Question 110: What private organizations and businesses did the Administration consult when creating the National Energy Policy report? Will you submit a list to the Committee for our information?

Answer: The Department of the Interior did not request information or views from private organizations and businesses in developing options for consideration in the National Energy Policy effort.

Question 111: The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) has clearly acknowledged that energy prices in California are not "just and reasonable." Yet according to FERC Commissioner William Massey, FERC is not willing to ensure that consumers are protected from these outrageous rates. In light of these facts, why didn't the National Energy Policy Development (NEPD) Group direct FERC to exercise their responsibility and regulate skyrocketing wholesale prices in the West?

Answer: Competition, if implemented effectively, will benefit consumers. The California deregulation plan, unfortunately, was severely flawed and counter-productive in that it did not allow the market to work. In order for electricity markets to function, there must be adequate supplies to meet demand, and there must be efficient means to deliver the goods to the electric power consumers. The major part of the problem of providing adequate supplies in California was locking in enough long-term contract power to provide a strong incentive to increase generating capacity and supply; this was exacerbated by the lack of new local generating facilities and the unusually low amount of hydropower generation due to the extensive regional drought. The problem with regulatory action — establishing price caps to lower the price of electricity in this market is that such caps will do nothing to increase, and may lower, the amount of electricity produced. At the same time the lower prices will increase the amount of electricity consumers use which is immediately and directly counterproductive.

The Administration's view of this unfortunate situation is that it is important for the market to continue to send price signals to consumers that more conservation is needed — especially in the immediate term, and to potential suppliers that more power needs to be produced in both the short and longer terms. This approach appears to be working since conservation is way up in California, and substantial new investment in new and expanded generating facilities is extensive. From FERC actions to date, it appears that there has been inappropriate overpricing of power in some specific cases; FERC appears to be dealing with this, and has ordered refunds where it has determined that overcharging took place.

Question 112: Most of the NEPD Group proposals are long term in scope and will not impact the consumer for many years to come. My constituents are dealing
Question 114: The Bush Administration froze funds for the Low Income Heating and Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP). The NEPD Group has proposed making the future of the program contingent on oil/gas royalties. In fact, the Groups recommendations go as far as to direct the Secretary of Energy to raid weatherization programs to fund LIHEAP. This program directly affects my constituents - people in dire need. Why would your group recommend risking funds for this program when it is so worthwhile?

Answer: The NEPD Group recommended that the President take steps to mitigate the impacts of high energy costs on low-income consumers. The President understands the real impacts of high energy prices on families. Interior will be working with HHS to examine innovative ways to fund our commitment to programs like LIHEAP. One such idea is to bolster LIHEAP funding by using a portion of oil and gas royalty payments. Another idea is to redirect royalties to LIHEAP whenever crude oil and natural gas prices are above a trigger price.

with an energy crisis today. How does the NEPD group propose to relieve this burden in the near future?

Answer: President Bush has directed us to expedite permits for new power production and to work as good partners to reduce our electricity use at federal facilities, especially during the peak periods this summer. The President has also instructed us to work with Congress in increasing funding for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) and allow use of oil and gas royalties for that program when oil or gas reaches certain prices.

Question 113: Extensive drilling will take place if this proposed National Energy Policy becomes a reality. How will the Administration ensure local voices are heard and taken into consideration when making decisions about drilling? How will you ensure that these activities are not taking place disproportionately in minority communities?

Answer: Leasing decisions are made only after extensive planning with ample opportunity for public participation. If applicable, we will proceed in light of Executive Order #12898 February 11, 1994 on Environmental Justice. Agencies must analyze the environmental effects (ie, human health and economic and social effects) of their actions -- including their effects on minority communities and low-income communities-- when such analysis is required by NEPA. Also, agencies must provide opportunity for community input in the NEPA process, including identifying potential effects and mitigation measures in consultation with affected communities and improving the accessibility of meetings, crucial documents and notices.
Question 115: The NEPD Group recommends what looks to be national electricity deregulation to increase competition. In light of the FERC's inability to live up to its responsibilities to ensure "just and reasonable" prices, how can we ensure that the price gouging of the West doesn't spread nationwide?

