Instead of looking at the organization purely as a food provider, Cindy found creative ways to turn it into a local community leader on ending hunger.

After the Lorna Prieta earthquake in 1989, Cindy helped create CADRE, the Collaborating Agencies Disaster Relief Effort, to effectively respond to natural disasters. Second Harvest Food Bank is still part of the CADRE leadership team. In 1997, Cindy was instrumental in forming the Safety New Project, a partnership to address welfare reform impacts. She continues to co-chair that committee. At the height of the Great Recession in 2010, Cindy in collaboration with the Santa Clara Social Services Agency, secured millions of dollars through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and the county was the first in the country to provide "stimulus food boxes" to those in need.

Cindy has a gift to bring public and private resources together to help people in need, educate the public and fight against the stigma of poverty. Under her leadership Second Harvest Food Bank has been honored with Feeding America's Advocacy Hall of Fame the last four years in a row. With each dose of food, Cindy hands out a dose of dignity.

In 2015, Second Harvest named Cindy Vice President of Community Engagement and Policy. In that role she formed the Children's Nutrition Coalition, which includes a dozen school districts, libraries, youth groups, and social services agencies, to ensure children get nutritious food particularly during the summer when families don't have access to school meals. She also launched the school breakfast initiative in high-need areas. Due to those pro-

grams, local children received over 300,000 additional meals last year.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the members of the House of Representatives to rise with me to celebrate a community leader who has literally nurtured tens of thousands of lives throughout her remarkable career. Cindy McCown is a visionary trailblazer and tireless advocate for people in need. She leaves behind a legacy of empathy, compassion and creative thinking that will enrich our community for years to come.

HONORING CORA GREENBERG

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor my constituent, Cora Greenberg of Pleasantville, New York. After 23 years of service, she will retire from her position as Executive Director of Westchester Children's Association (WCA) at the end of June.

Ms. Greenberg joined the 104-year-old organization in 1994. During her tenure, WCA expanded from a staff of two and an annual budget of \$120,000 to a staff of eight and a yearly budget of nearly \$1 million. WCA has increased Westchester County funding for youth programs and improved the selection process for funded programs through its Campaign for Kids. Additionally, WCA's data publications and analyses have become go-to resources for many advocates and policymakers.

Prior to joining WCA in 1994, Ms. Greenberg was the Associate Executive Director of Project Reach Youth, a multi-service youth and family agency in Brooklyn, New York, where she was highly influential in developing model programs in youth development, family literacy, and after-school education. Before joining Project Reach Youth, she served as Executive Director of Interfaith Neighbors, a youth program founded and supported by more than 20 churches and synagogues on Manhattan's Upper East Side, and as a Program Coordinator at United Neighborhood Houses, a membership organization of 39 settlement houses and community centers in New York City.

Throughout Ms. Greenberg's time at WCA, she improved the lives of children in Westchester County by shaping policies and programs to meet their needs. She made thoughtful community engagement a priority for WCA, ensuring the organization continues to thrive and is well positioned to help many more children in the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my fellow Members of Congress to join me in expressing thanks to Ms. Greenberg for her 23 years of outstanding service, dedication, and passion to the Westchester Children's Association and to the children and families of Westchester County and beyond.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JACKY ROSEN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Speaker, on June 25th, on roll call votes 289 and 290, I was not present due to work-related travel. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on roll call vote 289 and YEA on roll call vote 290.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KEVIN YODER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, please excuse my absence from the following votes. I was attending a meeting with President Trump regarding my official duties as a member of the House Appropriations Committee. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on Roll Call No. 291; Yea on Roll Call No. 292; and Yea on Roll Call No. 293.

COMMENDATION OF CSM DOLORES PANGELINAN KIYOSHI

HON. GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO SABLAN

OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, 27 years ago Dolores Pangelinan Kiyoshi decided to devote her life to serving her country. She left her home on Tinian, one of the Mariana Islands, and enlisted in the United States Army.

Recently, that journey has led her to promotion to the rank of Command Sergeant Major. She is the first woman from the Marianas to achieve that rank.

CSM Kiyoshi was introduced to military life and values—as so many are—through the Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps. In JROTC during high school on Guam, Ms. Kiyoshi achieved the rank of Battalion Commander; and she earned a four-year ROTC scholarship at the University of Guam. She was eager to serve her country, however, and to honor her parents' wishes that she become a soldier. So, she left officer training and in November 1990, joined the Army.

Upon completion of basic training at Fort Dix, New Jersey the new recruit identified medicine as the area in which she would specialize throughout her Army career.

She took advanced individual training as a combat medic at Fort Sam Houston, Texas. Subsequently, according to information provided by the U.S. Army, she has served in most Medical Command Leadership positions, including Patient Hold Non-Commissioned Officer In-Charge, Infection Control NCOIC, Birthing Center NCOIC, Intensive Care Unit Wardmaster, Chief Wardmaster, Department of Medicine NCOIC, Operations NCOIC, and Clinical Operations SGM.

Her stateside assignments include the 21st Combat Support Hospital at Fort Hood, TX,

Walter Reed Army Medical Center in Washington D.C., Darnall Army Community Hospital at Fort Hood, TX, 549th Area Support Medical Company at Fort Hood, TX, 28th CSH at Fort Benning, GA, 115th CSH at Fort Polk, LA, United States Army Sergeant Major Academy at Fort Bliss, TX, and the 44th Medical Brigade at Fort Bragg, NC.

Kiyoshi's overseas assignments include 560th Ground Ambulance Medical Company in Korea, 549th Area Support Medical Company in Croatia, Wurzberg MEDDAC in Germany, Benincaso Pavilion in Italy, and Tripler Army Medical Center in Hawaii.

She has deployed to Cuba, Croatia, Iraq, and Afghanistan for combat and peacekeeping missions.

Her education includes the Primary Leadership Development Course, Basic and Advanced NCO Course, First Sergeant Course, Sergeants Major Academy, Master Resilience Trainer, Deployable Medical Equipment Course, Equal Opportunity Leader Course, Unit Antiterrorism Advisor Level One Course, Deployable Sexual Assault Response Coordinator, Airborne School, and the Military License Practical Nurse School.

She also has an associate degree in General Studies.

Her awards and decorations include Bronze Star Medal (2nd award), Meritorious Service Medal (5th award), Army Commendation Medal (12th award), Army Achievement Medal (10th award), Army Superior Unit Award, Meritorious Unit Citation (2nd award), Army Good Conduct Medal (9th award), National Defense Service Medal (Bronze Star), Afghanistan Campaign Medal, Iraq Campaign Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Korean Defense Service Medal, NCOPD Ribbon (Numeral 5), Army Service Ribbon, Overseas Service Ribbon (Numeral 7), NATO Service Medal (2nd award), Parachutist Badge, EFMB Badge and the Drivers Mechanic Badge. She is also a Sergeant Audie Murphy recipient.

She is the daughter of Ignacio and Teresa P. Kiyoshi and the eldest of eight siblings. She has two daughters, Teresa and Marilyn Hernandez.

Upon retirement, CSM Kiyoshi plans to return to Tinian and serve her Familia, the Northern Marianas community.

All of us in the Marianas congratulate CSM Dolores Pangelinan Kiyoshi on her success. We thank her for her service. And we look forward to the day we welcome her home to stay.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SCOTT TAYLOR

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, due to a meeting at the White House, I missed the following votes. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on Roll Call No. 291; Yea on Roll Call No. 292; and Yea on Roll Call No. 293.

UPON THE OCCASION OF THE RETIREMENT OF PAT MARTEL FROM THE POSITION OF CITY MANAGER OF DALY CITY

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Pat Martel, the retiring City Manager of Daly City, California. Pat has served the people of Daly City, in one important capacity or another, for nearly two decades. To say that this is the end of an era in San Mateo County would be a profound understatement.

Pat Martel spent thirty-five years in local government service. The people of Inglewood, South San Francisco, San Francisco, and Daly City have all benefitted from Pat's steady hand and well-recognized skill at forming coalitions. She runs a city by the numbers, but with a heart. This is exemplified in part by her participation in nonprofit activities where she has served as Chair of Peninsula Family Service Agency, a nonprofit dedicated to helping struggling families in San Mateo County. She dedicated her life to her fellow professionals by volunteering to serve as a board member of the California City Management Foundation, served on the City Managers Department of the League of California Cities, and volunteered for the board of the International Hispanic Network.

I have worked with Pat Martel for decades. Many of my most important judgments were informed by Pat's advice. During the crucial time when San Francisco was determining how to upgrade and reinforce the critical Hetch Hetchy water system, serving 2.4 million users in San Francisco and the Bay Area, Pat assured me that city voters would pass the bond needed to make repairs. This reassurance led me to work with Pat and many others to get the measure passed and to establish a local government oversight board for the project. Without question, the water supply of these millions of people and businesses is more secure because Pat Martel was in the job when the job needed a tremendous leader.

The City of Daly City has undergone enormous changes since Pat arrived. It has always been a thriving commercial and cultural center on the Peninsula. "The Gateway to the Peninsula" is the city's motto, and Pat and her team kept the gateway sparkling and thriving despite sometimes difficult economic times over the years. Above all else, Daly City is a city of families. Pat is recognized as a strong advocate for city services such as libraries and parks that draw people together so that the fabric of community may be created and reinforced.

She is a graduate of the University of Southern California from which she received her B.S. degree in Public Affairs, and a Master's Degree in Public Administration. She is an ICMA Credentialed Manager and, in 2014, she was elected as a Fellow of the National Academy of Public Administration. Pat also has numerous other awards from her years of service, including those from the San Francisco Business Times and Kaiser Permanente and KQED radio, all of which recognized her as an outstanding manager and leader.

Daly City sits on the bluffs above the Pacific Ocean, at its edges defying gravity as its cliff

faces plunge into the water and its hang gliders dare nature in their soaring beauty. It is a complex place filled with honest and hard-working people. Even on its foggiest and windiest days, the people of Daly City are a furnace of good spirits and community pride.

Over the years, the city has known many local giants who, collectively, first developed local dairy farms into housing, brought in freeways and mass transit, and then decades later redeveloped the town into a modern suburb housing families from every point on the globe. All of those prior local giants would have embraced Pat Martel, just as the modern population extends its hand to her in thanks.

Since there really isn't a place on the city's ocean front from which to launch a ship into the sunset, I expect to instead see Pat Martel poised under a hang glider, atop a bluff, as she leaves her city behind. As she's done in the past, she will have done her homework so that she will not only soar with the others, but lead them as well into new expanses. We wish Pat well and know that she will not fail in her next adventure, for no one who knows her could imagine anything but success in all her future years. She will take her colorful kite with her, but behind she will leave a rainbow of good wishes and a pot of gold—a legacy of great management and great love for all people—for the next generation to treasure.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO COLONEL FRANK E. WENDLING UPON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. BRADLEY BYRNE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Colonel Frank E. Wendling upon his retirement from the U.S. Marine Corps. Wendling most recently served as the Senior Marine Liaison Officer to the Commander Naval Education and Training Command in Pensacola, Florida.

