



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: Monday, September 14, 2026
Subject: Markup of 17 Bills

The House Committee on Natural Resources will hold a markup on **Tuesday, September 15, 2026, at 10:15 a.m., in room 1324 Longworth House Office Building**. The bills to be considered include: H.R. 181 (Rep. McClintock); H.R. 184 (Rep. McClintock); H.R. 1555 (Rep. Bice); H.R. 4598 (Rep. Leger Fernandez); H.R. 5745 (Rep. Ezell); H.R. 7254 (Rep. Huffman); H.R. 7954 (Rep. Hurd); H.R. 8195 (Rep. Walberg); H.R. 8483 (Rep. Issa); H.R. 9269 (Rep. Clyburn); H.R. 9600 (Rep. Raskin); H.R. 9621 (Rep. Baumgartner); H.R. 9640 (Rep. Wittman); H.R. 9785 (Rep. Johnson of SD); H.R. 10136 (Rep. Westerman); H.R. 10306 (Rep. Amodei); and S. 675 (Sen. Hoeven).

Member offices are requested to notify Madeline Kelley (Madeline.Kelley@mail.house.gov) by 4:30 p.m. on Monday, September 14, 2026, to confirm their Member's attendance at the markup.

I. KEY MESSAGES & TOPLINE ACTIONS

- Bills expected to move by regular order: H.R. 181 (Rep. McClintock), To amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide that artificially propagated animals shall be treated the same under that Act as naturally propagated animals, and for other purposes.; H.R. 184 (Rep. McClintock), *"Action Versus No Action Act"*; H.R. 1555 (Rep. Bice), *"Bureau of Land Management Mineral Spacing Act"*; H.R. 5745 (Rep. Ezell), *"Marine Fisheries Habitat Protection Act"*; and H.R. 9621 (Rep. Baumgartner), *"Northwest Endangered Salmon Predation Prevention Act of 2026"*.
- Please note that H.R. 181, H.R. 184, H.R. 1555, H.R. 5745, and H.R. 9621 will each 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. 4598 (Rep. Leger Fernandez), *"Technical Corrections to the Northwestern New Mexico Rural Water Projects Act, Taos Pueblo Indian Water Rights Settlement Act, and Aamodt Litigation Settlement Act"*; H.R. 7254 (Rep. Huffman), To amend the National Trails System Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the feasibility of designating the Bay Area Ridge National Scenic Trail, and for other purposes.; H.R. 7954 (Rep. Hurd),

“Don Young Doug LaMalfa Indian Buffalo Management Act”; H.R. 8195 (Rep. Walberg), *“Responsible Cormorant Management and Control Act of 2026”*; H.R. 8483 (Rep. Issa), *“Barona Group of Capitan Grande Band of Mission Indians Land Transfer Act of 2026”*; H.R. 9269 (Rep. Clyburn), *“Renewing the African American Civil Rights Network Act”*; H.R. 9600 (Rep. Raskin), *“Common Sense 250 Act of 2026”*; H.R. 9640 (Rep. Wittman), *“Earth MRI Reauthorization Act of 2026”*; H.R. 9785 (Rep. Johnson of SD), *“South Dakota Water Feasibility Studies Act”*; H.R. 10136 (Rep. Westerman), *“Crossett Experimental Forest Act of 2026”*; H.R. 10306 (Rep. Amodei), *“Technical Correction to the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Reservation Water Rights Settlement Act of 2025”*; and S. 675 (Sen. Hoeven), *“Theodore Roosevelt Presidential Library Act”*.

II. EXPECTED LEGISLATION

H.R. 181 (Rep. McClintock), To amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide that artificially propagated animals shall be treated the same under that Act as naturally propagated animals, and for other purposes.

The Endangered Species Act (ESA) was enacted in 1973 to recover endangered and threatened species and the ecosystems upon which they depend.¹ Under the current regulatory framework, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s (NOAA) National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) (collectively, the Services) are responsible for determining whether species should be listed as threatened or endangered, as well as for designating critical habitat.² In many cases, the Services establish recovery goals or population thresholds to guide conservation and mitigation actions. The ESA does not explicitly require artificially propagated animals to be treated the same as naturally propagated animals, leaving it to the Services’ discretion whether to consider them when making determinations under the Act.

H.R. 181, introduced by Representative Tom McClintock (R-CA-05), and as amended by the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute (ANS), amends Section 7(a) of the ESA to require the Services to consider both naturally propagated and artificially propagated populations of a species for purposes of consultations under ESA Section 7. The bill also requires the Services to authorize the use of artificial propagation of a species for mitigation proposed by a federal action agency or applicant under the ESA.

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

Staff contact: Doug Levine (Doug.Levine@mail.house.gov).

¹ Pub. L. No. 93–205.

² Testimony of Karen Budd-Falen, “The Endangered Species Act: How Litigation is Costing Jobs and Impeding True Recovery Efforts,” Oversight Hearing, House Committee on Natural Resources, 112th Congress, 2011.