Answer: It is difficult to draw a general conclusion about deregulation from the California example. The risk that the California experience will repeat itself is low, since other states have not modeled their retail competition plan on the California model.

Question 116: The federal budget proposed by President Bush cut research for renewables, which would increase electricity generation and protect our environment. At the same time, the NEPD group recommends an increase in the Administration's requested funding for renewable research. How can you explain this discrepancy?

Answer: One NEPD recommendation was that the President should direct the Secretary of Energy to conduct a comprehensive review of current funding and historic performance of renewable and alternative energy research. The President is committed to increasing America's use of renewable and alternative energy.

Question 117: According to scientists throughout the world, your recommendations are sure to cause an increase in global warming. Yet, you make no mention about the climate in your policy discussion. Was this issue addressed during the NEPD Group's meetings? How will you ensure that the policy's actions don't increase greenhouse gas emissions?

Answer: The primary focus of the Administration on global warming is being addressed through the cabinet-level Global Climate Change Task Force which is currently assessing the science and potential actions to address the issue. While global warming was discussed in the processes of developing the National Energy Policy, the NEPD consciously deferred dealing with this issue because of the more comprehensive analysis on global climate change being conducted. There are a number of major elements in the National Energy Policy, however, that will help address global climate change including the major emphases on energy conservation, natural gas, clean coal technology, nuclear energy, and alternative energy sources such as wind, geothermal and solar power.

Question 118: One of the proposals that the NEPD Group put forth requires the Secretary of Transportation to provide Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFÉ) standards that will not negatively affect the auto industry. The Report says nothing about how the CAFÉ standards affect the environment, or about the Environmental Protection Agency's participation in the determination of
those standards. How will you ensure that the Secretary of Transportation takes into consideration the environmental impacts of the CAFE standards?

Answer: This question relates directly to a recommendation made by the NEPD that the President has tasked to the Secretary of Transportation. The Secretary of Transportation must craft CAFE standards that increase efficiency without adversely affecting the automotive industry. The President believes that environmental protection and economic growth are not mutually exclusive.

Question 119: The NEPD Group’s recommendations strongly support the expedited use of nuclear energy. How can the Administration endorse such a plan when we have not yet found a safe way of disposing of spent nuclear rods?

Answer: While I am perhaps not the most appropriate person to answer this question, I believe that the Administration will continue to study the science of disposal. In addition, the NEPD Group did recommend international partnerships to design reprocessing and fuel treatment technologies that are cleaner, more efficient, less waste-intensive, and more proliferation resistant.

(WILSON) Bureau of Reclamation and the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District

Question 120: As you know, the New Mexico office of the Bureau of Reclamation loaned the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District money for work on the Middle Rio Grande Project in 1951 and the San Juan-Chama Project; both projects involved District irrigation improvements and water. The Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District paid off the first loan last year. It recently tried to pay off the San Juan-Chama loan, but the Bureau refused to accept the payment and claimed indefinite control over these projects. This in effect federalizes the control of local water rights, whether intended or not. Will you direct the local office of the Bureau to accept complete repayment for the loan?

Answer: The Reclamation decisions carried out by the local office were discussed and supported by the highest levels of Reclamation and the Department. The Reclamation Act does not authorize Reclamation to issue loans. Rather, in the Reclamation Act, Congress authorized the funding and construction of federal Reclamation projects and provided that the dams and reservoirs that make up those federal projects would remain in federal ownership until Congress provided otherwise. Thus, when Congress authorized the federal Middle Rio Grande Project in 1948, it did not provide a situation where lands and facilities would be held as collateral for a loan, but rather was creating a federal Reclamation project which would remain in federal ownership until Congress made other provision. Consequently, the repayment of construction costs is not the equivalent of a
mortgage payment but instead is the price paid for water delivery from federal facilities.