Colonel Wendling, a native of Dearborn, Michigan, has served our nation in the U.S. Marine Corps for over 29 years. Within this period of dedicated service, Colonel Wendling received designation as a Naval Aviator, completed two Mediterranean deployments with the 26th Marine Expeditionary Unit, taught on the Air War College Faculty as a Seminar Director and Leadership and Warfighting Professor at Maxwell Air Force Base, and accumulated over 3,675 flight hours, amongst many other designations.

Colonel Wendling graduated from The University of South Alabama with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Civil Engineering in 1988. In 2004, Wendling earned a Master's Degree in Military Operational Art and Science from the Air Command and Staff College at Maxwell Air Force Base in Montgomery, Alabama. In 2006, he earned a second Master's Degree from Maxwell Air Force Base in Air Power Art and Science. In 2009, Wendling earned a third Master's Degree in National Security and Strategic Studies from the Naval War College at Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island.

Colonel Wendling has accumulated a commendable number of awards for his time served in the U.S. Marine Corps, including the Defense Superior Service Medal, the Legion

of Merit, the Defense Meritorious Service Medal, the Meritorious Service Medal with gold star in lieu of second award, and the single mission Air Medal with Combat Distinguishing Device, as well as others.

Mr. Speaker, it is people like Colonel Wendling who make the United States the greatest nation on the face of the earth. His commitment to serving our country and his community should serve as a shining example to the next generation.

On behalf of Alabama's First Congressional District and the countless people his leadership has impacted, I wish Colonel Wendling all the best upon his retirement. His tireless service to our country will not be forgotten.

RECOGNIZING THE 2018 MEXICAN
AMERICAN COUNCIL SCHOLARS

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the Mexican American Council (MAC), the Garza family, and the 2018 MAC Scholars.

On May 29th, the Mexican American Council celebrated the 34th Annual Farmworker Student Recognition Ceremony at the Homestead Miami Speedway.

In 1984, MAC's founder Cip Garza began this prestigious event to honor the academic achievements of Miami-Dade County's farmworker graduates.

In collaboration with Miami-Dade County Public Schools and Career Source South Florida, MAC awarded over \$150,000 in scholarships this year.

I wish to congratulate the following students on their phenomenal success and include the 2018 MAC Scholars in the RECORD:

Kassandra Castillo
Luis Diaz-Lopez
Jazmin S. Espinoza
Jenri Guerrero
Lissette Hernandez
Ugenie Jean
Kevyn Jimenez
Aleena Jones
Mari Marquez
Christella Nazaire
Blanca Rosas
Sintia Rosas
Naila Sanchez
Manaika Sainstyl
Giselle Trejo-Ramirez
Dulce Velasquez
Noelia Villa

Mr. Speaker, Cip and Maria Garza have done so much to benefit the lives of countless migrant families and Hispanic students in South Florida. I would like to thank them and everyone else at the Mexican American Council for all their tireless work. Once again, congratulations to all of the 2018 MAC Scholars, their enthusiasm, creativity, and entrepreneurship represent the best values of our diverse nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 295.

RECOGNIZING THE WINDSOR/
STEWARTSON-STRASBURG HIGH
SCHOOL SOFTBALL TEAM

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Windsor/Stewartson-Strasburg High School Softball Team. The WSS Hatchets are now the 2018 IHSA Class 1A State Champions.

The Hatchets won the state title game 8-5 to cap off a season with a record of 28 wins and four losses before facing the Goreville Blackcats in an exciting championship game. The Blackcats had a terrific performance, mounting a comeback after facing a six-run deficit to begin the game. However, due to their stellar pitching and timely hitting, the WSS Hatchets earned a hard-fought and well-deserved victory.

I would like to congratulate the entire WSS Softball Team on their victory: Megan Schlechte, Machenzi Tabbert, Ava Bennett, Hannah Hayes, Mackinzie Reynolds, Carson Cole, Sydney Taber, Katrina Davis, Mackenzie Brown, Theresa Davis, Anna Schlechte, Taylor Rentfro, Calla Roney, Madison Everett, Kassie Vonderheide, Makenna Taber, Paig Rentfro, Maggie Kelly and their coach Craig Moffett. Congratulations on a superb end to a great season.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to acknowledge the hard work and dedication of the Windsor/Stewartson-Strasburg High School Softball Team in winning the 2018 IHSA Class 1A State Title. I wish the team and their coach all the best in the future.

HONORING THE LIFE OF KARL
WICKSTROM

HON. BRIAN J. MAST

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Florida Sportsman founder Karl Wickstrom, who passed away on June 26, 2018 in Stuart, Florida.

Throughout his life, he was a passionate and inspiring champion for Florida's waterways. For decades, he supported organizations like the Rivers Coalition in the fight for cleaner waters in our community. His strong legacy of environmental activism will live on in the important work that each of the organizations he supported continues to do.

In addition to his lasting legacy in the form of laws protecting Florida's environment, he is also responsible for inspiring an entirely new

generation of champions for clean water. Because of his journalism and activism, his ideas for environmental protection will continue to reverberate through our communities for decades to come.

Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent upon all of us to take up this legacy, continue his fight, protect our estuaries and send the water south. While we continue to mourn the loss of this environmental visionary and pray for his family, let us also use this opportunity to fulfill his vision for a safer, healthier and stronger Florida.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TODD ROKITA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during this vote series. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 287, and YEA on Roll Call No. 288.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, on June 25, I missed Roll Call votes 289 and 290. Had I been present, I would have voted YES on Roll Call 289 regarding the Blue Water Navy Vietnam Veterans Act of 2018 and YES on Roll Call 290 related to H.R. 5783.

IN MEMORY OF WAYNE T.
VENDETTO, SR.

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of one of Connecticut's most dedicated public servants, Mr. Wayne T. Vendetto, Sr. Mr. Vendetto passed away in February, and I would be remiss not to take a moment to reflect on his years of dedication to his hometown. He was a patriot, a first responder, a democrat, a family man, and above all, a community servant.

A native of New London, CT, Wayne graduated from New London High School in 1962. In addition to his career at Sears, Roebuck & Co., he was a Connecticut State Marshal for 40 years.

Wayne honorably defended his country in the Connecticut National Guard and as a reservist. He also protected his neighbors as a volunteer firefighter and foreman at the former F.L. Allen Hook and Ladder Company No. 1 for 10 years, and was president of the New London Firemen's Association. In this capacity Wayne became famous for hosting the association's convention and parades, considered to be the biggest and best in the state.

Wayne was also active in local politics. He served on the New London Board of Education for 10 years and eventually became a

city councilor, deputy mayor, and then mayor. All his life he remained active in the Democratic party and was respected by both republicans and democrats.

Unsurprisingly, Wayne was a family man, affectionately known by his relatives as "Poppy." He was a father to Dana and Wayne, grandfather to Alexandra, Cole, Wayne, Atilia, and Connor, and great-grandfather to Gianni. Being one of six children himself, he left this earth as the proud great uncle to 59 nieces and nephews. Coming from such a big family, it was only natural that Wayne treated all of New London as his extended family, which was made evident through his extensive community service. He volunteered at the New London Senior Center, Catholic Charities, the American Cancer Society, the Hospice Fundraising Board, and the Make-A-Wish Foundation, just to name a few. Wayne was also a member of the New London Lodge of Elks and the New London Police Community Relations Committee.

Wayne Vendetto was a man who was constantly giving back. In this day and age, we'd be hard-pressed to find a public servant more involved or dedicated than him. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to please join me in recognition of this selfless servant. I know his loss will be felt deeply throughout the New London community for years to come.

HONORING MR. STEPHEN E. BOYD

HON. MARTHA ROBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my former Chief of Staff Mr. Stephen E. Boyd, for his years of service to the State of Alabama and Alabama's Second District.

Stephen grew up in Birmingham, Alabama, and graduated from the University of Alabama. Upon completion of his undergraduate degree, Stephen continued his education at the University of Alabama School of Law.

Prior to joining my staff in 2011, Stephen served for more than six years on the staff of former United States Senator Jeff Sessions as a senior advisor and Communications Director. Stephen also served as Communications Director for the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. After leaving my office, Stephen served as the Chief of Staff of the Office of Legal Policy at the United States Department of Justice.

Stephen is currently serves as the Assistant U.S. Attorney General for Legislative Affairs under Attorney General Jeff Sessions. There is no one better suited to serve our country in this key role than Stephen Boyd. I know that he will continue to have great success in this role as the head of the Department of Justice's Office of Legislative Affairs.

During his time on Team Roby, Stephen proved himself to be a gracious leader time and time again. He possesses a keen intellect, conducts himself with the utmost professionalism and decorum, and demonstrates remarkable work ethic. I am thankful for Stephen's time on my staff, and I am grateful to call him and his wife Brecke dear friends.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to join Stephen's colleagues, family, and friends in honoring his successful career in Congress. I con-

gratulate Stephen, and wish him all the best as he continues to serve our country.

TRIBUTE TO THE EXTRAORDINARY CONTRIBUTIONS OF SUE ANNE GILROY ON THE OCCASION OF HER RETIREMENT FROM ST. VINCENT FOUNDATION

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my dear friend, beloved and iconic member of the Hoosier community, Sue Anne Gilroy, on the occasion of her retirement from the St. Vincent Foundation. For the past twelve years Sue Anne served as Vice President and Executive Director, devoting a large portion of her life to facilitating and providing financial resources for sick patients unable to afford the care they desperately need. The people of Indiana's Fifth Congressional District are forever grateful for Sue Anne's commitment to her community, passion for public service, and years of inspired leadership with the St. Vincent Foundation and beyond.

A lifelong Hoosier, Sue Anne was born in Crawfordsville, Indiana. She attended DePauw University where she graduated cum laude and earned a Bachelor's Degree in speech and secondary education. From an early age, Sue Anne displayed a strong interest in public service. During her senior year at DePauw University, she accepted an internship in the office of Crawfordsville Mayor Bill Hays, Jr. This opportunity led to an introduction with then Mayor of Indianapolis Richard Lugar, where she became Assistant to the Mayor. Credited as her "big break", Sue Anne attributes this experience to the start of her career in public service. It was at the Mayor's Office where Sue Anne met the love of her life, Dick Gilroy, her husband of 42 years. Eager to learn even more about the public sector, she left the Mayor's Office to pursue her Master's degree in Public Administration at Indiana University-Purdue University in Indianapolis. After earning her Master's degree, she continued her career as State Director for Senator Richard Lugar from 1990 to 1993 and as Chair for Mayor Stephen Goldsmith's transition team in 1991.

