



HOUSE COMMITTEE ON
NATURAL RESOURCES
CHAIRMAN BRUCE WESTERMAN

To: House Committee on Natural Resources Republican Members
From: House Committee on Natural Resources Republican Staff
Date: Wednesday, November 19, 2025
Subject: Markup of 8 Bills

The House Committee on Natural Resources will hold a markup on **Thursday, November 20, 2025, at 10:00 a.m., in room 1324 Longworth House Office Building**. The bills to be considered include: H.R. 573 (Rep. Yakym); H.R. 681 (Rep. Keating); H.R. 3903 (Rep. Begich); H.R. 4386 (Rep. Walberg); H.R. 4467 (Rep. Thompson of MS); H.R. 4503 (Rep. Johnson of SD); H.R. 4776 (Rep. Westerman); and H.R. 5131 (Rep. Begich).

Member offices are requested to notify Madeline Kelley (Madeline.Kelley@mail.house.gov) by 4:30 p.m. on Wednesday, November 19, 2025, to confirm their Member's attendance at the markup.

I. KEY MESSAGES & TOPLINE ACTIONS

- Bills expected to move by regular order: H.R. 4776 (Rep. Westerman), "*Standardizing Permitting and Expediting Economic Development Act*" or "*SPEED Act*"
- Please note that H.R. 4776 will have an amendment in the nature of a substitute (ANS). Members should ensure that amendments are drafted to the ANS.
- Bills expected to move by unanimous consent: H.R. 573 (Rep. Yakym), "*Studying NEPA's Impact on Projects Act*"; H.R. 681 (Rep. Keating), To amend the Act of August 9, 1955 (commonly known as the "Long-Term Leasing Act"), to authorize leases of up to 99 years for land held in trust for the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe and the Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head (Aquinnah), and for other purposes.; H.R. 3903 (Rep. Begich), "*Chugach Alaska Land Exchange Oil Spill Recovery Act of 2025*"; H.R. 4386 (Rep. Walberg), To amend the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act to clarify entrance privileges for vehicles with respect to the America the Beautiful interagency pass.; H.R. 4467 (Rep. Thompson of MS), "*Vicksburg National Military Park Boundary Modification Act*"; H.R. 4503 (Rep. Johnson of SD), "*ePermit Act*"; and H.R. 5131 (Rep. Begich), "*Public Lands Military Readiness Act of 2025*".

II. EXPECTED LEGISLATION

H.R. 573 (Rep. Yakym), “*Studying NEPA’s Impact on Projects Act*”

In previous administrations, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) published several reports analyzing the time and paperwork burdens of National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)-related litigation and environmental reviews. From 2001 through 2013, CEQ conducted an annual survey on litigation involving a NEPA-based cause of action.¹ Each year, the survey tallied the federal agency that was the lead defendant in each NEPA case, the type of plaintiff, and the case outcome.² Notably, the surveys show that most litigation during the study period was initiated by activist groups, not individual members of the public.³

In 2020, the first Trump administration published a report examining federal agencies’ time to complete environmental impact statements (EISs) and records of decision (RODs) between 2010 and 2018. CEQ found that, on average, EISs took 4.5 years to complete and one-fourth of all EISs took over 6 years to complete.⁴ While these CEQ studies provide useful data on the cumbersome review timelines and resource strains resulting from NEPA analysis, they have been produced ad hoc and inconsistently over time.⁵ Recent studies have been conducted through the private sector, examining lawsuits pertaining to NEPA. According to a study from the Breakthrough Institute, for example, environmental non-governmental organizations (NGOs) were involved in 75 percent of NEPA cases, revealing the troubling extent to which radical NGOs have weaponized the NEPA process as a tactic to delay and even block critical projects.⁶