H.R. 184 (Rep. McClintock), “*Action Versus No Action Act*”

Research indicates that 71 percent of Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and 89 percent of U.S. Forest Service (USFS) lands have the potential to ignite and spread wildfire to nearby communities.³ Despite this danger, only a small portion of high-risk federal lands are treated annually, highlighting a gap between identified risk and the pace of active forest management.⁴ This discrepancy is due largely to a mixture of bureaucratic red tape, onerous regulations, and frivolous litigation stemming from the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA).⁵ Vital forest management projects are often delayed or canceled as land managers divert finite agency time and resources to endless analyses aimed at “bulletproofing” environmental assessments (EAs) or environmental impact statements (EISs) against litigation risk. In fact, research has revealed that mechanical treatments take 4.3 and 5.3 years to begin under EAs and EISs, respectively, while prescribed burns can take between 5.6 to 7.2 years to start.⁶

Because forests are living, evolving ecosystems, taking no action during this crisis period *is* a management decision, one that often results in project areas incinerating in catastrophic wildfires before receiving required federal approvals.⁷ To prevent this from recurring, H.R. 184, sponsored by Representative Tom McClintock (R-CA-05), limits the number of alternatives analyzed for certain forest management projects to: (1) the proposed agency action and (2) a no action alternative. Instead of leaving agencies to analyze endless permutations of management choices and get caught in analysis paralysis, this bill expedites environmental review while emphasizing the consequences of inaction in the face of increasing wildfire risk. Finally, H.R. 184 incentivizes community engagement and collaboration by extending this streamlined authority only to projects in high-risk areas or developed through a collaborative process, proposed by a resource advisory committee, or covered by a community wildfire protection plan. An ANS will be offered at markup reflecting technical assistance from the Trump administration.

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 Brandon Miller (Brandon.Miller@mail.house.gov).

³ A fireshed is a landscape-scale area that faces similar wildfire threats where a fire management strategy could affect fire outcomes. Alan Ager, *et al.*, “Development and Application of the Fireshed Registry,” U.S. Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Region, May 2021.

⁴ Anne Riddle, “Federal Wildfire Management: Ten-Year Funding Trends and Issues (FY2011-FY2020),” Congressional Research Service, October 28, 2020, <https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R46583>.

⁵ Pub. L. No. 91–190.

⁶ Eric Edwards & Sara Sutherland, “Does Environmental Review Worsen the Wildfire Crisis,” Property and Environment Research Center, June 14, 2022, <https://perc.org/2022/06/14/does-environmental-review-worsen-the-wildfire-crisis/>.

⁷ Scott Rodd, “Stalled U.S. Forest Service project could have protected California town from Caldor Fire destruction,” CapRadio, August 16, 2022, <https://www.capradio.org/articles/2022/08/16/stalled-us-forest-service-project-could-have-protected-california-town-from-caldor-fire-destruction/>.

H.R. 1555 (Rep. Bice), “*Bureau of Land Management Mineral Spacing Act*”

BLM administers the federal surface lands and subsurface estate under its jurisdiction pursuant to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA).⁸ Onshore federal lands include all federal surface lands and the federal mineral estate, covering 713 million acres.⁹ BLM “manages energy production and mineral development from these subsurface lands, including lands whose surface is managed by other federal agencies or for split-estate lands.”¹⁰

BLM’s split-estate policy commonly applies to situations where the surface rights are in private or state ownership, while the rights to development of the mineral resources are publicly held and managed by the federal government.¹¹ For purposes of federal and Indian oil and gas management, BLM’s jurisdiction extends to surface facilities on entirely non-federal lands only to the extent of assuring production accountability for royalties from federal and Indian oil and gas.¹² The term “Fee/Fee/Fed” refers to situations where a well is located on non-Federal land overlying non-Federal minerals, but some portion of the wellbore enters and produces from the federal mineral estate.¹³ The wellbore may enter and produce from any combination of private, state and federal minerals. The key is that the wellbore enters and produces federal minerals from a lease not underlying the well’s surface location.

Advancements in directional drilling have allowed oil and gas operators to reach multiple formations and leases from the same well pads.¹⁴ Historically, through conventional drilling, operators encountered split-estate scenarios less frequently. However, with technological developments such as directional drilling, operators increasingly encounter federal minerals within the proposed spacing unit while drilling on private or state surface land.¹⁵

When this occurs, the operator is required to submit an Application for a Permit to Drill (APD) to BLM before commencing any drilling activities. During this phase, BLM must comply with NEPA, the ESA, and the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), creating long delays for the applicant. Moreover, operators must endure duplicative state processes to obtain state permits for surface disturbance and the development of state and private mineral resources. Tedious processes that involve federal agencies frequently discourage optimal mineral production.

H.R. 1555, sponsored by Representative Stephanie Bice (R-OK-05), lessens these regulatory burdens by removing the requirement to obtain an APD from BLM in instances when: (1) less than half of the subsurface minerals within a drilling spacing unit are owned by the federal government, and (2) the federal government does not own or lease the surface rights.¹⁶ The bill

⁸ Lexie Ryan, “Revenues and Disbursements from Oil and Natural Gas Leases on Onshore Federal Lands,” Congressional Research Service, February 12, 2026, <https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R46537>.