An inspiration to her community, Sue Anne began to redefine the role of women in public service. She became the first female director under Mayor Lugar's UniGov by serving as the Director of the Indianapolis Department of Parks and Recreation. She broke yet another barrier becoming Indiana's first female Secretary of State in 1994. During her eight years in office, Sue Anne focused on election, corporate, and securities reform throughout the state of Indiana. Although unsuccessful, she ran a competitive race for Mayor of the City of Indianapolis in 1999. After finishing her second term as Indiana Secretary of State, Sue Anne became Director of Advancement at the University High School in Carmel, Indiana, where she was responsible for building community relationships, developing financial resources, providing strategic planning leadership, and serving as a student mentor for the newly established institution.

Inspired by her late daughter Emily, who passed away from childhood cancer at the age of 11 in 1989, Sue Anne became the Vice President of Development and Executive Director of the St. Vincent Foundation. Here she raised funds for underprivileged families in need of medical resources. Under Sue Anne's leadership, the St. Vincent Foundation has raised more than \$70 million to support St. Vincent hospital projects and programs. The foundation's assets increased from \$23 million to over \$100 million.

Sue Anne's life-long commitment to her community goes beyond her career. Using her vast knowledge and expertise, she consulted in fundraising and business administration for the Tabernacle Presbyterian Church in Indianapolis, Indiana. In her free time, she notably served on the board of directors at the University of Indianapolis, Cathedral High School, Indiana Dollars for Scholars, and Highland Country Club. She also served on the advisory board for Salvation Army. A member of the Junior league of Indianapolis, Sue Anne promoted voluntarism, development of women, and improvement of the community through her philanthropic endeavors. Sue Anne was a co-founder of The Richard G. Lugar Excellence in Public Service Series, an organization designed to provide leadership training experience that encourages, mentors, and prepares women leaders at the local, state, and federal levels of government. Governor Mitch Daniels appointed her to serve on the Blue Ribbon Commission on Local Government Reform and Governor Eric Holcomb recently appointed Sue Anne to serve on the State Ethics Commission.

Sue Anne's consistent leadership and commitment to the highest standard of success has not gone unnoticed. The beneficiary of numerous awards and accolades, Sue Anne most notably received the Sagamore of the Wabash, Girls Inc. Touchstone Honoree, IJB Woman of Influence, SPEA Distinguished Alumna, Guardian of Small Business, and Speaking of Woman's Health Honoree, all illuminating her countless achievements throughout her career. She was also the recipient of the Nancy A. Maloley Outstanding Public Servant Award in 2015. This award recognizes a Hoosier Republican woman who demonstrates extraordinary dedication to serving the public good through appointed governmental and political office.

Sue Anne leaves behind a strong legacy of success at the St. Vincent Foundation and has made a remarkable impression on her friends, family, colleagues, and community. Her dedication and service to others was always supported by the enduring love and support of her husband Dick. They were married for over 4 decades before he unexpectedly passed away in 2015. On behalf of Indiana's Fifth Congressional District, I would like to congratulate Sue Anne on her extraordinary career and extend my gratitude for all the wonderful contributions she has made to our Hoosier community. While I know Sue Anne will be missed at the Saint Vincent Foundation, I wish the very best to her and hope that she will have many happy times on the golf course and enjoying more time with her son, Dr. Grant Gilroy, daughter-in law, Andrea Lee, and three grandchildren.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for Roll Call votes 291, 292, 293, 294 and 295 on Tuesday, June 26, 2018. Had I been present, I would have voted Nay on Roll Call votes 291, 292, 294 and 295. I would have voted Yea on Roll Call vote 293.

BORDER SECURITY AND IMMIGRATION REFORM ACT OF 2018

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2018

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition of H.R. 6136, the "Border Security and Immigration Reform Act of 2018."

This so-called compromise is anything but a compromise. There was not even a markup in the Judiciary Committee; only secret meetings with Administration officials known to author the worst immigration policy this nation has witnessed.

Perhaps H.R. 6136 was an attempt at compromising amongst the various factions that currently divide the majority and prevent Congress from accomplishing meaningful immigration reform.

But this "compromise" is a sham. H.R. 6136:

- fails to cover Dreamers;
- fails to provide a certain path to citizenship;
- claims to "end" Trump's family separation policy by requiring long-term detention;
- revokes critical protections for detained children and families;
- makes deep cuts to legal family immigration;
- revokes the approvals of over 3 million family members who have been waiting for years to legally reunify with U.S. citizens;
- eliminates important asylum protections;
- ends the Diversity Visa program,
- makes immigrant communities less safe by forcing cooperation with immigration detainers.

At every step, this bill attacks family unity, immigrant communities, and common decency.

The United States of America is and will always be the land of opportunity, refuge, and safe haven for all.

The current Administration's policies of closing our doors and borders, by forcibly tearing apart families and eliminating lawful means of entering the United States, are simply inhumane.

H.R. 6136 would act as an overall deterrent to immigrants and people around the world finding refuge and opportunity here in the United States.

The bill would prevent many asylum seekers from even applying for asylum, and would eliminate the Diversity Visa Program, which has traditionally sent a diverse pool of educated immigrants who have contributed to America's success.

Moreover, the bill would needlessly attack sanctuary cities and immigrant communities,

and would invest billions of dollars in President Trump's unnecessary border wall and military technology along the border.

Overall, the bill would simply dismantle families, detain innocent immigrants and children for prolonged, indefinite amounts of time, and closes our border and walls to people around the world who are ready to contribute to the American dream.

This is not what America is or has ever been. Our diverse nation was built by immigrants coming here to build for themselves and their families, along with other communities.

By adopting this bill, America would be acting inconsistent with its core values, and contrary to its reputation as the world's most generous and welcoming nation.

And for those reasons, I urge my colleagues to stand in opposition to H.R. 6136, the "Border Security and Immigration Reform Act of 2018."

COMMEMORATING THE FIFTIETH SEASON OF THE KANSAS CITY ROYALS AND THE HISTORY OF BASEBALL IN KANSAS CITY

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 50th season of the Kansas City Royals baseball team and the dedication of their fans. Fifty years ago, the Athletics were officially transferred to Oakland California, leaving Kansas City without a Major League Baseball team. With a legacy and tradition of the All-American pastime serving as one of the foundational elements of Kansas City, it was essential that they worked quickly to fill this void with a new team. Although the Major League Baseball owners had approved an expansion club for the city, there was a potential for delay. It was the quick action of then-Senator Stuart Symington that threatened Congressional action that would usher in the next generation of KC baseball—The Royals.

As many of you are aware, Kansas City has a rich history of contributions to America's favorite pastime. Starting as early as 1884, the Kansas City Cowboys threw the first pitch as the first professional baseball team to represent the municipality. Although the KC Cowboys only fielded a team for one season, the Kansas City Blues immediately followed as one of the original eight founding members of the American Association, a minor league baseball association. This initial Kansas City team influenced many "greats" through the league until 1954. Yielding notable alumni players and managers, one of unique merit being Mickey Mantle.

Concurrently, in 1920 the Kansas City Monarchs, one of the initial teams that formed the Negro National League, launched its first team. As men came home from World War I, entrepreneur and former pitcher, J.L. Wilkinson, brought together a team of multi-racial players that eventually became known as the KC Monarchs. Claiming 12 league titles and two Negro World Series titles, the Monarchs would commonly lead the league as a major contender. Stars from these Monarch teams included baseball legends and Hall of

Famers like Satchel Paige, Jackie Robinson, Ernie Banks, Willard Brown, and Buck O'Neil.

The Kansas City Blues and Monarchs lead Kansas City in its original baseball fandom, eventually resulting in the establishment of the city's first stadium in 1923. Known initially as Muehlebach Field, the stadium is rooted adjacent to the Historic 18th and Vine Jazz District. This stadium would change hands several times; however, in the early 1950's, a wealthy real estate developer purchased the stadium, as well as the Philadelphia Athletics, with the goal of bringing a major league team back to Kansas City. Eventually, it was sold to Kansas City, Missouri. Encouraged by fans to step up to the plate and expand the venue to hold some 30,000 fans each game, the city agreed to bring the newly named Kansas City Athletics to Municipal Stadium.

After only 90 days of reconstruction, the new stadium would be debuted to a sold-out crowd. Independence native and former President of the United States, Harry S. Truman threw out the first pitch in 1955. Kansas City would be victorious on that day, defeating the Detroit Tigers in an 8-2 bout. Following their victorious debut, the Athletics would continue to draw enormous crowds, making Kansas City baseball attendance third behind only the illustrious Yankees and Milwaukee Braves. Ultimately, the Kansas City Athletics would go through many changes, leading fans on a topsy-turvy ride with various owners, uniforms, mascots, team colors, and even names of the team. Inevitably, the owner at the time, Charles "Charlie" O. Finley, decided to move the team in 1967.

Although the Athletics left in 1968, Kansas City baseball fans didn't give up on the sport, as voters approved a bond issue to construct a new baseball stadium. With the roar and threat of Missouri's U.S. Senator Stuart Symington, Major League Baseball was forced to ensure that a team would be in Kansas City no later than 1969. Local entrepreneur Ewing Kauffman won the contentious bid as the new team's owner and joined a local committee to crown the team as the Kansas City Royals, in recognition of the region's historic livestock economy and thriving American Royal livestock show that has a legacy dating back to the late 19th century. Although Kansas City's hometown team would not only be based on a hometown history, the design of the team's logo would be furthermore iconized by an artist, Shannon Manning, from another Kansas City original: Hallmark Cards.

The Kansas City Royals were fated for greatness as the new team took the field in their new stadium. With the 1969 Rookie of the Year Lou Piniella on the Royal's side, the Minnesota Twins were destined for defeat. In a 4-3 win after 12 innings, the Royals truly earned their crown that night. Furthermore, the team would go on to field some of Major League Baseball's premier players including: five-time allstar and three-time golden glove winner Amos Otis, Hispanic Heritage Baseball Museum's Hall of Famer and five-time all-star Octavio Victor "Cookie" Rojas, twotime all-star Steven Lee "Buzz" Busby, legendary manager Dorrel Norman Elvert "Whitey" Herzog, and many more.

In 1980, famed Royal slugger George Brett led the Royals to their first American League Pennant. Finally defeating the Yankees, the Royals triumphed over a bitter rival that had defeated them three consecutive seasons in

the American League Championship Series for a pennant win. This was the first year the Royals took the field in search for a World Series title. Unfortunately, the Royals would lose the nail-biting seven game series. However, that defeat only prompted Brett to drive the team further. In 1983, Brett hit a two-run homer in the top of the 9th inning to put the Royals in the lead over the Yankees only to be called out on a technicality, prompting Brett to storm the field in raging protest. "The Pine Tar Incident," as it would be known from that point forward, would forever be hailed in baseball history, even inspiring song-writer Lorde to draft a song about Brett's reaction to being tossed out of the game. The Royals were making their mark on baseball history and the fans were cheering them on along the way.