Additionally, the Reclamation laws impose conditions upon those who enter into contracts for Reclamation water. Those conditions include price and acreage limitations in order to control the benefits provided by Reclamation projects and ensure they are provided to the largest number of people possible. Therefore, Congress also placed stringent conditions upon the repayment of construction obligations and the termination of price and acreage limitations.

In 1951, the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District (MRGCD) contracted to repay, without interest, the reimbursable costs of the Middle Rio Grande Project. In 1963, that contract was amended to include repayment, without interest, of a supplemental water supply from the San Juan Chama Project.

Acting pursuant to authority provided to the Secretary by Congress in 1962, Reclamation constructed the SJ-C Project to furnish irrigation water to Native Americans, Pueblo lands, and other lands within MRGCD. Additionally, the SJ-C Project provides water for municipal and industrial purposes and recreation and fish and wildlife benefits in New Mexico. The SJ-C Project is a transbasin diversion which helps to satisfy New Mexico’s entitlement to water from the Colorado River and helps meet the increasing demands in the Rio Grande basin. The United States holds title to all lands acquired for the San Juan-Chama Project and owns and operates all SJ-C Project facilities. El Vado Dam was rehabilitated by the United States and the spillway and outlet works were reconstructed and enlarged to accommodate the SJ-C Project, and as a result, the spillway and outlet works of El Vado Dam are owned by the United States.

In 2000, MRGCD completed repayment for the Middle Rio Grande Project portion of its contract but has until 2022 to repay the approximately $2.4 million balance on the San Juan-Chama (SJ-C) Project portion. On May 14, 2001, MRGCD attempted to present Reclamation with a check. After consultation with its Solicitors, Reclamation declined to accept payment because Section 213 of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (RRA) precludes lump sum or accelerated repayment by water users unless specifically provided for in a contract existing prior to enactment of the RRA. MRGCD’s contract requires repayment in 50 consecutive annual installments ending in 2022 and makes no provision for lump sum or accelerated repayment. Legislative action is necessary before Reclamation can accept complete repayment.

Section 213, Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (96 Stat. 1269; 43 U.S.C. § 390mm), paragraph (c), states:

74

22995

DOE024-0401

Obtained and made public by the Natural Resources Defense Council, March/April 2002
Nothing in this title shall be construed as authorizing or permitting lump sum or accelerated repayment of construction costs, except in the case of a repayment contract which is in effect upon the date of enactment of this Act and which provides for such lump sum or accelerated repayment by an individual or district.

Since 1902, acreage limitation has been a major condition for receiving subsidized water from Reclamation projects, and through the RRA, acreage-limitation remains an important part of Reclamation law westwide. Legislative history indicates that Congress intended Section 213 to preclude water users from using lump sum or accelerated repayment to circumvent the ownership and full-cost pricing limitations of the RRA. Legislation exempting MRGCD from Section 213 might be viewed as a signal that Congress no longer supports the ownership and full-cost pricing limitations of the RRA.

MRGCD has stated publicly that its objective is to terminate Contract No. 178r-243 and obtain title to project lands and facilities in order to remove the federal presence from the Middle Rio Grande Project. An exemption from Section 213 authorizing early payout would not accomplish this objective because Reclamation law requires that title to project lands and facilities must remain in the name of the United States until Congress provides otherwise.

Reclamation law also requires a contract with the United States before water can be delivered from a Reclamation project (Section 46 of the Omnibus Adjustment Act of 1926 and Section 9(d) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939).

Section 46, Omnibus Adjustment Act of 1926 (44 Stat. 6749, 43 U.S.C. § 423e) states:

No water shall be delivered upon the completion of any new project or new division of a project until a contract or contracts in form approved by the Secretary of the Interior shall have been made with an irrigation district or irrigation districts organized under State law providing for payment by the district or districts of the cost of constructing, operating, and maintaining the works during the time they are in control of the United States, ...