⁹ *Id.*

¹⁰ *Id.*

¹¹ “Leasing and Development of Split Estate,” Bureau of Land Management, <https://www.blm.gov/programs/energy-andminerals/oil-and-gas/leasing/split-estate>.

¹² “Directional Drilling into Federal Mineral Estate from Well Pads on Non-Federal Locations,” Bureau of Land Management, June 12, 2018, <https://www.blm.gov/policy/pim-2018-014#:~:text=Policy/Action:%20These%20policies%20and,Fee/Fee/Fed%20situations>.

¹³ *Id.*

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶ H.R. 1555, 119th Congress, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/119th-congress/house-bill/1555?s=1&r=13>.

still requires operators to comply with all state laws, regulations, and guidance governing covered activities in each relevant jurisdiction and to pay all royalties to the federal government for use of federal resources.¹⁷

This legislation furthers the goals outlined in President Trump’s Executive Order (E.O.) 14154, titled “Unleashing American Energy,”¹⁸ and E.O. 14156, titled “Declaring a National Energy Emergency.”¹⁹

At markup, an ANS will be offered which reflects the key elements from the Senate version of this bill, addressing additional Fee-Fee-Fed scenarios. Specifically, the ANS further defines when an operator can avoid duplicative federal reviews by clarifying that both wellbores originating on non-federal land that simply traverse federal land, and those that originate on non-federal land but enter and produce from a federal minerals estate, may avoid federal permitting processes.

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

Staff contact: Murray Miller (Murray.Miller@mail.house.gov).

H.R. 5745 (Rep. Ezell), “*Marine Fisheries Habitat Protection Act*”

The National Fishing Enhancement Act of 1984²⁰ came in response to increased interest and participation in fishing around offshore oil and gas platforms and “widespread support for effective artificial reef development by coastal states.”²¹ For decades, marine scientists and anglers have witnessed this infrastructure catalyze the development of fisheries habitat.²² Recognizing the value of such habitat, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management found that removing these structures could have “significant adverse impacts” on surrounding fisheries.²³

The National Fishing Enhancement Act created national standards for artificial reef development via the National Artificial Reef Plan and a reef-permitting system.²⁴ The Rigs to Reefs initiative, born out of this legislation, enhances collaboration between federal and state entities and bridges the gap between artificial structures and the natural marine environment, transforming decommissioned offshore rigs into thriving marine ecosystems. The Marine Minerals Administration (MMA), in consultation with the U.S. Coast Guard, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, NOAA, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, currently oversees the

¹⁷ *Id.*

¹⁸ “Unleashing American Energy,” The White House, January 20, 2025, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidentialactions/2025/04/reinvigorating-americas-beautiful-clean-coal-industry-and-amending-executive-order-14241/>.

¹⁹ “Declaring a National Energy Emergency,” The White House, January 20, 2025, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidentialactions/2025/01/declaring-a-national-energy-emergency/>.

²⁰ Pub. L. No. 98-623.

²¹ “Rigs to Reefs Program Fact Sheet,” U.S. Department of the Interior, March 2022, <https://www.bsee.gov/sites/bsee.gov/files/rigs-to-reefs-program-fact-sheet.pdf>.

²² “Rigs-To-Reefs: The Opportunity to Save Exceptional Marine Habitat,” Congressional Sportsmen’s Foundation, <https://congressionalsportsmen.org/page/rigs-to-reefs/>.

²³ *Id.*

²⁴ *Id.*

program at the federal level and ensures compliance with environmental and safety standards.²⁵ MMA enforces regulations for offshore oil and gas operations and the eventual removal of temporary facilities on the federal Outer Continental Shelf.²⁶

Introduced by Representative Mike Ezell (R-MS-04), H.R. 5745 builds upon the National Fishing Enhancement Act by encouraging more active participation in the Rigs to Reefs initiative. Since MMA is responsible for decommissioning offshore energy infrastructure, the agency's continued authority over the reefing process will ensure that all safety protocols are followed. Currently, states' authority to assume liability for rigs in federal waters is found only in federal regulations. By codifying that authority in statute, H.R. 5745 provides increased certainty for states, industry, and sportsmen.

H.R. 5745 provides a more streamlined process for owners and operators to reef in place inactive offshore energy infrastructure within two years, provided the owner and operator have satisfied the following conditions: documented the presence of an established reef ecosystem on the inactive infrastructure; made sure the inactive infrastructure has been safely plugged and abandoned; removed hydrocarbons; taken the necessary steps to aid navigation; and ensured that a state will assume title and liability once the reefing activity is complete. Operators begin by submitting a notice of intent to reef, which a corporate officer must sign to show good faith.

This bill directs the U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI), in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, to conduct "an assessment of each Inactive Structure," including its corals and fish species. The legislation allows DOI to enter into agreements with owners and operators of the infrastructure to have third parties, including states, conduct these assessments.

Within 60 days of completing each assessment, DOI must determine that the Inactive Structure is an Eligible Structure if "there is an established reef ecosystem on, under, or in the immediate vicinity of the Inactive Structure." After an Eligible Structure determination, DOI has 90 days to designate the footprint of the structure as a Reef Planning Area. Within 180 days of a Reef Planning Area being designated, applicants must submit all permits and applications for authorizations required under federal law. If the applicant cannot provide this, the Secretary may grant an extension if the applicant is working in good faith to obtain the required permits and approvals.