H.R. 573, the “Studying NEPA’s Impact on Projects Act,” sponsored by Representative Rudy Yakym (R-IN-02), would coalesce prior data collection and reporting efforts into a single report published annually by CEQ, ensuring that consistent, transparent data is regularly available. Like CEQ’s annual litigation surveys conducted between 2001 and 2013, the report would identify for each case the cause of action, lead federal agency, lead plaintiff, and project outcome.⁷ The bill would also build off of the first Trump administration’s NEPA studies, directing CEQ to review the length of EISs over the last five years and the timelines to complete environmental reviews over the last ten years, with updates published annually.⁸ This transparency will help ensure that the deadlines and page limits for NEPA documents enacted in the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023 (FRA) are being followed and provide Congress with information needed to ensure federal

¹ Council on Environmental Quality, “National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA Litigation, CEQ Reports,” 2001-2013, <https://ceq.doe.gov/ceq-reports/litigation.html>.

² Council on Environmental Quality, “NEPA Litigation Surveys: 2001-2013,” 2013, <https://ceq.doe.gov/docs/ceq-reports/nepa-litigation-surveys-2001-2013.pdf>.

³ Philip Rossetti, “ADDRESSING NEPA-RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE DELAYS,” R Street Institute, July 2021, https://www.rstreet.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/FINAL_RSTREET234.pdf.

⁴ Council on Environmental Quality, “ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT TIMELINES (2010-2018),” June 12, 2020, https://ceq.doe.gov/docs/nepa-practice/CEQ_EIS_Timeline_Report_2020-6-12.pdf.

⁵ Reps. Yakym and Panetta, “Support the Studying NEPA’s Impacts on Projects Act,” November 2, 2023, <https://d12t4t5x3vyizu.cloudfront.net/yakym.house.gov/uploads/2023/10/Studying-NEPAs-Impact-on-Projects-Act-One-Page.pdf>.

⁶ The Breakthrough Institute, “The Procedural Hangover: How NEPA Litigation Obstructs Critical Projects,” July 24, 2025, <https://thebreakthrough.org/issues/energy/the-procedural-hangover>.

⁷ H.R. 573, “Studying NEPA’s Impact on Projects Act,” 119th Congress, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/119th-congress/house-bill/573/text>.

⁸ *Id.*

laws and regulations are in line with the current administration’s efforts to reduce extensive permitting timelines. At markup, an ANS will be offered, making technical changes and concentrating the scope of the report.

Hearing information, including testimony, may be viewed [here](#), and the hearing memo may be viewed [here](#).

Staff contact: Rob MacGregor (Robert.MacGregor@mail.house.gov).

[H.R. 681](#) (Rep. Keating), To amend the Act of August 9, 1955 (commonly known as the “Long-Term Leasing Act”), to authorize leases of up to 99 years for land held in trust for the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe and the Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head (Aquinnah), and for other purposes.

The Non-Intercourse Act prohibited land transactions with Indians unless federally authorized.⁹ Over time, this restriction came to apply primarily to (1) trust lands held by the United States for tribes or individual Indians and (2) restricted fee lands, where tribes or individual Indians hold title, but which are subject to federal limitations on sale or transfer.¹⁰

Congress enacted the Indian Long-Term Leasing Act (LTLA) in 1955 to allow leasing of trust and restricted fee lands, despite the Non-Intercourse Act’s earlier prohibitions.¹¹ The LTLA authorized the leasing of trust and restricted fee lands by the Indian owners, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior (Secretary). The LTLA’s original cap on lease terms was 25 years, with the possibility of one renewal of equal length.¹²

Since its enactment, Congress has amended the LTLA many times, including granting some tribes 99-year lease authority.¹³ H.R. 681, introduced by Representative William Keating (D-MA-09), would add the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe and the Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head (Aquinnah), both of Massachusetts, to the list of tribes authorized to enter into 99-year leases.

Hearing information, including testimony, may be viewed [here](#), and the hearing memo may be viewed [here](#).

Staff contacts: Ken Degenfelder (Ken.Degenfelder@mail.house.gov) and Hannah Hulehan (Hannah.Hulehan@mail.house.gov).