In 1985, during the I-70 Series Showdown against the St. Louis Cardinals, KC's Bret Saberhagen and the all-star team finally brought home the Commissioners Trophy. Royal's stars such as Frank White, Willie Wilson, Dan Quisenberry, and many others mounted a comeback rarely seen in baseball, roaring back from a 3-1 series deficit. The Royals would have many ups and downs before they would win another pennant or be crowned as World Series champions; however, they continued to energize fans with greats such as: Bo Jackson, Carlos Beltran, Mike Sweeney, and many more. In 2014, the Royals would once again take their shot at the World Series. As fans continued to "believe" in the Royals, their eyes were glued to their screens as our boys in blue raced towards the post-season for the first time in nearly 30 years. In a stunning wild-card clinch, the Royals boasted a crowd-inspiring winning streak, winning eight consecutive games and securing their place as American League Champions. They went on to face the San Francisco Giants in their first World Series appearance since 1985. Sadly, our star-studded team fell in seven games, but continued to remind fans that we would be "forever Royal."

Just as the sun sets, it is sure to rise the next morning. Therefore, as the next season began, the Royals—lead by all-star and fan favorites like Eric Hosmer, Mike Moustakas, Salvador "Salvy" Perez, Alex Gordon, and Lorenzo Cain—would yet again drive us towards another pennant win. With an even more focused effort, the Royals would head into the All-Star break, with the best record in the American league. Based primarily on the momentum from fans and experience from the previous season, the Royals won another American League Pennant and were heading back to the World Series to face the New York Mets. This time, the Royals secured their crown in only five games, solidifying their victory with a Game 5 rally to tie in the 9th inning and a five-run smattering in the 12th inning. This year, the Royals returned home with their second Commissioner's Trophy.

Like many cities across the country, the Royals dawned their crown and headed toward main street for their victory day parade. Like every other parade, they were welcomed by firetrucks, marching bands, trolleys, and floats. However, as the parade route came to close at the crossroads of the Historic Union Station and the National World I Museum and Memorial, our boys in blue were welcomed by nearly 800,000 cheering fans celebrating a city-wide victory and uniting people across all spectrums. On this day, I believe, every base-

ball fan across the country was cheering for the Royals.

Mr. Speaker, please join with me as we commemorate the 50th Anniversary season of the Kansas City Royals. The historic contributions of Kansas City's commitment to baseball will live on through our legacy and as we continue to inspire the next generation baseball fans.

ENDANGERED SALMON AND FISHERIES PREDATION PREVENTION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SUZANNE BONAMICI

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 2018

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2083) to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to reduce predation on endangered Columbia River salmon and other non-listed species, and for other purposes:

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 2083, the Endangered Salmon and Fisheries Predation Prevention Act. This bill will help reduce sea lion predation on threatened and endangered fish populations.

Salmon and steelhead are an important part of our heritage in the Pacific Northwest, and they are facing devastating threats. At present thirteen salmon and steelhead populations in the Columbia River, Willamette River, and Snake River systems are listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act. Because of successful conservation efforts under the protection of the Marine Mammal Protection Act, California sea lions have fully rebounded and have reached carrying capacity. Many of the thriving species are moving up the Columbia River for easy access to migrating salmon and steelhead. According to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, between 2002 and 2015 California sea lions consumed an estimated 46,000 salmonids within a quarter mile of the Bonneville Dam. It is unlikely that we will see the necessary recovery of threatened and endangered fish populations without responding to the ongoing predation by sea lions in the region.

Oregon's economic vitality relies on the health of the Pacific Ocean and the Columbia River. The natural resources in our region support a significant portion of our economy, and we are very vulnerable to changes to our ecosystem. Healthy salmon and steelhead runs support the commercial and recreational fishing industry, guiding and outdoor retail businesses, restaurants, and coastal communities that benefit from tourism. In addition to the troubling effects on the region's ecosystem, sea lion predation is harmful to tribal fisheries. Tribes have fishing rights and a deep cultural and historical connection to the fish populations threatened by sea lions. The health of native fish runs is dependent on Congressional action to protect these threatened species from sea lion predation.

This bill will allow for more efficient intervention by allowing states and tribes to apply for permits to remove sea lions along the Columbia River and its tributaries. I am pleased to

see changes to this bill in its amended form, including the removal of language that would undermine the National Environmental Policy Act. The revised language is the result of negotiations with a coalition of local stakeholders, tribes, and agencies in Oregon and Washington State. I appreciate the Ranking Member's concerns that this bill only addresses one of the many threats facing our salmon and steelhead populations, but it is an important step toward mitigating the damage to the fish population. We must continue to address the threat of sea lion predation and avoid further loss of irreplaceable species of salmon and steelhead in our region. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 295.

IN RECOGNITION OF CHANCELLOR DAVID O. BELCHER

HON. MARK MEADOWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life and memory of Dr. David O. Belcher, Chancellor of Western Carolina University. Dr. Belcher was a light in his community, always encouraging and pouring into the people around him through his passion for higher education, embodiment of service, and Catamount pride.

A native of Barnwell, South Carolina, Dr. David O. Belcher began his career as a faculty member at Missouri State University. Prior to arriving at Western Carolina University, he was Provost and Vice Chancellor for academic affairs at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock. Dr. Belcher began his tenure as Chancellor at Western Carolina University on July 1st, 2011. This date will be etched in WCU's history as a starting point for accelerated growth and positive change for the institution and Western North Carolina. Dr. Belcher crafted a 2020 Vision program to focus on the Western Carolina University's future, along with a development plan that has been essential to tremendous campus growth and transformation.

Dr. Belcher cared for the faculty, staff, and students of WCU, and took an active role of service in Western North Carolina. Dr. Belcher served on the Board of Directors of the North Carolina Arboretum and the Asheville Chamber of Commerce. Dr. Belcher also served on the Board of Trustees of Harris Regional Hospital and Swain County Hospital. Dr. Belcher was an accomplished pianist and brought joy to many with his enthusiasm. His passion, determination, kindness, and ceaseless energy will forever be imprinted on the hearts of those who knew him.

Dr. David O. Belcher will forever be highly regarded, remembered and loved amongst his

colleagues throughout the state of North Carolina, particularly at Western Carolina University. Dr. Belcher's wife, Susan Belcher, the Belcher family, and the community of Western Carolina University are in my prayers during this time. It was a privilege to know Chancellor Belcher and, on behalf of the people of Western North Carolina, I am honored to celebrate his life and recognize his many outstanding achievements.

FAIRNESS IN POLITICAL
ADVERTISING ACT

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reintroduce my bill, the Fairness in Political Advertising Act. It's time to level the playing field for viable candidates to compete against campaigns bankrolled by special interests. My bill would provide this access. It would require television stations to make available 2 hours of free advertising broadcast time during each even-numbered year, to each qualified political candidate in a statewide or national election.

The direction we are headed, only millionaires or corporate interests will have a seat at the representative table. This is unacceptable in our democracy.

Of the money raised in political campaigns, the largest expense for campaigns is advertising. Even today in this internet world, most dollars are still spent on television ads. In the 2014 midterms, \$2.8 billion was spent on political television ads. In 2018, Cook Political Report estimates \$2.4 billion will be spent on local broadcast and another \$850 million for local cable.

The math is clear: to be a viable candidate in America today, you need an incredible amount of capital. Our Fathers would be ashamed of this truth.

We must return to an era of access for all. Mr. Speaker, I urge you to bring the Fairness in Political Advertising Act to the floor for a vote today and work to level the playing field for all candidates who want to participate in our democracy. Access should not require a campaign bankrolled by special interests. I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 22, 2018, I missed votes because I was unavoidably detained due to a death in the family.

Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 287; and YEA on Roll Call No. 288.

HONORING THE LEGACY OF THE
53RD WEATHER RECONNAISSANCE
SQUADRON

HON. CHARLIE CRIST

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Mr. CRIST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the legacy of the 53rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron, the famed "Hurricane Hunters." This group of brave men and women from across the country save countless lives each year by literally "flying into the eye of the storm," to collect data unattainable by other means. In communities across Florida, we have seen firsthand how critical this information is to hurricane preparedness and recovery.

The "Hurricane Hunters" are a component of the 403rd Wing at Keesler Air Force Base in Biloxi, Mississippi. Serving the Eastern Gulf of Mexico, they are the only operational unit in the world, flying weather reconnaissance on a regular basis. Their 20 aircrews consistently fly into tropical storms and hurricanes to fulfill their mission when and where it is most critically needed.

Early and accurate detection is key to providing millions of Americans ample time to prepare and evacuate. The 53rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron is on constant standby, and can be deployed to up to three storms at once—crucial during a busy storm season. The 53rd works closely with the National Hurricane Center and NOAA to collect and relay real-time data from the center of the storm, the backbone of public weather alerts and warnings.

While modern satellites have greatly improved our ability to analyze storms at a distance, the data collected through firsthand observation provides a level of detail that remote analysis cannot match. By providing this information, the 53rd reduces the "cone of uncertainty," projecting the storm's path, by nearly 30 percent. These enhanced projections provide critical lead time to prepare and respond, enhancing the protection of lives and property.

In a typically male-dominated field, the 53rd Squadron also stands out. With six female officers, they serve as role models for little girls everywhere who love science and dream of serving their country.

I am humbled to honor the legacy of our Hurricane Hunters, who put their lives on the line every day to protect Floridians and the American people from tropical storms and hurricanes. I thank them for all that they do, risking their lives in service to the public.

HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY
OF THE ARMY WARRANT
OFFICER CORPS

HON. MARTHA ROBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 100th anniversary of the Army Warrant Officer Corps.

The Army Warrant Officer Corps was established on July 9, 1918, to serve as the technical foundation for the U.S. Army. Today,

Army Warrant Officers serve as technical experts, combat leaders, trainers, or advisers who fall into one of two categories: Aviators or Technicians. Army Warrant Officers serve on active duty, U.S. Army Reserve, and Army National Guard. I am proud that candidates are trained at the Warrant Officer Candidate School (WOCS) administered by the Warrant Officer Career College at Fort Rucker in the Wiregrass region of Alabama's Second Congressional District.

I recently introduced House Resolution 947, legislation to designate July 9th as "Warrant Officer Day." Since the Corps' establishment, Army Warrant Officers have continually demonstrated superb expertise and professionalism in carrying out the objectives of the U.S. Army. This resolution is a small token of appreciation for the service and sacrifices of the brave men and women who have and are currently serving as Army Warrant Officers.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to acknowledge the Army Warrant Officer's centennial anniversary and to celebrate this special occasion with those who serve.

IN RECOGNITION OF COLONEL
JOSEPH M. MURRAY

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Colonel Joseph M. Murray for his service as Commander at Marine Corps Base Quantico. Colonel Murray has served as Commander at Marine Corps Base Quantico since the summer of 2015, during which time he has provided extensive support and leadership for the Quantico community.