Within 30 days of the reef planning area designation, DOI must transmit the designation to the Secretary of the Army and provide consistent and timely updates on application status. After that, DOI has 180 days to decide whether to approve the structure for reefing in place. After approval, an applicant has two years to complete reefing in place of the eligible structure.

States that have artificial reefing programs may enter into agreements with operators to assume responsibility for a structure upon completion of reefing in place, in exchange for an amount of funds as determined by the state.

²⁵ "Rigs to Reefs Directive Supplemental Data Sheet," U.S. Department of the Interior, November 21, 2019, www.bsee.gov/sites/bsee.gov/files/rigs-to-reefs-program-policy.pdf.

²⁶ 30 CFR § 250.1700.

The legislation also requires the Secretary of the Interior to provide the House Committee on Natural Resources and the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources with “a report summarizing all actions taken in relation to an Inactive Structure” under the bill in the preceding 12 months.

At markup, an ANS will be offered that closes potential loopholes by shortening timelines, adding withdrawal consequences to prevent abuse of withdrawals of notices of intent to reef in place, and encouraging good-faith efforts. The ANS also removes pipelines from the bill and shifts primary responsibility for the program to DOI.

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

Staff contacts: Murray Miller (Murray.Miller@mail.house.gov) and Ray Phillips (Ray.Phillips@mail.house.gov).

H.R. 9621 (Rep. Baumgartner), “Northwest Endangered Salmon Predation Prevention Act of 2026”

In recent decades, pinniped populations—including harbor seals, California sea lions, and Steller sea lions—have exploded across the Pacific Northwest, jeopardizing the recovery of ESA-listed salmonid populations, undermining tribal treaty-reserved fishing rights, and threatening billions of dollars in taxpayer investments.²⁷ The Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), however, generally prohibits the “take” of marine mammals, including pinnipeds.²⁸ The MMPA’s rigid requirements offer minimal flexibility for managing pinniped populations, even when increased takings would benefit species listed under the ESA,²⁹ such as certain vulnerable salmon and steelhead populations.

H.R. 9621, bipartisan legislation introduced by Representative Michael Baumgartner (R-WA-05), tackles the limited effectiveness and scope of existing authorities. The bill eliminates the restrictions that specify where lethal management can occur on the Columbia River and that prescribe chemical euthanasia as the only acceptable method of take. By incorporating adaptive management principles into those processes, the legislation ensures that the fisheries’ co-managers can do their jobs effectively.

To halt the longstanding decline of salmon and steelhead populations in the Puget Sound and other parts of western Washington, H.R. 9621 also extends these management tools to allow state and tribal fishery co-managers in western Washington. The bill authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to issue permits to these eligible entities to allow for the humane lethal taking of harbor seals, California sea lions, and Steller sea lions in “each river and stream in the State of Washington that flows into the marine waters of the State....”³⁰

²⁷ *Pinniped Predation on Salmonids in the Washington Portions of the Salish Sea and Outer Coast*, Washington State Academy of Sciences, <https://wdfw.wa.gov/sites/default/files/publications/02579/wdfw02579.pdf>.

²⁸ “Marine Mammal Protection,” NOAA Fisheries, 2018, www.fisheries.noaa.gov/topic/marine-mammal-protection.

²⁹ *Id.*

³⁰ H.R. 9621, 119th Congress, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/119th-congress/house-bill/9621/text?s=4&r=1>.

An ANS will be considered at markup that makes technical and clarifying changes to the bill based on agency and stakeholder feedback.

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

Staff contact: Kirby Struhar (Kirby.Struhar@mail.house.gov).

H.R. 7954 (Rep. Hurd), “*Don Young Doug LaMalfa Indian Buffalo Management Act*”

American Indians and Alaska Natives have nurtured a longstanding cultural and spiritual relationship with the buffalo. For centuries, many tribes have relied on buffalo for food, shelter, tools, and clothing, with only the buffalo’s near-extinction threatening that relationship.³¹ Fortunately, conservation efforts involving tribal partnerships, among other efforts, have led to significant recoveries in buffalo populations.³²

Sponsored by Representative Jeff Hurd (R-CO-03), H.R. 7954 continues these efforts by directing the Secretary of the Interior to work with tribes and tribal organizations to promote tribal management of buffalo and buffalo habitat, continue conservation work to enhance buffalo herds, and ensure that tribes are consulted on DOI initiatives related to buffalo and buffalo habitats. Additionally, this legislation directs the Secretary of the Interior to enter into grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements with tribes and tribal organizations to facilitate buffalo restoration and management. Lastly, the legislation authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into agreements with tribes or tribal organizations to transport surplus buffalo from federal land to Indian land.

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

Staff contact: Kirstin Liddell (Kirstin.Liddell@mail.house.gov).

