



## Amendments to H.R. 5055: Fiscal Year 2017 Energy and Water Appropriations (Rep. Simpson, R-ID) – Part I

CONTACT: [Matt Dickerson](mailto:Matt.Dickerson@rsc.house.gov), 202-226-9718

The Committee Report can be found [here](#), and the text of the legislation can be found [here](#). The Legislative Bulletin on the bill can be found [here](#).

**This Legislative Bulletin includes summaries of amendments for which votes were requested last night. Additional amendments will be summarized in Legislative Bulletins as they become available.**

### SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF AMENDMENTS:

1. **[Clawson \(R-FL\)](#)**: Would increase funding for the Construction account of the Army Corps of Engineers by \$50 million and would decrease funding for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR) by \$50 million.

The bill funds the Construction account at \$1.946 billion, a level that is \$856 million above the president's budget request, \$83 million above the FY 2016 enacted level, and \$315 million above the level proposed by the House Appropriations Committee for FY 2016. The SPR is funded at \$257 million, a level that is equal to the president's budget request, \$45 million above the FY 2016 enacted level, and \$45 million above the level proposed by the House Appropriations Committee for FY 2016.

2. **[McNerny \(D-CA\)](#)**: Would strike authorizing provisions of the bill related to California water. The underlying bill includes provisions from [H.R. 2898, the Western Water and American Food Security Act of 2015](#), related to flow requirements for the Old and Middle Rivers, state water project offset and water rights, prohibiting funds to implement the Stipulation of Settlement (*Natural Resources Defense Council, et al. v. Kirk Rodgers, et al.*) and for additional storage at the New Melones Reservoir. H.R. 2898 passed the House on July 16, 2015, by a [245 - 176](#) vote.
3. **[Griffith \(R-VA\)](#)**: Would increase Fossil Energy Research and Development by \$45 million and would reduce Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) by \$50 million.

Fossil Energy Research and Development is appropriated \$645 million, a level that is \$285 million above the president's budget request, \$13 million above the FY 2016 enacted level, and \$40 million above the level proposed by the House Appropriations Committee for FY 2016. EERE is

appropriated \$1.825 billion, a level that is \$1.073 billion below the president's budget request, \$248 million below the FY 2016 enacted level, and \$167 million above the level proposed by the House Appropriations Committee for FY 2016. The [RSC Budget](#) called for eliminating both of the programs involved in this transfer.

4. [Buck \(R-CO\)](#): Would eliminate funding for energy subsidies in the bill, including for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE), Nuclear Energy, and Fossil Energy. In total, the amendment would save \$3.482 billion.

The [RSC Budget](#) called for eliminating these programs, stating that "Just as this budget calls for the elimination of "green" energy subsidies, it also calls for the elimination of subsidies for conventional energy sources ... Instead of government-directed subsidies, the U.S. should pursue a market-oriented "all of the above" energy strategy."

5. [First Polis \(D-CO\)](#): Would increase Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) by \$9.75 million and would reduce Fossil Energy Research and Development by \$13 million.

EERE is appropriated \$1.825 billion, a level that is \$1.073 billion below the president's budget request, \$248 million below the FY 2016 enacted level, and \$167 million above the level proposed by the House Appropriations Committee for FY 2016. Fossil Energy Research and Development is appropriated \$645 million, a level that is \$285 million above the president's budget request, \$13 million above the FY 2016 enacted level, and \$40 million above the level proposed by the House Appropriations Committee for FY 2016. The [RSC Budget](#) called for eliminating both of the programs involved in this transfer.

6. [Second Polis \(D-CO\)](#): Would reduce Fossil Energy by \$285 million, taking funding down to down to the president's budget request of \$360 million.

Fossil Energy Research and Development is appropriated \$645 million, a level that is \$285 million above the president's budget request, \$13 million above the FY 2016 enacted level, and \$40 million above the level proposed by the House Appropriations Committee for FY 2016. This program conducts research on fossil fuels, such as coal, oil, and natural gas. Of the total funding, \$442 million is for coal.

The [RSC Budget](#) proposed eliminating this account. Several conservative groups have opposed this program, including [American Energy Alliance](#), [Cato](#), [Citizens Against Government Waste](#), [Heritage Foundation](#), and [National Taxpayers Union](#).

7. [Weber \(R-TX\)](#): Would reduce funding for the Title 17 Loan Guarantee Program by \$7 million, which would eliminate the net appropriation for administrative expenses, thereby preventing any new loans from being made under the program.

The [RSC Budget](#) proposed eliminating this program, stating: "This is the program that gave us the Solyndra scandal that resulted in the taxpayers losing more than \$500 million after the administration gambled on a politically favored company." Several conservative groups have supported eliminating this program, including [American Energy Alliance](#), [Americans for Prosperity](#), [Cato](#), [Heritage](#), [Mercatus](#), and [Taxpayers for Common Sense](#).

8. [Welch \(D-VT\)](#): Would increase Northern Border Regional Commission by \$2.5 million and reduce the Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR) by \$2.5 million.

The Northern Border Regional Commission is funded at \$5 million, equal to the president's budget and \$2.5 million below the FY 2016 enacted level.

The [RSC Budget](#) proposed eliminating the five regional commissions, including the Northern Border Regional Commission, stating: "The economic development programs are duplicative of other programs in the federal government and provide federal funding for local projects... These activities are also more appropriately carried out by state and local governments." Several conservative organizations have supported eliminating these commissions, including [Americans for Prosperity](#), [Citizens Against Government Waste](#), [Heritage Action](#) and [National Taxpayers Union](#).

9. [Ellison \(D-MN\)](#): Would establish Congressional intent that \$1 million of DOE Departmental Administration funding would be to create an "Office of Good Jobs".

Such an office has been advocated for by the [leadership PAC associated with the Congressional Progressive Caucus](#) on a federal government-wide basis.

10. [Farr \(D-CA\)](#): Would strike the rider in the bill inserted in the base bill by RSC Chairman Flores to prohibit the use of funds to carry out the [National Ocean Policy](#) under Executive Order 13547.

The National Ocean Policy was established by an Executive Order that mandates new priorities for all federal agencies to follow when issuing permits or authorizing activities for any activity which might affect ocean quality – including inland activities. In addition to creating a further level of bureaucracy without statutory authorization, these policies would create more uncertainty for inland businesses, mandating where activities can and cannot occur in the ocean and coastal zones, could over-ride local and state zoning authorities, and will lead to litigation attempting to stop or needlessly delay Federally-permitted activities.

11. [Garamendi \(D-CA\)](#): Would prohibit funds made available by the bill to expand plutonium pit production capacity at the [PF-4 facility](#) at the Los Alamos National Laboratory. These pits are at the core of weapons in the U.S. strategic arsenal, and an increase in production may be necessary to accommodate the [life extension programs](#) for various warheads, including the W78 and W88.

---

**NOTE:** *RSC Legislative Bulletins are for informational purposes only and should not be taken as statements of support or opposition from the Republican Study Committee.*

###