Section 9(d), Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (43 U.S.C. 485b(d)) states:

No water may be delivered for irrigation of lands in connection with any new project, new division of a project, or supplemental works on a project until an organization satisfactory in form and powers to the Secretary, has entered into a repayment contract with the United States, in form satisfactory to the Secretary, providing among other things ... That the
general repayment obligation of the organization shall be spread in annual installments, of the number and amount fixed by the Secretary, over a period of not more than 40 years, ...

Question 121: The local Bureau of Reclamation office has refused to accept repayment of a federal loan from the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District. This defies common sense. This position is unacceptable and may be contrary to law. Is this the official position of the Bush Administration or reflection of the local Bureau of Reclamation office policy? Do you support this policy or will you reverse the position of the local Bureau of Reclamation?

Answer: Reclamation and I share your view that interest-free loans should be recovered quickly whenever possible. However, the Middle Rio Grande Project was authorized subject to the full body of Reclamation law.

Section 203 [Middle Rio Grande Project], Flood Control Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1179)

In carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall be governed by and have the powers conferred upon him by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388), and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, except as is otherwise provided in this Act or in the reports referred to above. This Act shall be deemed a supplement to said Federal reclamation laws.

Section 213 of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (RRA) appears to leave Reclamation no administrative remedy to solve this problem without Congressional assistance. We believe that legislation exempting the District from Section 213 is necessary before Reclamation can accept their lump sum payment.

Even though a statutory exception from Section 213 and other provisions of the RRA could facilitate prepayment, such an exception alone will not achieve the District's publicly stated desires to terminate its contract and obtain title to project facilities.

Title to project facilities does not automatically transfer to the District when their contract is paid in full. Section 6, Reclamation Act of 1902 (32. Stat. 389, 43 U.S.C. §§491, 498), states:

Provided, that when the payment required by this act are made for the major portion of the lands irrigated from the waters of any of the works herein provided for, then the management and operation of such irrigation works shall pass to the owners of the lands irrigated thereby, to be
maintained at their expense under such form of organization and under such rules and regulations as may be acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior: Provided, that the title to and the management and operation of the reservoirs and works necessary for their protection and operation shall remain in the Government until otherwise provided by Congress.

This is also reiterated in Article 29 of the District’s contract, which specifically states: “Title to all works constructed by the United States under this contract and to all such works as are conveyed to the United States by the provision hereof, shall, as provided in Article 26, be and continue to be vested in the name of the United States until otherwise provided for by Congress, notwithstanding the transfer hereafter of any such works to the District for operation and maintenance.”

I do not believe that current law allows this prepayment. Our management actions must continue to comply with the law.

Question 122: If the reason for the Bureau’s policy is based on statute, it clearly has unintended consequences. Will you provide Congress with specific language that will allow us to correct this situation for the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District?

Answer: We appreciate your willingness to seek a legislative remedy and are willing to work with your staff and the District to find a solution for this situation. Reclamation believes that legislation would be required in order to terminate MRGCD’s contract without terminating water delivery. Reclamation also believes that legislation would be required before title to project lands and facilities could be transferred from the United States to MRGCD.

Termination of the contract and transfer of title to project facilities would reduce the federal presence in the Middle Rio Grande Project. Termination of the contract would terminate MRGCD’s right to receive water from both the Middle Rio Grande and the San-Juan Chama projects unless Congress deauthorized the projects and removed them from Reclamation law. Legislation which would fully accomplish this objective would be complex.

An exemption from Section 213 of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (RRA) alone would not relieve MRGCD of all of the acreage limitation and reporting requirements of the RRA. Despite early payout, MRGCD would remain subject to acreage limitation and reporting requirements unless the legislation also exempted MRGCD from other portions of the RRA. A comprehensive exemption from RRA requirements might be viewed as precedent-setting.