H.R. 8195 (Rep. Walberg), “*Responsible Cormorant Management and Control Act of 2026*”

Double-crested cormorants are one of six cormorant species native to North America, with the largest concentration located in the Great Lakes region. Cormorants were listed under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) in 1972.³³ Today, FWS estimates the cormorant population in the continental U.S. and Canada to be between 871,001 and 1,031,757 birds.³⁴ Cormorants eat mostly fish, averaging approximately one pound of fish per day, which can make commercial aquaculture facilities and free-swimming fish populations optimal feeding grounds.³⁵ In 2021, FWS established an individual-permit system based on a Population Take Limit model to

³¹ Intertribal Buffalo Council testimony before Indian and Insular Affairs Subcommittee, December 2023, https://naturalresources.house.gov/uploadedfiles/carlson_testimony.pdf.

³² “Bison Management,” National Park Service, <https://www.nps.gov/thro/learn/nature/bison-management.htm>.

³³ “Expanding Management of Conflicts Associated with Double-crested Cormorants: Frequently Asked Questions,” U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, <https://www.fws.gov/node/417891>.

³⁴ *Id.*

³⁵ *Id.*

manage cormorant populations. The system requires individuals to apply annually for permits, with FWS currently allowing an annual take of up to 121,504 cormorants.³⁶

Led by Representative Tim Walberg (R-MI-05), H.R. 8195 changes this management framework by requiring FWS to develop, in consultation with the four regional flyway councils, regional management frameworks for the take of cormorants. The frameworks would ensure that cormorant breeding populations are maintained at self-sustaining and appropriate levels in accordance with the MBTA and consider the negative effects of overabundant cormorant populations on fisheries, sensitive vegetation, other migratory bird populations, and federally listed species. The bill also requires FWS to identify management actions within the National Wildlife Refuge System to address cormorant populations. The regional frameworks and population surveys must be updated every five years.

An ANS will be considered at markup that makes substantive changes, including requiring the Secretary of the Interior to report to Congress on the feasibility of hunting as a tool to manage cormorant populations within the regional frameworks and modifications to comply with House floor protocols.

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

Staff contact: Doug Levine (Doug.Levine@mail.house.gov).

H.R. 8483 (Rep. Issa), “*Barona Group of Capitan Grande Band of Mission Indians Land Transfer Act of 2026*”

The Barona Group of Capitan Grande Band of Mission Indians, also known as the Barona Band of Mission Indians (Barona Band), resides on a 7,500-acre reservation (Barona Reservation) located in San Diego County, California.³⁷ Introduced by Representative Darrell Issa (R-CA-48), H.R. 8483 places approximately 1,362 acres of land into trust for the Barona Band.

The land included in this legislation holds immense historical and cultural value for the tribe,³⁸ as it was the original location where Barona Band members predominantly resided and buried their ancestors.³⁹ The Barona Band has worked with USFS and BLM to reclaim this property, located between the Barona and the Capitan Grande Reservations.

The legislation includes a gaming prohibition, protects existing water rights and service agreements, and states that all valid, preexisting liens, rights-of-way, reciprocal road right-of-way agreements, licenses, leases, permits, and easements will remain unaltered.

At markup, an ANS will be offered that reflects technical assistance and clarifies maintenance of a fuel break.

³⁶ *Id.*

³⁷ Information provided to Subcommittee on Indian and Insular Affairs Staff on May 12, 2026. On file.

³⁸ *Id.*

³⁹ *Id.*

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

Staff contact: Kirstin Liddell (Kirstin.Liddell@mail.house.gov).

H.R. 9640 (Rep. Wittman), “*Earth MRI Reauthorization Act of 2026*”

The U.S. Geological Survey’s (USGS) Earth Mapping Resources Initiative (Earth MRI) collects geologic, geophysical, geochemical, topographic, and related data for, among other uses, identifying mineral, energy, and groundwater resources and natural hazards.⁴⁰ Earth MRI provides valuable, necessary data for the responsible management and development of our surface, subsurface, and mineral estate. The same geologic and geophysical information used to map our mineral resources can also support a wide range of activities outside mineral exploration.⁴¹ These include studying water resources, identifying sand and gravel deposits for infrastructure development, locating geothermal reservoirs, mapping natural hazards, and planning energy infrastructure development.⁴²

Earth MRI was conceptualized during the first Trump administration, with an E.O. and subsequent DOI Secretarial Order being issued in response to growing vulnerabilities in the nation’s critical mineral supply chains.⁴³ These actions mandated the federal government work to identify new sources of critical minerals. Congress authorized Earth MRI in 2021,⁴⁴ requiring “an initial comprehensive national modern surface and subsurface map and data integration by November 15, 2031,” and provided it with \$320 million in funding, in addition to annual appropriations.⁴⁵

H.R. 9640, introduced by Representative Rob Wittman (R-VA-01), reauthorizes Earth MRI for another five years and sets the authorization of appropriations at \$16.8 million per fiscal year. Reauthorizing Earth MRI is important to developing America’s critical minerals supply chains and ensuring national and economic security and industrial competitiveness.

At markup, an ANS will be offered that encourages USGS to prioritize American contractors and subcontractors and replaces the term “natural hydrogen” with the broader term “geologic hydrogen.”

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

⁴⁰ “Earth Mapping Resources Initiative (Earth MRI): About,” U.S. Geological Survey, <https://www.usgs.gov/special-topics/earth-mri/about>.