Colonel Murray was born and raised in Washington, D.C., graduating from Gonzaga College High School in the District. He has long been dedicated to serving our great Nation, as he was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps following his graduation from Ohio Wesleyan University. Since commissioning, he has held many operational assignments, including tours with 2nd Marine Division Camp Lejeune, North Carolina with 2nd Assault Amphibian Battalion, 1st BN 2nd Marines, and 2nd Light Armored Reconnaissance Battalion. He also served as the Deputy G-3, 2nd Marine Logistics Group, and commanded 2nd Supply Battalion during Operation Iraqi Freedom. Serving as Commander of Marine Corps Base Quantico is the newest adornment to his extensive list of military accomplishments, and I am extremely grateful for Colonel Murray's service to Marine Corps Base Quantico and our great Nation.

I am fortunate to have had the opportunity to work with Colonel Murray on several different occasions on behalf of our men and women in uniform residing in Virginia's First Congressional District. I extend my best wishes to Colonel Joseph M. Murray as his Change of Command approaches and he embarks on his next journey with the Marine Corps. He has proven a phenomenal leader, and I am certain that he will continue to lead with the confidence and commitment he has shown as Commander of Marine Corps Base Quantico as he continues his career as a Marine.

Mr. Speaker, I request you and my colleagues to join me as we congratulate Colonel Joseph M. Murray's service to Marine Corps Base Quantico.

HONORING PAULINE A. ELLISON,
THE 6TH NATIONAL PRESIDENT
OF THE LINKS, INC.

HON. ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Pauline A. Ellison, the sixth National President of the Links, Inc. The Links, Inc. is an international not-for-profit and one of our nation's oldest and largest volunteer service organizations committed to enriching, sustaining, and ensuring the culture and economic survival of African Americans and other persons of African ancestry. This week, the Links, Inc. gather for their 41st National Assembly in Indianapolis, Indiana where they will honor their current and past national presidents.

Pauline A. Ellison was born in Iron Gate, Virginia and graduated from Watson High School in Covington, Virginia. She was valedictorian of her class and matriculated to Howard University on a full scholarship. As a student at Howard University, she majored in Chemistry and graduated with honors. After college, she became the first African American woman to be named as an employee relation's officer at the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). During her tenure at HUD, she served as the Vice President of the Hubert Humphrey Committee on Back-To-School programs and assisted with President Lyndon B. Johnson's Youth Programs where she helped train and educate thousands of young people.

Through her strong interest in the academic development of young people, she founded the Northern Virginia Chapter of Jack and Jill and served on the boards of Burgundy Farm Country Day School and the United Way. Mrs. Ellison attended Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service and was nominated to attend the Federal Executive Institute in Charlottesville, Virginia. Following her time at Georgetown, Mrs. Ellison received her Master's in Public Administration from American University. She spent two years in Germany and served as the vice president of the Hahn Officers Wives' Club, where she developed and implemented programs for American-German orphans and American Girl Scouts.

Pauline A. Ellison was one of several members who chartered the Arlington Chapter of The Links, Inc., on November 19, 1966. She served as vice president and president of the Arlington Chapter and was later appointed as the National Director of Services to Youth. In that role, she compiled and distributed a single publication listing the activities of every chapter in each program facet. During The Links, Inc. National Assembly in 1974, Pauline A. Ellison was elected to serve as the 6th National President.

Under Mrs. Ellison's administration, she implemented a national headquarters with paid staff. It wasn't until the end of her second term, that the headquarters was fully operational. As national president, she continued

her support of national and community service programs by representing The Links, Inc. in other major service organizations such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), the National Urban League, Opportunities Industrialization, Inc., and the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund. One of her biggest accomplishments was the fulfillment of The Links' pledge to contribute half a million dollars to the United Negro College Fund (UNCF). Due to her transformative leadership, Mrs. Ellison was honored by numerous national and civic organizations for her tireless dedication to public service.

Following the completion of her term as National President, she served in several other roles with The Links, Inc., as a member of the Executive Council for four years and the National Personnel Committee for eight years. She also assisted in the organization, staffing, and implementation of personnel policies and procedures for the national headquarters. She continued her service to the County of Arlington, Virginia by serving in numerous leadership roles in local civic organizations. For six years, she served as a delegate and president of the International Service Club Council—an organization of 32 recognized service organizations in Arlington County.

Mrs. Ellison served as community advisor to the Board of Directors of Arlington Hospital and as secretary of the Women's Committee of the Washington Performing Arts Society. Concurrently, she served as community advisor to the Northern Virginia Junior League and assisted the county as a member of the Classification and Pay Committee, responsible for advising the county in a comprehensive study and revision of its total classification and pay system for all employees.

She was the first African American woman to become a member of the Board of Directors of Central Fidelity Banks, Inc., where she served on the public policy committee. While serving on the board, the corporation contributed one million dollars to support education of minority students.

Mr. Speaker, Pauline A. Ellison has never sought public recognition for her hard work and dedication to the community. She has dedicated her life to the advancement, growth, and success of The Links, Inc. and to the County of Arlington, Virginia, in which she still resides. Her efforts and dedication as the 6th National President have elevated the organization to one of prominence and service to the community. She has been supported by her husband, Dr. Oscar Ellison, Jr., her children, Oscar Ellison III, Paula Mitchell, and Karla Ellison. As the Links, Inc. gather in Indianapolis for their 41st National Assembly, I join them in paying tribute and honoring the remarkable service of Pauline A. Ellison.

CONGRATULATIONS VAN D. HIPPI,
JR.

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate former Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army, Van Hipp, on the establishment of the Hipp Center for National

Security and Foreign Policy at Wofford College in Spartanburg, South Carolina.

The Hipp Center provides experiential learning options for students interested in international relations, which includes student opportunities for internships in national security and foreign policy and an upcoming exchange program. Van founded the Hipp Lecture Series on International Affairs and National Security in 2011 which has since hosted many great American lecturers including President Donald Trump, Secretary Ben Carson, and Governor George Pataki.

Speaker Newt Gingrich said of the center, "Van Hipp has spent a lifetime working to defend America and defeat our enemies. This new Center for National Security and Foreign Policy will help a new generation learn the key lessons which shaped Van's life."

Hipp is a former chairman of the South Carolina Republican Party and is now chairman of American Defense International, Inc., in Washington. He serves on the board of directors of the American Conservative Union and on the National Capital Board of the Salvation Army. Van Hipp's enduring generosity will positively impact both students at Wofford College and South Carolinians for years to come.

REFUSE ACT

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Repelling Encroachment by Foreigners into U.S. Elections (REFUSE) Act. As the costs of campaigns rise exponentially, the question remains: how much inappropriate foreign influence has risen as well?

Being a viable candidate in an American election requires an unprecedented amount of capital. Following Citizens United, which threw open the floodgates for billionaires and special interests to spend unlimited secret money on our elections, it's impossible to know exactly how much of that money comes from foreign nationals.

This bill will stop the free flow of foreign money into our elections through dark channels and increase transparency around foreign election influence.

It achieves this through two major reforms. First, the bill will prohibit election spending by foreign-influenced corporations and 501(c)(4) nonprofit organizations at two thresholds of foreign ownership interest/funding: 20 percent for foreign nationals and a more strict 5 percent if those foreign parties are directly connected to foreign governments.

Second, the bill will modernize and tighten reporting requirements of the Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA) and expand the Department of Justice's FARA enforcement authority.

Look no further than the pervasive impact of Russian-sponsored political ads on Facebook to see why we need to maximize transparency. We must close the loopholes within our broken campaign finance system. Until we repeal Citizens United, we need common-sense restraints to ensure foreign interests do not influence American democracy, especially from the shadows.

Mr. Speaker, the REFUSE Act is a sharp tool crafted to combat the influence of money in politics and shine a spotlight in the deepest recesses of our election system. The American people consistently report campaign finance reform as one of their top concerns for Congressional action. It is time for this body to act seriously to illuminate the full reach of foreign and corporate special interests. This is the first step to restore the integrity of our democracy.

HONORING MR. JOEL “JOE” P.
WILLIAMS

HON. MARTHA ROBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my District Director Mr. Joel “Joe” P. Williams, who is leaving my office after more than 20 years of service to Alabama’s Second District.

Joe grew up in Headland, Alabama, and graduated from Auburn University in 1991. Upon completion of his undergraduate degree, Joe attended law school at my alma mater, the Cumberland School of Law at Samford University, and then received a Master’s Degree in Public Administration from the University of Alabama at Birmingham in 1997.

Joe has served members of Congress for more than twenty years. Before joining my team as my District Director in 2010, Joe served on the staff of former Congressman Terry Everett for more than ten years. During his time with former Congressman Everett, he was the chief local contact with elected officials and community groups, and the manager of a range of constituent services in Congressman Everett’s district offices.

As a member of Congress, I know how vital it is to have a team of experienced and talented individuals who are familiar with the issues impacting the people of Alabama and who are dedicated to service. Joe has shown an unparalleled knowledge of Alabama’s Second District, and he has gone above and beyond the call of duty. I am thankful for Joe’s long tenure in my office, and I am proud to call him a dear friend.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to join Joe’s colleagues, family, and friends in honoring his successful career in Congress. I wish him all the best as he transitions to the External Affairs division of the Alabama Community College System and continues to serve the great state of Alabama. I congratulate Joe—his presence on Team Roby will be greatly missed.

HONORING THE CENTENNIAL OF
HILTON VILLAGE IN NEWPORT
NEWS, VIRGINIA

HON. ROBERT C. “BOBBY” SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate a historic neighborhood in the Hampton Roads region of Virginia. Historic Hilton Village in Newport News will

celebrate its centennial on July 7, 2018. To mark the occasion, I would like to take a moment to highlight the history of this neighborhood and recognize its contributions to our community.

Hilton Village sits on 100 acres of forested land between the James River and C&O Railroad in the city of Newport News, Virginia. It was constructed in 1918 to address the severe housing shortage for shipbuilders employed by the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Company. At the time, the United States had just entered World War I and Newport News Shipbuilding had received contracts to build naval ships and thousands of shipbuilders came to the area to assist with the war effort.

Hilton Village stands out in United States history as the first government experiment in urban planning and the first federally funded war-housing project. The President of Newport News Shipbuilding, Homer L. Ferguson, first lobbied Congress for additional housing to support his burgeoning workforce when he traveled to Washington in 1917 to voice his concern with the overcrowding of shipbuilder’s quarters. Shortly after his visit, Congress provided the United States Shipping Board with \$1.2 million to plan and build Hilton Village. Henry Vincent Hubbard, a Harvard graduate and one of the best town planners at the time, served as the village planner. Francis Joannes was the village architect and Francis H. Bulot was the project engineer. They designed the buildings with the most modern methods based on input of shipbuilders’ wives. Hilton Village was designed to offer many local services. The plan even included tracks for a trolley car to allow workers to commute to the Shipyard and to the greater Newport News region where city services and shopping were centered. The first development of Hilton Village consisted of a block of English village style homes owned by Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Company, plots for four churches, a library and a strip of stores. By 1920, Hilton Village had developed into almost 400 homes, a fire-house, a business district, an elementary school which is still open to this day—Hilton Elementary School—and a small park with a beach and pier known as Hilton Pier.