⁹ Mariel J. Murray, “Tribal Land and Ownership Statuses: Overview and Selected Issues for Congress,” Congressional Research Service, July 21, 2021, <https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R46647/>

¹⁰ Subcommittee on Indian, Insular, and Alaska Native Affairs, Hearing Memorandum: Legislative Hearing on S. 249, June 6, 2017, https://naturalresources.house.gov/uploadedfiles/hearing_memo_-_leg_hrg_on_s._249_06.07.17.pdf.

¹¹ “Hageman Introduces Legislation to Streamline Tribal Land Leasing,” The Office of Congresswoman Harriet Hageman, March 1, 2023, <https://hageman.house.gov/media/press-releases/hageman-introduces-legislation-streamline-tribal-land-leasing>.

¹² Subcommittee on Indian, Insular, and Alaska Native Affairs, Hearing Memorandum: Legislative Hearing on S. 249, June 6, 2017, https://naturalresources.house.gov/uploadedfiles/hearing_memo_-_leg_hrg_on_s._249_06.07.17.pdf.

¹³ 25 U.S.C. § 415(a).

H.R. 3903 (Rep. Begich), “Chugach Alaska Land Exchange Oil Spill Recovery Act of 2025”

In 1989 the *Exxon Valdez* oil spill resulted in one of the most significant environmental disasters in U.S. history.¹⁴ Following the disaster, the *Exxon Valdez* Oil Spill Trustee Council (EVOSTC) was established and directed approximately \$900 million in settlement funds toward environmental restoration and conservation, including the acquisition of more than 600,000 acres of surface estate for permanent protection.¹⁵

For the Chugach region of Alaska, these acquisitions have resulted in a “split-estate problem,” where the federal government owns the surface title and the Chugach Alaska Corporation (CAC) owns the subsurface mineral estate.¹⁶ This split-estate has precluded Chugach from exercising its property rights, restricted shareholder economic opportunities, and complicated federal land management by dividing surface and subsurface ownership.¹⁷

H.R. 3903, sponsored by Representative Nicholas Begich (R-AK-At Large), stems from a negotiated resolution to the split-estate issue. The legislation authorizes, within one year of enactment, a land exchange whereby the Secretary must accept CAC’s offer of roughly 231,000 subsurface acres and, in return, convey to CAC approximately 65,374 acres of federal land in the Chugach region.

Hearing information, including testimony, may be viewed [here](#), and the hearing memo may be viewed [here](#).

Staff contacts: Ken Degenfelder (Ken.Degenfelder@mail.house.gov) and Kirstin Liddell (Kirstin.Liddell@mail.house.gov).

H.R. 4386 (Rep. Walberg), To amend the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act to clarify entrance privileges for vehicles with respect to the America the Beautiful interagency pass.

Under the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (FLREA), the “America the Beautiful—the National Parks and Federal Recreational Lands Pass” provides annual access to national parks and federal recreation lands.¹⁸ Historically, the pass permitted entry for two motorcycles travelling together.¹⁹ In 2024, however, the Biden administration changed this policy to unfairly

¹⁴ National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, “Exxon Valdez,” <https://darrp.noaa.gov/oil-spills/exxon-valdez>, last accessed November 14, 2025.

¹⁵ *Exxon Valdez* Oil Spill Trustee Council, “Settlement,” <https://evostc.state.ak.us/oil-spill-facts/settlement/>, last accessed November 14, 2025.

¹⁶ U.S. Department of the Interior, Statement of Karen Kelleher before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources on S. 4310, <https://www.doi.gov/ocl/pending-legislation-78>, last accessed November 14, 2025.

¹⁷ *Id.*

¹⁸ 87 U.S.C. 6801.