⁴¹ “Meeting Future U.S. Mineral Resource Needs: The Role of the U.S. Geological Survey Mineral Resources Program,” National Academies Press, 2025, <https://www.nationalacademies.org/read/29068/chapter/6#37>.

⁴² *Id.*

⁴³ Executive Order 13817, “A Federal Strategy To Ensure Secure and Reliable Supplies of Critical Minerals,” Federal Register, December 20, 2017, <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2017/12/26/2017-27899/a-federal-strategy-to-ensure-secure-and-reliable-supplies-of-critical-minerals>.

⁴⁴ Pub. L. No. 117-58.

⁴⁵ Linda Rowan, “The USGS Earth Mapping Resources Initiative,” Congressional Research Service, December 4, 2025, <https://www.crs.gov/Reports/IF13058?source=search&index=0&searchGUID=c4c820e4e4b64f48a5603ba33331490e>.

Staff contacts: Murray Miller (Murray.Miller@mail.house.gov) and Ray Phillips (Ray.Phillips@mail.house.gov).

H.R. 9785 (Rep. Johnson of SD), “*South Dakota Water Feasibility Studies Act*”

H.R. 9785, sponsored by Representative Dusty Johnson (R-SD-AL), directs the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) to conduct feasibility studies for three proposed water-supply projects in the Missouri River basin: the Western South Dakota Water Supply Project, the Lewis and Clark Regional Water System Expansion, and the Dakota Mainstem Water Supply Project.

The Western South Dakota Water Supply Project would supply western South Dakota with supplemental water drawn from the Missouri River, securing a long-term and sustainable water supply for the region.⁴⁶ As introduced, H.R. 9785 authorizes the appropriation of \$10 million for Reclamation to conduct a feasibility study to evaluate the project’s potential benefits and costs, with a federal share not exceeding 50 percent.⁴⁷

The Lewis and Clark Regional Water System (LCRWS) currently supplies dependable drinking water from the Missouri River aquifer to more than 350,000 people across southeast South Dakota, northwest Iowa, and southwest Minnesota.⁴⁸ LCRWS plans to expand its water capacity from 23.5 million gallons per day (MGD) to 45 MGD by 2028, with plans to reach 60 MGD in the future.⁴⁹ As introduced, H.R. 9785 authorizes the appropriation of \$10 million for Reclamation to conduct a feasibility study to evaluate the potential benefits and costs of expanding the existing project, with a federal cost share not exceeding 50 percent.⁵⁰

The proposed Dakota Mainstem Regional Water System would bring water to South Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, and the Santee Reservation of the Santee Sioux Tribe in Nebraska along the South Dakota border.⁵¹ As introduced, H.R. 9785 authorizes the appropriation of \$10 million for Reclamation to conduct a feasibility study to evaluate the project’s potential benefits and costs, with a federal share not exceeding 50 percent.⁵²

An ANS will be considered at markup to comply with House floor protocols and revise the recommendations that Reclamation must include in a final feasibility study.

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

Staff contact: Richie O’Connell (Richie.O’Connell@mail.house.gov).

⁴⁶ “Progress,” Western Dakota Regional Water System, 2026, <https://wdrws.org/progress>.

⁴⁸ “About Lewis & Clark,” Lewis and Clark Regional Water System, 2026, lcrws.org/about-lewis-clark/.

⁴⁹ *Id.*

⁵⁰ *Id.*

⁵¹ “A New Way Forward,” Dakota Mainstem Regional Water System, Inc., 2026, <https://www.dakotamainstem.com/>;

“Frequently Asked Questions,” Dakota Mainstem Regional Water System, Inc., 2026, <https://www.dakotamainstem.com/frequentlyaskedquestions>.

⁵² H.R. 7288, 119th Congress, <https://www.congress.gov/119/bills/hr7288/BILLS-119hr7288ih.pdf>.

H.R. 10136 (Rep. Westerman), “*Crossett Experimental Forest Act of 2026*”

The 1,685-acre Crossett Experimental Forest (CEF) in Ashley County, Arkansas, has served as a premier site for forestry research and demonstrations for roughly 90 years.⁵³ The CEF historically supported collaborative research among USFS, the State of Arkansas, and the University of Arkansas.⁵⁴ However, in recent years, the CEF has fallen into disrepair due to federal staffing shortages and neglect.

H.R. 10136, introduced by Chairman Bruce Westerman (R-AR-04), directs the Secretary of Agriculture, at the State of Arkansas’s request, to convey the CEF, including the R.R. Reynolds Research Natural Areas and associated facilities, to the State of Arkansas without consideration. The property would continue to be managed as the Crossett Experimental State Forest for forestry research, education, and demonstration, in coordination with the University of Arkansas at Monticello and the University of Arkansas Division of Agriculture. Transferring the CEF to the state will provide the staffing and resources necessary to continue the CEF’s historic mission and maintain the forest as a resource for forest managers, landowners, scientists, and students. An ANS will be offered at markup making minor technical corrections to the bill.

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 Brandon Miller (Brandon.Miller@mail.house.gov).