After World War I, the chairman of the board at the shipyard, Henry E. Huntington purchased Hilton Village from the government and operated the community as the Newport News Land Company. Huntington’s Newport News Land Company rented out Hilton homes to community residents and in 1922 sold the properties to private owners. Gradually, Hilton Village became a community for families, business owners, retirees and young adults. In 1969, Hilton Village was listed on the National Register of Historic Places, which deemed it worthy of preservation for its historical significance. Four streets—Hopkins Street, Post Street, Ferguson Avenue and Palen Avenue—are named after former Newport News Shipyard and Drydock Company executives. Two other avenues, Hurley and Piez were named in honor of U.S. Shipping Board and Emergency Fleet Corporation executives involved in the project.

Today Hilton Village boasts 27 unique boutiques, eateries, art galleries and salons and continues to thrive as one of Newport News’ prized cultural centers. In 2009, Hilton Village was designated one of 10 Great Neighbor-

hoods by the American Planning Association, because it is a prime example of timeless neighborhood planning. It was the first out of about 100 federally financed housing projects during World War I, and it remains a national model for communities that are looking to plan and build inclusive, pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the residents of Hilton Village on their centennial celebration and for helping make Newport News a great place to live and raise a family.

HONORING ROBERT HOLMSTROM
OF MAPLEWOOD, MINNESOTA

HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Robert Holmstrom of Maplewood, Minnesota. Earlier this year he, along with 13,000 men and women who formed the ranks of the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) were awarded the Congressional Gold Medal. Their heroic actions during World War II contributed greatly to the success of our nation’s war efforts. So consequential were the missions they carried out that Robert and those with whom he served were sworn to secrecy for 40 years.

The OSS served as the preeminent intelligence and special operations organization over the course of World War II and the precursor to the Central Intelligence Agency. The OSS “organized, trained, supplied, and fought” in both the European and Pacific theaters, playing a decisive role in the Allied victory over Axis forces. The ranks of the OSS were comprised of exceptional citizens as well as members of every branch of the armed services. Their work was often conducted under conditions of extreme danger and in the most intense environments. The tide of the war may very well have turned against the Allies had it not been for the perpetual bravery and success of the men and women of the OSS.

An Army Air Corps-trained pilot, Robert Holmstrom was recruited to fly missions for the OSS. Conducted under Operation CARPETBAGGER, the missions would take him and a crew, in a blacked-out B-24, deep into Nazi occupied France where they dropped weapons, equipment, and OSS agents to assist French resistance fighters prior to the Allied invasion at Normandy on D-Day. Often flying in weather deemed unsafe for regular missions, and only on moonlit nights so as to see the resistance fighters signaling them with flashlights, these airdrops were often flown at very low altitudes. Between January of 1944 and May 1945, the men and women working under Operation CARPETBAGGER, completed 1,860 sorties and delivered 20,495 containers and 11,174 packages of vital supplies to the resistance forces in western and northwestern Europe. Their success and bravery earned them the moniker of “Carpetbaggers”.

Mr. Holmstrom returned to Minnesota where he had a long and successful career in Airline Plant Protection for Northwest Airlines.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Robert Holmstrom and the many others like him, who so admirably served our nation in the Office of Strategic Services during WWII.

In a time of unparalleled challenges, their bravery helped to lead the U.S. and our Allies to victory.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM GRAVES

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on June 26, 2018, I missed several votes, as I was at the White House meeting with President Trump to discuss the way forward on the Appropriations process.

I missed Roll Call Number 291, Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 961. Had I been present, I would have voted yes.

I missed Roll Call Number 292, on agreeing to H. Res. 961. Had I been present, I would have voted yes.

I missed Roll Call Number 293, on passage of H.R. 4294, the Prevention of Private Information Dissemination Act. Had I been present, I would have voted yes.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a constitutional amendment to reverse the impact of the Supreme Court's decision in

Citizens United v. FEC. No other recent decision has more sweepingly impacted our elections than this decision which allowed corporations to spend unlimited amounts of money to support candidates and PACs. Citizens United inflated the influence of corporations, megadonors, and special interests in American elections and in effect drowned out American votes.

Citizens United unleashed corporate campaign spending. But it also created a gaping hole in the barrier that once blocked foreign money in U.S. elections. Before 2010, all federal campaign spending was traceable back to an individual's contribution to a candidate or a PAC.

But because of the combination of Citizens United and FEC v. Wisconsin Right to Life, "social welfare" nonprofits (501(c)(4)) can now make political expenditures just like other super PACs. These 501(c)(4)s are even more attractive money funnels than traditional super PACs. They don't have to publicly disclose their donors.

Almost all major corporations have some foreign ownership. The black hole of corporations' unlimited contributions to PACs and 501(c)(4)s should trouble all freedom lovers. This amendment nullifies the misguided decision in Citizens United and chips away at the influence of special interests in our elections.

It restores the power of the American people to choose representatives who reflect their priorities. Mr. Speaker, I urge you to bring this bill to the floor for swift consideration.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4,

1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, June 28, 2018 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 11

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to examine S. 2154, to approve the Kickapoo Tribe Water Rights Settlement Agreement, and S. 2599, to provide for the transfer of certain Federal land in the State of Minnesota for the benefit of the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe.

SD-628

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4459–S4688

Measures Introduced: Nine bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 3144–3152, and S. Res. 557. **Pages S4512–13**

Measures Reported:

Special Report entitled “Further Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals for Fiscal Year 2019”. (S. Rept. No. 115–287)

S. 2842, to prohibit the marketing of bogus opioid treatment programs or products, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 115–285)

S. 2848, to improve Department of Transportation controlled substances and alcohol testing, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 115–286)

S. 1158, to help prevent acts of genocide and other atrocity crimes, which threaten national and international security, by enhancing United States Government capacities to prevent, mitigate, and respond to such crises, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. 2463, to establish the United States International Development Finance Corporation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Page S4512**

Measures Considered:

Agriculture and Nutrition Act—Agreement: Senate began consideration of H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, after agreeing to the motion to proceed, and taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S4460–92**

Pending:

Roberts Amendment No. 3224, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S4460**

McConnell (for Thune) Amendment No. 3134 (to Amendment No. 3224), to modify conservation reserve program provisions. **Pages S4460–61**

A motion was entered to close further debate on Roberts Amendment No. 3224 (listed above), and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of

the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Friday, June 29, 2018. **Page S4491**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of Roberts Amendment No. 3224. **Pages S4491–92**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, June 28, 2018. **Page S4468**

Messages from the House: **Pages S4505–06**

Measures Referred: **Page S4506**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S4506**

Enrolled Bills Presented: **Page S4506**

Executive Communications: **Pages S4506–12**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S4512**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S4513–15**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S4515–16**

Additional Statements: **Pages S4503–05**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S4517–S4687**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S4687**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S4687**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:09 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, June 28, 2018. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S4688.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2019 for the Department

of State, after receiving testimony from Mike Pompeo, Secretary of State.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 645, to require the Secretary of Commerce to conduct an assessment and analysis of the effects of broadband deployment and adoption on the economy of the United States, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1092, to protect the right of law-abiding citizens to transport knives interstate, notwithstanding a patchwork of local and State prohibitions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1896, to amend section 8331 of title 5, United States Code, and the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to clarify the treatment of availability pay for Federal air marshals and criminal investigators of the Transportation Security Administration, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 2941, to improve the Cooperative Observer Program of the National Weather Service, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3094, to restrict the department in which the Coast Guard is operating from implementing any rule requiring the use of biometric readers for biometric transportation security cards until after submission to Congress of the results of an assessment of the effectiveness of the transportation security card program;

H.R. 4254, to amend the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 to strengthen the aerospace workforce pipeline by the promotion of Robert Noyce Teacher Scholarship Program and National Aeronautics and Space Administration internship and fellowship opportunities to women, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

H.R. 4467, to require the Federal Air Marshal Service to utilize risk-based strategies;

H.R. 4559, to conduct a global aviation security review; and

The nominations of Karen Dunn Kelley, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Secretary of Commerce, Heidi R. King, of California, to be Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, Geoffrey Adam Starks, of Kansas, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission, Peter A. Feldman, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, and a routine list in the Coast Guard.

MEDICAID FRAUD AND OVERPAYMENTS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine

Medicaid fraud and overpayments, focusing on problems and solutions, including actions needed to mitigate billions in improper payments and program integrity risks, after receiving testimony from Gene L. Dodaro, Comptroller General, Government Accountability Office; and Brian P. Ritchie, Assistant Inspector General for Audit Services, Office of Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services.

FAST-41 AND THE FEDERAL PERMITTING IMPROVEMENT STEERING COUNCIL

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine FAST-41 and the Federal Permitting Improvement Steering Council, focusing on progress to date and next steps, including S. 3017, to amend the FAST Act to improve the Federal permitting process, after receiving testimony from former Senator Mary Landrieu; Angela Colamaria, Acting Executive Director, Federal Permitting Improvement Steering Council; Megan K. Terrell, Office of the Governor of Louisiana, Baton Rouge; Alexander Herrgott, Council on Environmental Quality, Joseph Johnson, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Christy Goldfuss, Center for American Progress, and Sean McGarvey, North America's Building Trades Unions, all of Washington, D.C.; and Jolene S. Thompson, American Municipal Power, Inc., Columbus, Ohio.

HEALTH CARE COSTS

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine how to reduce health care costs, focusing on understanding the cost of health care in America, after receiving testimony from Melinda J. B. Buntin, Vanderbilt University School of Medicine, Nashville, Tennessee; Ashish K. Jha, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health Global Health Institute, Cambridge, Massachusetts; and Niall Brennan, Health Care Cost Institute, and David A. Hyman, Georgetown University Law Center, both of Washington, D.C.

RADIATION EXPOSURE COMPENSATION PROGRAM

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the eligibility requirements for the Radiation Exposure Compensation Program to ensure all downwinders receive coverage, including S. 197, to amend the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act to improve compensation for workers involved in uranium mining, after receiving testimony from Senator Udall; Eltona Henderson, Idaho Downwinders, Emmett; Jonathan Nez, Navajo Nation, Window Rock, Arizona; Robert N. Celestial, Pacific Association for Radiation Survivors, Barrigada, Guam; and Tina Cordova, Tularosa Basin

Downwinders Consortium, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

T-MOBILE–SPRINT TRANSACTION

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights concluded a hearing to examine the competitive impact of the T-Mobile–Sprint transaction, after receiving testimony from John Legere, T-Mobile US, Inc., Bellevue, Washington; Marcelo Claure, Sprint Corporation, Overland Park, Kansas; Asha Keddy, Intel Corporation, Beaverton, Oregon; and Gene Kimmelman, Public Knowledge, Roslyn Layton, American Enterprise Institute, and George P. Slover, Consumers Union, all of Washington, D.C.