¹⁹ American Motorcyclist Association. Letter from Secretary Burgum: “America the Beautiful” – The National Parks and Federal Recreational Lands Annual Pass [PDF]. February 2025. <https://americanmotorcyclist.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/02/SecretaryBurgum-Letter-Americathe-Beautiful-TheNationalParksandFederalRecreationalLandsAnnualPass.pdf>.

restrict entry for motorcyclists to one bike per pass instead of two.²⁰ H.R. 4386, led by Representative Tim Walberg (R-MI-05), amends FLREA to restore the prior policy, allowing two motorcycles per annual pass to enter our national parks and public lands. This change reinstates long-standing parity with other vehicle types, supports motorcycle tourism, and maintains riders' affordable access to public lands. This reform directly advances the vision outlined in President Trump's Executive Order (E.O.) 14189, "Celebrating America's 250th Birthday," and E.O. 14314, "Making America Beautiful Again by Improving Our National Parks," by keeping national parks affordable for American citizens ahead of the country's 250th birthday celebration.²¹ An amendment will be offered at markup, adding a short title to the bill.

Hearing information, including testimony, may be viewed [here](#), and the hearing memo may be viewed [here](#).

Staff contact: Aniela Butler (Aniela@mail.house.gov) and William Kelleher (William.Kelleher@mail.house.gov).

H.R. 4467 (Rep. Thompson of MS), "*Vicksburg National Military Park Boundary Modification Act*"

Vicksburg National Military Park (Park) is the site of the pivotal Battle of Vicksburg, a decisive Civil War engagement that gave the Union control of the Mississippi River.²² Despite the Park's national significance and strong visitation figures, many of its facilities, including the visitor center, are outdated and limit opportunities for interpretation and public engagement. To enhance education and improve the visitor experience, the Mississippi Department of Archives and History (MDAH), in partnership with state and private entities, plans to construct and operate a new interpretive center.²³ H.R. 4467, sponsored by Representative Bennie Thompson (D-MS-02), authorizes the Secretary to convey a small footprint of National Park Service land to the State of Mississippi for the construction of this new welcome and interpretive center. The legislation also directs the Secretary to modify the Park's boundary to reflect this transfer. At markup, an amendment will be offered reflecting technical assistance from the Department of the Interior.

²⁰ The Office of Representative Tim Walberg, "Walberg introduces legislation to support motorcyclists visiting national parks," February 6, 2025, <https://walberg.house.gov/media/press-releases/walberg-introduces-legislation-support-motorcyclists-visiting-national-parks>.

²¹ A Presidential Document by the Executive Office of the President, "Celebrating America's 250th Birthday," February 3, 2025, Executive Order 14189, <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2025/02/03/2025-02231/celebrating-americas-250th-birthday>. A Presidential Document by the Executive Office of the President, "Making America Beautiful Again by Improving Our National Parks," July 9, 2025, Executive Order 14314, <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2025/07/09/2025-12775/making-america-beautiful-again-by-improving-our-national-parks>.

²² National Park Foundation, "Vicksburg National Military Park", <https://www.nationalparks.org/explore/parks/vicksburg-national-military-park>.

²³ Brother Rogers, "Vicksburg National Military Park to receive upgrade", Magnolia Tribune, May 18, 2023, <https://magnoliatribune.com/2023/05/18/vicksburg-national-military-park-upgrade/>.

Hearing information, including testimony, may be viewed [here](#), and the hearing memo may be viewed [here](#).

Staff contacts: Aniela Butler (Aniela@mail.house.gov) and Hannah Devereaux (Hannah.Devereaux@mail.house.gov).

H.R. 4503 (Rep. Johnson of SD), “ePermit Act”

The current technology landscape for federal permitting comprises diverse, isolated systems, with many agencies lacking sufficient cybersecurity infrastructure and expertise. As a result, projects seeking federal environmental reviews and authorizations are often mired in antiquated paper-based processes, poor interagency coordination, and duplicative data submission requirements, resulting in lengthy and unpredictable delays.