The United States holds water rights for the six Native American Pueblos (Acts of February 14, 1927, March 13, 1928, August 27, 1935, and June 30, 1938). These
rights are satisfied first through natural flow of the Rio Grande, but any deficiencies are made up through Rio Grande water stored in El Vado Reservoir under a 1981 agreement. Water is delivered to the Pueblos through facilities of the Middle Rio Grande Project. The Secretary of the Interior has a trust responsibility to the Pueblos associated with the Pueblos' entitlement to receive water through project facilities to irrigate lands which were reclaimed under the Middle Rio Grande Project. A portion of the Pueblo right has first priority over any water right lands within MRGCD, and the water right for reclaimed Pueblo lands has priority equal to water delivered to other water right lands within MRGCD. Additionally, because the Middle Rio Grande Project facilities must continue to deliver Pueblo water, a portion of the federal interest in the Middle Rio Grande facilities would survive title transfer.

The reach of the Middle Rio Grande from which MRGCD obtains its water supply is considered critical habitat for the endangered Rio Grande silvery minnow. In 1999 a coalition of environmental groups filed suit against the United States and MRGCD alleging violations of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in the operation of the Middle Rio Grande Project. Authorization of early payout could impact the outcome of ongoing litigation in the Federal District Court for the District of New Mexico (CIV 99-1320-JP/RLP-ACE, Rio Grande Silvery Minnow vs. J. William McDonald, et al., and Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District)

Many municipal providers, such as the City of Albuquerque, receive a municipal and industrial water supply from the SJ-C Project and have repayment contracts with Reclamation similar to MRGCD's contract. Additionally, it would be inconsistent if MRGCD were the only entity to receive title transfer to any SJ-C Project facilities by repaying its portion of the construction obligation.
Attachment A

OCS Policy Committee Meeting (May 24, 2001)

The OCS Policy Committee is an independent advisory committee chartered under the Federal Advisory Committee Act to give the Secretary of the Interior advice on discretionary issues related to implementation of the OCS Lands Act. The members represent Governors of coastal States, local government, environmental interests, and the offshore oil and gas, minerals and fishing industries.

In October 2000, the OCS Policy Committee established a Natural Gas Subcommittee to independently review and evaluate information on natural gas, and then provide an assessment of the contribution the OCS can make to meeting the short term and long term natural gas needs of the United States within the framework of a national energy policy. The subcommittee forwarded its report with accompanying recommendations for consideration of the OCS Policy Committee on April 20, 2001.

Action Taken: The OCS Policy Committee on May 24, 2001 amended the Subcommittee recommendations and adopted the resolution to forward its amended recommendations to the Secretary of the Interior.
OCS POLICY COMMITTEE
Resolution of the OCS Policy Committee on Recommendations based on
The Report from the Subcommittee on Natural Gas

In consideration of the duty of the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Policy Committee to provide
policy guidance to the Secretary of the Interior on issues related to the management, protection, and
development of mineral resources on the OCS, the following resolution is hereby adopted in
Alexandria, Virginia on this 24th day of May, 2001;

WHEREAS, growth of U.S. consumptive demand for natural gas is currently of national interest,
with projections as high as 30 trillion cubic feet (Tcf) of natural gas annually by the year 2015,
representing a 50 percent increase over current national consumption;

NOTING that if the offshore is expected to maintain the same percentage contribution towards
future U.S. gas consumption, the annual gas production from Federal waters will have to be
increased to reach about 7 to 8 Tcf from its current level of 5 Tcf;

WHEREAS, the OCS Policy Committee established a Subcommittee to independently review and
evaluate information on natural gas, and then provide an assessment of the contribution the OCS
can make to meeting the short term and long term natural gas needs of the United States within the
framework of a national energy policy; and

WHEREAS, the Subcommittee on Natural Gas, after careful review and due consideration of
significant factors including resource, production, and demand projections; infrastructure;
alternatives; the environmental safety record of, and current technologies and procedures used by,
the offshore industry; leasing moratoria; safety and operational considerations unique to natural
gas; and social impacts; has prepared a report that documents its review and offers
recommendations; but does not evaluate energy, fuel, or building efficiencies and the roles these
may play in the nation's energy needs over the next several decades; and