H.R. 10306 (Rep. Amodei), “*Technical Correction to the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Reservation Water Rights Settlement Act of 2025*”

Enacted as part of Public Law 111-11, the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes (Tribes) of the Duck Valley Reservation Water Rights Settlement Act (Settlement, or Act) authorized \$60 million to implement parts of the Settlement. The Settlement stated that funds be made available to the Tribes after the Settlement’s effective date and directed the Secretary of the Interior, upon the effective date, to manage the funds as a trust fund bearing interest for the benefit of the Tribes.⁵⁵ Congress appropriated the \$60 million between Fiscal Years 2010 and 2014, with the Settlement becoming effective on January 25, 2016.⁵⁶

Contrary to the Settlement, the funds were inadvertently invested under the Obama administration and earned interest of approximately \$5.5 million prior to the effective date.⁵⁷

⁵³ Jim M. Guldin, “The Crossett Experimental Forest—72 years of science delivery in silviculture of southern pines,” U.S. Forest Service, 2009, <https://research.fs.usda.gov/download/treesearch/33681.pdf>.

⁵⁴ *Id.*

⁵⁵ Pub. L. No. 111-11.

⁵⁶ “Statement of Findings: Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Reservation Water Rights Settlement Act,” 81 Fed. Reg. 4063, January 25, 2016, <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2016-01-25/pdf/2016-01401.pdf>.

⁵⁷ Letter to Larry S. Roberts, Bureau of Indian Affairs, from the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation, dated February 29, 2016, https://naturalresources.house.gov/uploadedfiles/investment_ltr_.pdf.

However, the Obama administration declined to pay the Tribes these earnings, claiming it lacked the legal authority to do so.⁵⁸

Sponsored by Representative Mark Amodei (R-NV-02), H.R. 10306 amends the Act to grant DOI the legal authority to transfer to the Tribes the interest earned prior to the effective date on the Settlement funds. The bill, as introduced, authorizes \$5.1 million in back interest for this purpose.

An ANS will be considered at markup to ensure the bill complies with House floor protocols.

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

Staff contact: Richie O’Connell (Richie.O’Connell@mail.house.gov).

S. 675 (Sen. Hoeven), “*Theodore Roosevelt Presidential Library Act*”

The Theodore Roosevelt Presidential Library (Library) officially opened in Medora, North Dakota, on July 4, 2026.⁵⁹ Located near Theodore Roosevelt National Park in the North Dakota Badlands, the privately operated, 96,000-square-foot library features exhibits, historic artifacts, and interactive elements dedicated to the life and legacy of America’s 26th president.⁶⁰ S. 675, sponsored by Senator John Hoeven (R-ND), authorizes DOI, subject to the availability of appropriations, to provide up to \$50 million in matching grants to the Theodore Roosevelt Presidential Library Foundation (Foundation). Before receiving any grant funding, the Foundation must certify that it has already received at least \$100 million from the State of North Dakota or other non-federal sources. The bill also authorizes DOI to loan relevant museum objects to the Library, particularly items not otherwise on public display, while clarifying that the federal government has no role in operating the privately run library facility.

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).

⁵⁸ Letter to Lindsey Manning, Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation, from the U.S. Department of the Interior, dated October 6, 2016, https://republicans-naturalresources.house.gov/UploadedFiles/Letty_Belin_Letter.pdf.

⁵⁹ “Theodore Roosevelt Presidential Library,” Theodore Roosevelt Presidential Library, <https://www.trlibrary.com/>.

⁶⁰ “The Theodore Roosevelt Presidential Library: Where Vision Becomes Place,” Theodore Roosevelt Presidential Library, <https://www.trlibrary.com/tr/legacy/the-library>.

H.R. 4598 (Rep. Leger Fernandez), “*Technical Corrections to the Northwestern New Mexico Rural Water Projects Act, Taos Pueblo Indian Water Rights Settlement Act, and Aamodt Litigation Settlement Act*”

H.R. 4598 amends the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 and the Claims Resolution Act of 2010 to authorize funding for the Navajo Nation Water Resources Development Trust Fund, the Taos Pueblo Water Development Fund, and the Aamodt Settlement Pueblos’ Fund. The authorized funding amount is equivalent to the amounts that would have accrued to the trust funds had DOI possessed the authority to invest the fund’s original appropriation.

When these settlements were enacted, the law did not explicitly allow for DOI to invest the funds upon appropriation. Yet DOI mistakenly started investing the funds.⁶¹ When DOI discovered this error, the Solicitor’s Office determined that the interest amounts earned prior to the funds’ investment authorization date were contrary to the Antideficiency Act⁶² and must be returned to the U.S. Treasury Department.⁶³

H.R. 4598 authorizes back interest to be used for settlement implementation. As introduced, the bill authorizes appropriations totaling \$18.5 million, of which \$7.79 million would be deposited into the Taos Pueblo Water Development Fund, \$4.3 million for the Aamodt Settlement Pueblos’ Fund, and \$6.35 million for the Navajo Nation Water Resources Development Trust Fund.

An ANS will be considered at markup to ensure the bill complies with House floor protocols.

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

Staff contact: Richie O’Connell (Richie.O’Connell@mail.house.gov).