To address these issues, on April 15, 2025, President Trump issued a memorandum titled “Updating Permitting Technology for the 21st Century.”²⁴ This memorandum prioritizes modernizing permitting technology across executive branch departments and establishes a Permitting Innovation Center under CEQ to design and test prototype permitting technologies.²⁵ Following President Trump’s memorandum, on May 30, 2025, CEQ issued its groundbreaking Action Plan, which provides a government-wide strategy to optimize technology to evaluate environmental permits more effectively and efficiently.²⁶ This guidance sets the foundation for seamless information exchange between agencies, simplified interactions for applicants, and greater transparency and predictability on environmental review and permitting schedules for project sponsors and stakeholders.

H.R. 4503, the “ePermit Act,” introduced by Representative Dusty Johnson (R-SD-At Large), codifies key aspects of CEQ’s Action Plan, provides legislative direction on how federal agencies should implement electronic permitting systems, and clarifies CEQ’s authority to coordinate interagency permitting technology efforts. Additionally, the legislation directs CEQ and federal agencies to work towards establishing a “unified interagency data system” with shared digital services for environmental reviews and authorizations. At markup, an ANS will be offered, with technical changes to ensure the bill is compliant with House Rules for the 119th Congress.

Hearing information, including testimony, may be viewed [here](#), and the hearing memo may be viewed [here](#).

Staff contact: Rob MacGregor (Robert.MacGregor@mail.house.gov).

²⁴ The White House, “Updating Permitting Technology for the 21st Century,” April 15, 2025, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/04/updated-permitting-technology-for-the-21st-century/>.

²⁵ Council on Environmental Quality, “Permitting Innovation Center,” <https://permitting.innovation.gov/>.

²⁶ The White House, “Trump Administration Launches Permitting Technology Action Plan,” May 30, 2025.

H.R. 4776 (Rep. Westerman), “Standardizing Permitting and Expediting Economic Development Act,” or “SPEED Act”

NEPA establishes parameters for assessing and publicly disclosing the environmental impact of all “major federal actions,”²⁷ which encompass a broad range of governmental activities that impact the American economy. Originally intended to strike an appropriate balance between protecting the environment and promoting economic development, the NEPA process has become increasingly complex, resulting in unwieldy NEPA documents, excessive timelines, and an increase in frivolous litigation.²⁸ These delays have imposed significant time and cost burdens, with environmental analysis adding an estimated average of \$4.2 million to project costs.²⁹ CEQ recently found that Federal Highway Administration projects, for example, take more than 7 years to get from a notice of intent to the issuance of a ROD.³⁰ This data contrasts sharply with CEQ’s 1981 prediction that agencies would be able to complete EISs in twelve months or less.³¹ Adding to this complexity is the fact that NEPA is the “most frequently litigated environmental statute,” according to the Department of Justice.³² A recent study by the Breakthrough Institute reveals that NEPA-related litigation on EISs takes an average of 4.2 years to resolve.³³

On June 2, 2023, President Biden signed into law the FRA,³⁴ which included the first significant NEPA reforms in over 40 years. Those reforms defined ambiguous terms in the statute and set time and page limits for NEPA documents. Unfortunately, rather than abide by the FRA’s significant NEPA and permitting reforms intended to streamline construction in America, speed up timelines for critical infrastructure projects, and reduce the burden on taxpayers by creating efficiencies in the permitting process, the Biden administration largely ignored the FRA’s changes, instead choosing to weaponize the NEPA process to delay critical domestic energy projects.

On May 29, 2025, the Supreme Court strongly reaffirmed NEPA’s procedural nature and finite scope with its unanimous decision in *Seven County Infrastructure Coalition v. Eagle County (Seven County)*.³⁵ In the decision, the Supreme Court held that courts must afford agencies substantial deference when examining whether an agency acted reasonably in determining the appropriate scope and content of an environmental document prepared under NEPA. The Court explained that a NEPA analysis for a given project need not consider the broad effects of

²⁷ Pub. L. 91-190; 42 U.S.C. 4321-4347, January 1, 1970, as amended by Pub. L. 94-52, July 3, 1975, Pub. L. 94-83, August 9, 1975, and Pub. L. 97-258, § 4(b), September 13, 1982.