WHEREAS, the report of the Subcommittee will help guide the Secretary of the Interior and the
Minerals Management Service (MMS) in identifying the role of the OCS in addressing the natural
gas needs of the nation by identifying potential issues and policy options;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the OCS Policy Committee that the attached
recommendations based on the Report of the Subcommittee on Natural Gas are approved and
adopted by the OCS Policy Committee; and

Further, Be It Resolved, that the Secretary of the Interior is urged by the OCS Policy Committee to
take timely action to implement the recommendations of this Committee.

Outer Continental Shelf Policy Committee
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Chairman Donald F. Oltz, Jr.
OCS Policy Committee Recommendations Based
On the Report from the Subcommittee on Natural Gas
May 24, 2001

After consideration of the available information concerning the supply and demand for energy in
the U.S., the Policy Committee finds that natural gas should be considered as a significant part of
an energy base, which includes alternatives and conservation programs. Recognizing that natural
gas is only a portion of a national energy policy, the Policy Committee makes the following
recommendations:

17. The Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) should be viewed as a significant source for increased
supply of natural gas to meet the national demand for the long term.

18. Congressional funding to MMS and other critical agencies such as Fish and Wildlife
Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, DOE, and EPA, should be assured to allow
staff to accomplish the work necessary to increase production of natural gas in an
environmentally sound manner from the OCS.

19. Future production will have technical and economic challenges; therefore, following on
the success of the deep water royalty relief program, MMS should develop economic
incentives to encourage new drilling for natural gas in an environmentally sound manner
in deep formations, subsalt formations, and in deep water. Such incentives should be
considered for both new leases and existing leases to maximize the use of the existing
natural gas infrastructure on the OCS.

20. The MMS, in cooperation with industry, should encourage increased natural gas
production in an environmentally sound manner from existing OCS leases.

21. The Policy Committee supports the existing 5-year leasing program. However, the leasing
process can be improved with increased congressional funding for mitigation, including
impact assistance funds, revenue sharing, and local participation in the decisionmaking
process.

22. Encourage congressional funding for additional education and outreach regarding the
leasing program.

23. With regard to improving the leasing process, the Policy Committee also recommends that
MMS:

Include the mitigation of local social, cultural, and economic impacts within its policy
determinations and recommendations.
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Consider how the Bureau can restructure its decisionmaking process to provide for greater input from local communities, including the opportunity for MMS, the industry, and local residents to attempt to reach agreement on controversial matters and how they should be adjusted, remedied, or mitigated—at specific times and places that various activities occur.

Conduct a comparative assessment of environmental risk between offshore and onshore production, where onshore reserves exist in the same area as offshore reserves.

Encourage operators to provide natural gas to the local communities in all areas.

Specifically in Alaska,

Give special consideration to local, social, cultural, and economic impacts in northern Alaskan communities, in light of the unique subsistence culture in, and the remoteness of, these communities.

Adopt as a resource tool the 1994 NRC Committee report entitled "Environmental Information for Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Decisions in Alaska" (National Academy Press, 1994).

1. The MMS, partnering with DOE, should expand cooperative research with other agencies and industry seeking technical solutions to leading edge issues such as seismic imaging of subsalt areas and drilling in deep formations.

2. The MMS, in cooperation with DOE, should encourage international cooperation in development of gas hydrates in an environmentally sound manner, with a goal of a pilot program in place within 10 years.

3. A gas pipeline from Alaska to the lower 48 States would favorably encourage an increase in natural gas production by creating favorable economics for Federal OCS production in Alaska. The Policy Committee recommends that DOI work with other agencies to expedite all appropriate permit reviews for such a pipeline.