NOMINATION

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Robert L. Wilkie, of North Carolina, to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Tillis, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 21 public bills, H.R. 6236–6256; 1 private bill, H.R. 6257; and 2 resolutions, H.J. Res. 136 and H. Res. 970, were introduced. **Pages H5814–16**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H5817**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 5905, to authorize basic research programs in the Department of Energy Office of Science for fiscal years 2018 and 2019, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–787);

H.R. 5907, to provide directors of the National Laboratories signature authority for certain agreements, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–788);

H.R. 5346, to amend title 51, United States Code, to provide for licenses and experimental permits for space support vehicles, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–789);

H.R. 5729, to restrict the department in which the Coast Guard is operating from implementing any rule requiring the use of biometric readers for biometric transportation security cards until after submission to Congress of the results of an assessment of the effectiveness of the transportation security card program, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–790, Part 1); and

H. Res. 971, providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 970) insisting that the department of Justice fully comply with the requests, including subpoenas, of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the subpoena issued by the Committee on the Judiciary relating to potential violations of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance

Act by personnel of the Department of Justice and related matters (H. Rept. 115–791). **Page H5814**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Rogers (KY) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H5751**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:52 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Pages H5756–57**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Dr. Jack Trieber, North Valley Baptist Church, Santa Clara, California. **Page H5757**

Border Security and Immigration Reform Act of 2018: The House failed to pass H.R. 6136, to amend the immigration laws and provide for border security, by a recorded vote of 121 ayes to 301 noes, Roll No. 297. Consideration began Thursday, June 21st. **Pages H5766–67**

Rejected the Espallat motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 190 ayes to 230 noes, Roll No. 296. **Page H5766**

H. Res. 953, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6136) was agreed to Thursday, June 21st.

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

American Leadership in Space Technology and Advanced Rocketry Act: H.R. 5345, amended, to designate the Marshall Space Flight Center of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to provide leadership for the U.S. rocket propulsion industrial base; **Pages H5769–70**

Commercial Space Support Vehicle Act: H.R. 5346, to amend title 51, United States Code, to provide for licenses and experimental permits for space support vehicles; **Pages H5770–71**

Department of Energy Science and Innovation Act of 2018: H.R. 5905, amended, to authorize basic research programs in the Department of Energy Office of Science for fiscal years 2018 and 2019; **Pages H5771–79**

Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy Act of 2018: H.R. 5906, amended, to amend the America COMPETES Act to establish Department of Energy policy for Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy; and **Pages H5779–81**

National Innovation Modernization by Laboratory Empowerment Act: H.R. 5907, to provide directors of the National Laboratories signature authority for certain agreements. **Pages H5781–82**

National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019—Motion to go to Conference: The House agreed by unanimous consent to disagree to the Senate amendment and request a conference on H.R. 5515, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, and to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year. **Page H5782**

Rejected the Carbajal motion to instruct conferees by a yea-and-nay vote of 188 yeas to 231 nays, Roll No. 300. **Pages H5783–84**

Agreed to the Thornberry motion to close portions of the conference by a yea-and-nay vote of 403 yeas to 15 nays, Roll No. 301. **Pages H5784–85**

Later, the Chair appointed the following conferees: From the Committee on Armed Services, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Thornberry, Wilson of South Carolina, LoBiondo, Bishop of Utah, Turner, Rogers of Alabama, Shuster, Conaway, Lamborn, Wittman, Coffman, Hartzler, Austin Scott of Georgia, Cook, Byrne, Stefanik, Bacon, Banks of Indiana, Smith of Washington, Davis of California, Langevin, Cooper, Bordallo, Courtney, Tsongas, Garamendi, Speier, Veasey, Gabbard, O'Rourke, and Murphy of Florida. **Page H5788**

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of title XVII of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Latta, Johnson of Ohio, and Pallone. **Pages H5788–89**

From the Committee on Financial Services, for consideration of title XVII of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Rep-

resentatives Hensarling, Barr, and Maxine Waters of California. **Page H5789**

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of title XVII of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Royce of California, Kinzinger, and Engel. **Page H5789**

American Innovation \$1 Coin Act: The House agreed to take from the Speaker's table and concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 770, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of American innovation and significant innovation and pioneering efforts of individuals or groups from each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the United States territories, to promote the importance of innovation in the United States, the District of Columbia, and the United States territories. **Pages H5786–87**

North Korean Human Rights Reauthorization Act: The House agreed to take from the Speaker's table and concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2061, to reauthorize the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004. **Pages H5787–88**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, June 28th. **Page H5788**

Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2019: The House considered H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019. Consideration began yesterday, June 26th. **Pages H5789–H5812**

Agreed to:

Jackson Lee amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 115–785) that states that no funding in this Act shall be used or otherwise made available by this Act to end Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC) programs at HBUCs, Hispanic Serving Institutions and Tribal Colleges and Universities; **Pages H5789–91**

Frankel (FL) amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 115–785) that allocates \$3,000,000 for training on gender perspectives and full-time advisors on Women, Peace and Security at each of the Combatant Commands, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Defense Security Cooperation Agency, and the Joint Staff; \$900,000 for training on the meaningful participation of women through foreign national security forces capacity building programs and for the collection of gender-disaggregated data in that programming; and \$100,000 for training on gender perspectives at the war colleges and research on women's contributions to security at the National Defense University Institute for National Security Studies; **Pages H5791–92**

Rosen amendment (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 115–785) that increases funding for the training and

retention of cybersecurity professionals under the Defense-Wide Operation and Maintenance Account by \$5,000,000; **Pages H5792–93**

Lynch amendment (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 115–785) that reduces funding for the Office of the Secretary of Defense by \$10,000,000 and increases funding for the Defense POW/MIA Accounting Agency by \$10,000,000; **Page H5793**

Kuster (NH) amendment (No. 6 printed in H. Rept. 115–785) that provides \$1 million to the Defense Advisory Committee on Investigations, Prosecution, and Defense of Sexual Assault in the Armed Forces (DAC–IPAD) for additional staff to conduct a first-ever review of collateral misconduct and disciplinary actions brought against survivors of sexual assault; **Pages H5793–94**

Hudson amendment (No. 9 printed in H. Rept. 115–785) that increases Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide funds by \$5 million to provide for additional training of Special Operations Forces; **Page H5796**

Welch amendment (No. 10 printed in H. Rept. 115–785) that increases funding for the Defense Health programs by \$1 million and decreases the Operations and Maintenance account, Defense-Wide, by \$1.3 million to improve coordination between DoD and the VA as both agencies study the effects of toxic exposure to burn pits; **Pages H5796–97**

Nolan amendment (No. 11 printed in H. Rept. 115–785) that provides an additional \$6 million for the Department of Defense's Lung Cancer Research Program and decreases the Operations and Maintenance, Defense-wide account by the same amount; **Page H5797**

Gabbard amendment (No. 12 printed in H. Rept. 115–785) that increases open air burn pits research funding by \$1 million; **Pages H5797–98**

Delaney amendment (No. 13 printed in H. Rept. 115–785) that provides for an additional \$5 million for the Fisher House Foundation which is offset by an outlay neutral reduction in the Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide account; **Pages H5798–99**

Jackson Lee amendment (No. 14 printed in H. Rept. 115–785) that reduces funding for Procurement, Defense-Wide, by \$10 million and increases funding for Defense Health Programs by \$10 million in order to address Triple Negative Breast Cancer research; **Pages H5799–H5800**

Crawford amendment (No. 16 printed in H. Rept. 115–785) that reduces Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide by \$1,000,000 and increases it by the same to be used for explosive ordinance disposal equipment upgrades and technology enhancements; **Pages H5801–02**

Langevin amendment (No. 21 printed in H. Rept. 115–785) that removes \$10 million from Next Gen-

eration Air Dominance (0207110F), and provides \$10 million to be used for the DOD Cyber Scholarship Program within the Information Systems Security Program (0303140D8Z); **Page H5802**

Esty amendment (No. 22 printed in H. Rept. 115–785) that increases funding for the Sexual Assault Special Victims' Counsel Program by \$2 million for sexual assault prevention and response programs; **Page H5803**

Gallego amendment (No. 25 printed in H. Rept. 115–785) that prohibits the use of funds in this bill to procure any good or service or enter into any contract with the Chinese companies ZTE and Huawei; **Page H5805**

Wittman amendment (No. 26 printed in H. Rept. 115–785) that strips the limiting language of "CVN–80" from the text which would allow funding for both CVN–80 and CVN–81 and thereby enable dual-buy; and **Pages H5805–06**

Murphy (FL) amendment (No. 27 printed in H. Rept. 115–785) that increases funding for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense; National Guard counter-drug program by \$3.0 million, and reduces funding for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide by \$3.2 million. **Pages H5806–07**

Rejected:

Langevin amendment (No. 9 printed in Part A of H. Rept. 115–783) that was debated on June 26th that sought to provide \$10 million for Weapons and Munitions Technology (0602624A), \$10 million for Innovative Naval Prototypes (INP) Applied Research (0602792N), and \$20 million for Innovative Naval Prototypes Advanced Technology Development (0603801N) to be used for accelerated development and prototyping for the electromagnetic railgun (by a recorded vote of 188 ayes to 228 noes, Roll No. 302); and **Pages H5785–86**

Poe (TX) amendment (No. 20 printed in Part A of H. Rept. 115–783) that was debated on June 26th that sought to reduce the amount of Coalition Support Fund reimbursements Pakistan is eligible to receive by \$200 million (by a recorded vote of 175 ayes to 241 noes, Roll No. 303). **Page H5786**

Withdrawn:

Langevin amendment (No. 18 printed in H. Rept. 115–785) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have removed \$50 million from the Strategic Capabilities Office (0604250D8Z), and provides \$50 million to be used for directed energy solutions for boost phase missile defense, specifically the DPAL program with Technology Maturation Initiatives (0604115C). **Page H5802**

Proceedings Postponed:

Gallagher amendment (No. 7 printed in H. Rept. 115–785) that seeks to increase funding for Navy AIM–120D missile procurement by \$23.8M to help

meet Indo-PACOM required critical capabilities and match the House-passed authorization in the FY 2019 NDAA, while reducing defense-wide operation and maintenance by the same amount;

Pages H5794–95

Gallagher amendment (No. 8 printed in H. Rept. 115–785) that seeks to increase funding for Air Force AIM–120D missile procurement by \$33M to help meet Indo-PACOM required critical capabilities and match the House-passed authorization in the FY 2019 NDAA, while reducing defense-wide operation and maintenance by the same amount;

Pages H5795–96

Clark (MA) amendment (No. 15 printed in H. Rept. 115–785) that seeks to reduce and then increase the defense-wide research, development, test and evaluation account by \$14.364 million with the intent of supporting DOD innovation;

Pages H5800–01

Foster amendment (No. 24 printed in H. Rept. 115–785) that seeks to prohibit the use of funds to develop a space-based ballistic missile intercept layer; and

Pages H5803–05

Courtney amendment (No. 29 printed in H. Rept. 115–785) that seeks to provide funding for long lead time materials to construct additional Virginia-class submarines in FY 2022 and FY 2023.