²⁸ Healthy Forests, Healthy Communities, 2020.

²⁹ NEPA Modernization 101: An Outdated Environmental Law the is Impeding Clean Energy Developments, C3 SOLUTIONS, <https://www.c3solutions.org/policy-paper/nepa-modernization-101/>.

³⁰ Council on Environmental Quality, Update to the Regulations Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act, July 16, 2020, <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2020/07/16/2020-15179/update-to-the-regulations-implementing-the-procedural-provisions-of-the-national-environmental#footnote-2-p43305>.

³¹ Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ’s National Environmental Policy Act Regulations, 46 FR 18026, March 23, 1981, <https://www.energy.gov/nepa/downloads/forty-most-asked-questions-concerning-ceqs-national-environmental-policy-act>.

³² Nina M. Hart & Linda Tsang, “National Environmental Policy Act: Judicial Review and Remedies,” Congressional Research Service, September 22, 2021, IF11932.

³³ The Breakthrough Institute, “Understanding NEPA Litigation: A systematic Review of Recent NEPA-Related Appellate Court Cases,” July 11, 2024, <https://thebreakthrough.org/issues/energy/understanding-nepa-litigation>.

³⁴ Press Release, THE WHITE HOUSE, *Bills Signed: H.R. 346, H.R. 3746*, June 3, 2023, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/legislation/2023/06/03/press-release-bills-signed-h-r-346-h-r-3746/>.

³⁵ 605 U. S. ____ (2025), https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/24pdf/23-975_m648.pdf.

separate projects if an agency determines that those upstream and downstream effects are remote in both time and place.³⁶ The decision also admonished lower courts not to “substitute [their] judgment for that of the agency as to the environmental consequences of its actions.”³⁷ *Seven County* was a significant milestone in returning common sense to the NEPA process and in providing long-sought clarity that NEPA review should focus on the project under consideration rather than broader, indirect impacts.

H.R. 4776, led by Chairman Bruce Westerman (R-AR-04) and Jared Golden (D-ME-02), would build on the FRA reforms and further improve NEPA, including codifying key aspects of the *Seven County* decision. The bill clarifies that NEPA is a “purely procedural statute”³⁸ that “does not mandate particular results, but simply prescribes the necessary process,”³⁹ borrowing language from the Supreme Court’s decisions in *Seven County* and *Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens Council*. The legislation also prevents duplication by allowing federal agencies to utilize environmental reviews conducted under other federal or state environmental statutes, so long as they meet the requirements of NEPA.

One of the most glaring issues with NEPA is that it does not clearly explain which effects an agency must consider in a review. This omission has led to bloated environmental documents and egregious timelines. H.R. 4776 rectifies this issue by clarifying that agencies may consider only those effects proximately caused by major federal actions and may not consider effects that are speculative or separate in time or place from those actions. By mandating that the alternatives considered in a given NEPA document meet the applicant’s purpose and need, the bill also ensures that agencies cannot use NEPA to significantly change proposed projects they disfavor.

As previously discussed, NEPA establishes parameters for assessing and publicly disclosing the environmental impact of all “major federal actions.” This term was not defined until the passage of the FRA. Unfortunately, that definition was not comprehensive enough, as the Biden administration largely ignored the changes. H.R. 4776 would clarify the definition of major federal action by explaining once and for all that agencies may not determine an action to be a major federal action based solely on the provision of federal funds.