4. To help develop information and enhance an informed public debate on whether or not there are grounds and support for a limited lifting of moratoria in existing moratoria areas, the MMS in consultation with industry and affected states, should identify the 5 top geologic plays in the moratoria areas, and if possible, the most prospective areas for natural gas in the plays that industry would likely explore if allowed. The following process would be used:

   Encourage congressional funding to MMS for the acquisition of seismic data to assist in narrowing down prospective areas. It is important that these data be non-proprietary, which would be the case if acquired exclusively by MMS.

   Encourage congressional funding for environment and social/human impacts studies for broad based or specific to 5 prospective geological plays.

   Establish a site-specific stakeholder consultation process that would permit a sharing of information and discussion of concerns regarding the pilot areas.
1. Although the following are not under the purview of the MMS and the Policy Committee, it is recommended that a national energy policy consider:

- Continuing to expand and develop the national pipeline infrastructure, looking at corridor access, environmental, safety and regulatory issues, and capacity.
- Encouraging dual fuel capacity for new electricity generating plants.
- Encouraging the review by the Administration of cost-effective tax incentives to increase the production of natural gas.
- Encouraging conservation and increasing efficiency in the use of natural gas, as a part of a national energy policy portfolio.
### SUMMARY OF BUREAU APPROPRIATIONS (all dollar amounts in thousands)

Comparison of 2001 Request with 2001 Enacted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations</th>
<th>2001 Request</th>
<th>2002 Request</th>
<th>Change From 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Lands and Resources</td>
<td>6,494</td>
<td>6,514</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildland Fire Management</td>
<td>2,445</td>
<td>2,445</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Hazardous Materials Fund</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments in Lieu of Taxes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon &amp; California Grant Lands</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range Improvements</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Charges, Deposits &amp; Forfeitures</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Trust Funds (Indefinite)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12,405</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Appropriations</td>
<td>10,167</td>
<td>2,146,677</td>
<td>10,173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Permanents and Trusts

| Miscellaneous Trust Funds                           | 13  | 1,595     | 13  | 1,595    | 0   | 0        |
| Permanent Operating Funds                           | 0   | 19,419    | 0   | 133,610  | 0   | 114,191  |
| Ops. & Main. of Quarters                            | 2   | 155       | 2   | 155      | 2   | 155      |
| Recreation Fee Collections                          | 1   | 125       | 1   | 125      | 0   | 0        |
| Recreation Fee Demonstration                        | 71  | 7,500     | 71  | 8,000    | 0   | 500      |
| Forest Ecosystems Health & Recovery                 | 127 | 5,332     | 124 | 10,917   | (3) | 5,585    |
| Expenses, Road Maintenance Deposits                 | 21  | 2,999     | 21  | 2,999    | 0   | 0        |
| Timber Sale Pipeline Restoration Fund               | 83  | 513       | 80  | 334      | (3) | (179)    |
| Southern Nevada Land Sales                          | 10  | 50,575    | 10  | 50,575   | 0   | 0        |
| Southern Nevada Earnings on Investments             | 0   | 1,737     | 0   | 2,752    | 0   | 1,015    |
| Land Sales, Deshutes County                         | 0   | 648       | 0   | 0        | 0   | (648)    |
| Lincoln County Land Sales                           | 0   | 0         | 0   | 5,313    | 0   | 5,313    |
| Interest, Lincoln County Land Sales Act             | 0   | 0         | 0   | 102      | 0   | 102      |
| Commercial Film & Photography Fees                  | 0   | 500       | 0   | 500      | 0   | 0        |
| White River Oil Shale Mine (Utah Sale)              | 0   | 700       | 0   | 0        | 0   | (700)    |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Purchases/Land Sales</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>4,000</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>10,875</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>6,875</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Perm. Operating Funds</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>74,784</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>92,647</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>17,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helium Fund</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offseting Collection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(14,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(15,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Capital Fund</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offseting Collection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(33,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(31,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Permanents and Trusts</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>95,798</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>227,852</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>132,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal, Reimbursable &amp; Other FTE</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>10,771</td>
<td>2,242,475</td>
<td>10,771</td>
<td>2,000,279</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(242,196)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>