Pages H5807–12

H. Res. 961, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 6157) and (H.R. 2083) was agreed to yesterday, June 26th.

H. Res. 964, the rule providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6157) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 230 ayes to 185 noes, Roll No. 299, after the previous question was ordered by a recorded vote of 231 ayes to 188 noes, Roll No. 298.

Pages H5767–68

Senate Referral: S. 2385 was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Homeland Security.

Page H5812

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today and appears on page H5768.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and six recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H5766, H5767, H5767–68, H5768, H5783–84, H5784–85, H5785–86, and H5786. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:08 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a markup on legislation on the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act of 2018; H.R. 959, the “Title VIII Nursing Workforce Reauthorization Act of 2017”; H.R. 1676, the “Palliative Care and Hospice Education and Training Act”; H.R. 3728, the “Educating Medical Professionals and Optimizing Workforce Efficiency Readiness Act of 2017”; and H.R. 5385, the “Children’s Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act of 2018”. H.R. 959 was forwarded to the full Committee, without amendment. H.R. 1676, H.R. 3728, H.R. 5385, and legislation on the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act of 2018 were ordered to the full Committee, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment held a markup on H.R. 2278, the “Responsible Disposal Reauthorization Act of 2017”; and H.R. 2389, to reauthorize the West Valley demonstration project, and for other purposes. H.R. 2278 and H.R. 2389 were forwarded to the full Committee, as amended.

OVERSIGHT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Oversight of the Department of Housing and Urban Development”. Testimony was heard from Ben Carson, Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

CRISIS IN THE REPUBLIC OF THE CAMEROON

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations held a hearing entitled “Crisis in the Republic of the Cameroon”. Testimony was heard from Donald Y. Yamamoto, Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of African Affairs, Department of State; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 5859, the “Education and Energy Act of 2018”; H.R. 6087, the “Removing Barriers to Energy Independence Act”; H.R. 6088, the “SPEED Act”; and H.R. 6107, the “Ending Duplicative Permitting Act”. H.R. 5859, H.R. 6087, H.R. 6088, and H.R. 6107 were ordered reported, as amended.

EXAMINING THE ADMINISTRATION'S GOVERNMENT-WIDE REORGANIZATION PLAN

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Examining the Administration’s Government-wide Reorganization Plan”. Testimony was heard from Margaret Weichert, Deputy Director for Management, Office of Management and Budget.

INSISTING THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE FULLY COMPLY WITH THE REQUESTS, INCLUDING SUBPOENAS, OF THE PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE AND THE SUBPOENA ISSUED BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY RELATING TO POTENTIAL VIOLATIONS OF THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT BY PERSONNEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE AND RELATED MATTERS

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H. Res. 970, insisting that the Department of Justice fully comply with the requests, including subpoenas, of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the subpoena issued by the Committee on the Judiciary relating to potential violations of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act by personnel of the Department of Justice and related matters. The Committee granted, by record vote of 8–4, a rule providing for the consideration of H. Res. 970 under a closed rule. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the resolution. The rule provides that the resolution shall be considered as read and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. Testimony was heard from Representatives Jordan, Nadler, Meadows, and Perry.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 6227, the “National Quantum Initiative Act”; H.R. 6229, the “National Institute of Standards and Technology Reauthorization Act of 2018”; and H.R. 6226, the “American Space SAFE Management Act”. H.R. 6226, H.R. 6227, and H.R. 6229 were ordered reported, as amended.

BOLSTERING DATA PRIVACY AND MOBILE SECURITY: AN ASSESSMENT OF IMSI CATCHER THREATS

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Oversight held a hearing entitled

“Bolstering Data Privacy and Mobile Security: An Assessment of IMSI Catcher Threats”. Testimony was heard from Charles H. Romine, Director, Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce; and public witnesses.

ZTE: A THREAT TO AMERICA'S SMALL BUSINESSES

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “ZTE: A Threat to America’s Small Businesses”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Full Committee held a markup on General Services Administration Capital Investment and Leasing Program Resolutions; H.R. 66, the “Route 66 Centennial Commission Act”; H.R. 6194, the “REAL Reform Act of 2018”; H.R. 5846, the “Promoting Flood Risk Mitigation Act”; H.R. 5772, to designate the J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and Courthouse in Amarillo, Texas, as the “J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and Mary Lou Robinson United States Courthouse”; H.R. 3460, to designate the United States courthouse located at 323 East Chapel Hill Street in Durham, North Carolina, as the “John Hervey Wheeler United States Courthouse”; H.R. 6175, the “Maritime Safety Act of 2018”; H.R. 6206, the “Coast Guard Blue Technology Center of Expertise Act”; S. 756, the “Save Our Seas Act of 2017”; and H.R. 3906, the “Innovative Stormwater Infrastructure Act of 2017”. General Services Administration Capital Investment and Leasing Program Resolutions were approved. H.R. 5772, H.R. 6175, and H.R. 6206 were ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 66, H.R. 6194, H.R. 5846, H.R. 3460, S. 756, and H.R. 3906 were ordered reported, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Health held a markup on H.R. 2787, the “VET MD Act”; H.R. 3696, the “Wounded Warrior Workforce Enhancement Act”; H.R. 5521, the “VA Hiring Enhancement Act”; H.R. 5693, the “Long Term Care Veterans Choice Act”; H.R. 5938, the “Veterans Serving Veterans Act of 2018”; H.R. 6066, to improve the productivity of the management of Department of Veterans Affairs health care; H.R. 5864, the “VA Hospitals Establishing Leadership Performance Act”; and H.R. 5974, the “VA COST SAVINGS Enhancement Act”. H.R. 2787, H.R. 3696, H.R. 5693, H.R. 5938, H.R. 6066, H.R. 5974 were forwarded to the full Committee, as amended. H.R.

5864 was forwarded to the full Committee, without amendment.

Joint Meetings

U.S. LEADERSHIP ON DIGITAL TRADE

Joint Economic Committee: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the need for United States leadership on digital trade, after receiving testimony from Rachel F. Fefer, Analyst in International Trade and Finance, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; and Sean Heather, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Ryan Radia, Competitive Enterprise Institute, and Robert W. Holleyman, Crowell and Moring LLP, all of Washington, D.C.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 28, 2018

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: business meeting to markup an original bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and an original bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, 10:30 a.m., SD-106.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine legislative proposals to examine corporate governance, 10 a.m., SD-538.

Committee on Finance: business meeting to consider the nominations of Jeffrey Kessler, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Lynn A. Johnson, of Colorado, to be Assistant Secretary for Family Support, Department of Health and Human Services, and Elizabeth Ann Copeland, of Texas, and Patrick J. Urda, of Indiana, both to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court, Time to be announced, SD-215.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Charles P. Rettig, of California, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Department of the Treasury, 9:30 a.m., SD-215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Donald Lu, of California, to be Ambassador to the Kyrgyz Republic, Randy W. Berry, of Colorado, to be Ambassador to the Federal Democratic Republic of Nepal, and Alaina B. Teplitz, of Colorado, to be Ambassador to the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Maldives, all of the Department of State, 10:30 a.m., SD-419.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 2245, to include New Zealand in the list of foreign states whose nationals are eligible for admission into the United States as E-1 and E-2 nonimmigrants if United

States nationals are treated similarly by the Government of New Zealand, S. 2823, to modernize copyright law, S. 2946, to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify the meaning of the terms “act of war” and “blocked asset”, and the nominations of Britt Cagle Grant, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit, David James Porter, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, Holly A. Brady, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana, Andrew Lynn Brasher, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Alabama, James Patrick Hanlon, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Indiana, David Steven Morales, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, Lance E. Walker, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maine, and John D. Jordan, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Missouri, Nick Willard, to be United States Marshal for the District of New Hampshire, and Mark F. Sloke, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Alabama, all of the Department of Justice, 10 a.m., SD-226.

House

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Readiness, hearing entitled “Army and Marine Corps Depot Policy Issues and Infrastructure Concerns”, 8:30 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, markup on H. Res. 256, expressing support for the countries of Eastern Europe and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; H. Res. 944, expressing solidarity with and sympathy for the people of Guatemala after the June 3, 2018, eruption of the Fuego Volcano; H.R. 1697, the “Israel Anti-Boycott Act”; H.R. 4969, the “Improving Embassy Design and Security Act of 2018”; H.R. 5576, the “Cyber Deterrence and Response Act of 2018”; H.R. 5898, the “UNRWA Accountability Act of 2018”; H.R. 6197, the “Rescuing Animals With Rewards Act of 2018”; H.R. 6207, the “Democratic Republic of the Congo Democracy and Accountability Act of 2018”; and H. Con. Res. 20, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the execution-style murders of United States citizens Ylli, Agron, and Mehmet Bytyqi in the Republic of Serbia in July 1999, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn. 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Oversight of FBI and DOJ Actions Surrounding the 2016 Election”, 9:30 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, markup of legislation on the Matthew Young Pollard Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019; and to Call to the Attention of the House, pursuant to Committee Rule 14(i), the Classified Annex accompanying the Matthew Young Pollard Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019, 9 a.m., HVC-304. This meeting will be closed.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, June 28

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, June 28

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of H.R. 2, Agriculture and Nutrition Act.

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Complete consideration of H.R. 6157—Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2019. Consideration of H. Res. 970—Insisting that the Department of Justice fully comply with the requests, including subpoenas, of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the subpoena issued by the Committee on the Judiciary relating to potential violations of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act by personnel of the Department of Justice and related matters.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Babin, Brian, Tex., E927
Bonamici, Suzanne, Ore., E934
Brooks, Susan W., Ind., E932
Byrne, Bradley, Ala., E930
Cleaver, Emanuel, Mo., E933
Collins, Doug, Ga., E935
Courtney, Joe, Conn., E931
Crist, Charlie, Fla., E935
Graves, Tom, Ga., E938
Gutiérrez, Luis V., Ill., E933
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E933

Johnson, Sam, Tex., E931
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E935, E936, E938
Lowey, Nita M., N.Y., E929
Mast, Brian J., Fla., E931
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E937
Meadows, Mark, N.C., E934
Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E931, E934
Nadler, Jerrold, N.Y., E928
Norcross, Donald, N.J., E927
Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E928
Roby, Martha, Ala., E932, E935, E937
Rokita, Todd, Ind., E931
Ros-Lehtinen, Ileana, Fla., E931

Rosen, Jacky, Nev., E929
Sablan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho, Northern Mariana Islands, E928, E929
Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E927
Scott, Robert C. "Bobby", Va., E936, E937
Shimkus, John, Ill., E931
Speier, Jackie, Calif., E928, E930
Taylor, Scott, Va., E930
Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E927
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E936
Wittman, Robert J., Va., E935
Yoder, Kevin, Kans., E929



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.