The bill also addresses frivolous NEPA claims in several key ways. First, the bill codifies the *Seven County* decision by ensuring that courts do not improperly substitute their judgments for those made by the agencies. Next, the bill clarifies that the only remedy available to courts in deciding NEPA cases is to remand the action back to the lead agency; they may not enjoin or vacate the challenged action. Because NEPA is a purely procedural statute that establishes a process, it stands to reason that if an agency erred in its process, it should go back and complete it, without the underlying action being disqualified or cancelled. Finally, the bill requires that NEPA claims be filed within 150 days after the action is made public and must be filed by claimants who submitted a comment during the public comment period, have a claim related to their comment, and have been, or imminently will be, harmed by the proposed action. This

³⁶ *Id.*

³⁷ *Seven County Infrastructure Coalition v. Eagle County*, 605 U. S. ____ (2025), https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/24pdf/23-975_m648.pdf.

³⁸ *Id.*

³⁹ *Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens Council*, 490 U.S. 332, 350 (1989), <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/490/332/>.

provision facilitates a more timely litigation process and ensures that agencies are, at the very least, given the opportunity to address deficiencies before being sued.

At markup, an ANS will be offered that includes technical changes and edits that further the bill's goals. Specifically, the edits would limit claims against tribal projects, establish new timelines for agency organization and pre-NEPA activities, and allow agencies to rely on previously completed environmental documents for similar actions.

Hearing information, including testimony, may be viewed [here](#), and the hearing memo may be viewed [here](#).

Staff contact: Rob MacGregor (Robert.MacGregor@mail.house.gov).

H.R. 5131 (Rep. Begich), “Public Lands Military Readiness Act of 2025”

Sponsored by Representative Nicholas Begich (R-AK-At Large), H.R. 5131 extends critical, existing military land withdrawals in Alaska, New Mexico, and California for an additional 25 years through 2051 to ensure continued combat readiness for the U.S. Army. Under the Military Land Withdrawal Act of 1999, millions of acres of public land were withdrawn across several western states for military use, facilitating the establishment of prominent military training areas.⁴⁰ Totalling approximately 1.6 million acres, the land withdrawals in H.R. 5131 provide long-term certainty to the military and protect the unique training environments, infrastructure, and restricted airspace necessary to maintain military superiority and counter America’s adversaries.

At Forts Greely and Wainwright in Alaska, the bill extends the existing withdrawal of 869,862 acres. The land covered by this withdrawal includes the Donnelly and Yukon Training Areas, which provide the nation’s only Arctic environment for large-scale training.⁴¹ At Fort Irwin in California’s Mojave Desert, the bill extends the current land withdrawal and corrects a historic survey error that wrongfully excluded 7,710 acres from the installation’s footprint. Fort Irwin houses the National Training Center (NTC), the Army’s premier site for brigade-level, force-on-force training, where commanders prepare for dynamic threats and conduct large-scale exercises that cannot be replicated on smaller parcels of land.⁴² At the McGregor Range in southern New Mexico, which is part of Fort Bliss, the legislation extends the current withdrawal until November 6, 2051, and corrects the range's acreage from 608,385 to 605,401 acres, based on a new survey by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). The McGregor Range supports unique training functions, such as Patriot missile live-fire exercises, aerial gunnery, electronic warfare, and large-scale mobilization training for the Army Reserve and National Guard.⁴³

At markup, an ANS will be offered addressing minor technical corrections raised by the BLM.

⁴⁰ Title XXX of P.L. 106–65; 113 Stat. 898.

⁴¹ U.S. Army. Information paper: Critical training capabilities at Fort Irwin, CA, Fort Bliss, TX, and Fort Wainwright, AK [PDF]. DAMO-TRS. September 5, 2025.

⁴² *Id.*

⁴³ *Id.*

Hearing information, including testimony, may be viewed [here](#), and the hearing memo may be viewed [here](#).

Staff contacts: Aniela Butler (Aniela@mail.house.gov) and William Kelleher (William.Kelleher@mail.house.gov).

III. CBO SCORES

None available.

IV. EFFECT ON CURRENT LAW (RAMSEYER)

[H.R. 573](#)

[H.R. 681](#)

[H.R. 4386](#)

[H.R. 4776](#)

[H.R. 5131](#)