H.R. 7254 (Rep. Huffman), To amend the National Trails System Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the feasibility of designating the Bay Area Ridge National Scenic Trail, and for other purposes.

The Bay Area Ridge Trail (Trail) stretches more than 550 miles around the San Francisco Bay Area, creating a multi-use trail network that connects over 75 parks and recreation areas.⁶⁴ For more than three decades, local public and private entities coordinated to create and expand the Trail, and today roughly 80 percent of the completed Trail is open to hikers, bikers and equestrians.⁶⁵ H.R. 7254 amends the National Trails System Act to authorize a study on the

⁶¹ Testimony of Jason Freihage, “Legislative Hearing to receive testimony on S. 2783, S. 3406, S. 3857 & S. 4365,” Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, July 10, 2024, <https://www.indian.senate.gov/wp-content/uploads/07-10-2024-Freihage-Testimony.pdf>.

⁶² Pub. L. No. 97–258.

⁶³ Testimony of Jason Freihage, “Legislative Hearing to receive testimony on S. 2783, S. 3406, S. 3857 & S. 4365,” Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, July 10, 2024, <https://www.indian.senate.gov/wp-content/uploads/07-10-2024-Freihage-Testimony.pdf>.

⁶⁴ “Federal bill proposes review of Bay Area Ridge Trail for National Scenic Trail status,” Scenic.org, February 11, 2026, <https://www.scenic.org/2026/02/11/congress-considers-adding-a-new-national-scenic-trail/>.

⁶⁵ “Park and Open Space Partners,” Bay Area Ridge Trail Council, <https://ridgetrail.org/park-and-open-space-partners/>.

feasibility of designating the Trail as a national scenic trail.⁶⁶ This legislation neither designates the trail nor expands the federal estate. Any future designation as a national scenic trail would require a separate Act of Congress. An amendment will be offered at markup making technical corrections to the bill.

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 Brandon Miller (Brandon.Miller@mail.house.gov).

H.R. 9269 (Rep. Clyburn), “*Renewing the African American Civil Rights Network Act*”

Established by P.L. 115-04, which President Trump signed into law in 2018, the African American Civil Rights Network (AACRN) officially recognizes important people, places, and events associated with the Civil Rights Movement.⁶⁷ Like other NPS-administered networks, AACRN is a collection of 213 distinct properties, facilities, and programs that connects geographically distant sites and tells the cohesive story of those who fought to advance equality and justice in America.⁶⁸ H.R. 9269 reauthorizes AACRN, which expired on January 8, 2025, to continue providing resources to support conservation, education, and tourism at sites that honor the sacrifices and struggles of the Civil Rights Movement.⁶⁹ An ANS will be offered at markup, shortening the reauthorization from ten years to seven years to comply with House floor protocols.

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. 9600 (Rep. Raskin), “*Common Sense 250 Act of 2026*”

Thomas Paine is best known for writing *Common Sense*, the pamphlet published in early 1776 that galvanized support for the American Revolution. Paine’s writings on representative government, individual rights, and political liberty helped shape the ideas underlying the American Revolution. In 2022, Congress authorized the Thomas Paine Memorial Association to establish a privately funded commemorative work honoring Paine in Washington, D.C.⁷⁰ Under the Commemorative Works Act (CWA), Washington, D.C. is divided into different areas for the

⁶⁶ 16 U.S.C. 27.

⁶⁷ “About the Network,” National Park Service, 2026, <https://www.nps.gov/subjects/civilrights/about-the-network.htm>.

⁶⁸ Elliot Carter, “National Trust for Historic Preservation and Trust for Public Land Applaud Introduction of Bipartisan Legislation to Reauthorize the African American Civil Rights Network,” National Trust for Historic Preservation, 2026, <https://savingplaces.org/press-center/media-resources/national-trust-tpl-applaud-legislation-to-reauthorize-aacrn>.

⁶⁹ “Clyburn, Scott, Blunt Rochester, Carey Reintroduce Renewing the African American Civil Rights Network Act,” The Office of James E. Clyburn, 2026, <https://clyburn.house.gov/clyburn-scott-blunt-rochester-carey-reintroduce-renewing-the-african-american-civil-rights-network-act/>.

⁷⁰ Pub. L. No. 117-328, <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/PLAW-117publ328/pdf/PLAW-117publ328.pdf>.

placement of commemorative works.⁷¹ Area I is reserved for subjects of “preeminent historical and lasting significance to the United States,” and placement within Area I requires additional congressional approval.⁷² H.R. 9600 provides such approval by authorizing the Thomas Paine Memorial to be located within Area I.⁷³

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).

III. CBO SCORES

None available.

IV. EFFECT ON CURRENT LAW (RAMSEYER)

[H.R. 181](#)

[H.R. 1555](#)

[H.R. 4598](#)

[H.R. 5745](#)

[H.R. 7254](#)

[H.R. 9269](#)

[H.R. 9621](#)

[H.R. 9640](#)

[H.R. 10306](#)

⁷¹ *Id.*

⁷² *Id.*

⁷³ “The Reserve Map,” National Capital Planning Commission, <https://www.ncpc.gov/maps/the-reserve/>.