



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 28, 2018

No. 109

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable DEAN HELLER, a Senator from the State of Nevada.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Sovereign God, thank You that Your mercies endure forever. Show us Your ways and teach us Your paths as You lead us with Your truth.

Today, set the hearts of our lawmakers on Heaven's way. In all of their actions, may they seek Your celestial approval. Remind them that You are the only constituent they absolutely must please. May our Senators stand on Your promises and lean on Your grace.

Lord, thank You for Your mercy. You lift the lowly, satisfy the thirsty, and fill the hungry with good things.

And, Lord, thank You for the faithfulness of our summer pages.

We pray in Your Holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 28, 2018.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable DEAN HELLER, a Senator from the State of Nevada, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HELLER thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2018

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 2, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Roberts amendment No. 3224, in the nature of a substitute.

McConnell (for Thune) amendment No. 3134 (to amendment No. 3224), to modify conservation reserve program provisions.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

RETIREMENT OF JUSTICE ANTHONY KENNEDY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I want to take another opportunity to pay tribute to Justice Anthony Kennedy, who announced yesterday that he will retire from active service and assume senior status at the end of July.

Justice Kennedy deserves our sincere thanks for his service and our congratulations on a truly remarkable ca-

reer. He served our Nation on the Federal Bench for 43 years, 30 of which he spent as an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

His contributions to American jurisprudence have been many. In particular, he has earned our gratitude for his steadfast defense of the vital First Amendment right to political speech.

We congratulate Justice Kennedy, his wife Mary, and their entire family on this well-earned retirement. We wish them every happiness during the additional time they will get to spend together in the years ahead.

FILLING THE UPCOMING SUPREME COURT VACANCY

As I stated yesterday, the Senate stands ready to fulfill our constitutional role by offering advice and consent on President Trump's nominee to fill the vacancy that Justice Kennedy's retirement will create. The Senate will vote to confirm Justice Kennedy's successor this fall.

This is not 2016. There aren't the final months of a second-term, constitutionally lame duck Presidency with a Presidential election fast approaching. We are right in the middle of this President's very first term.

To my knowledge, nobody on either side has either suggested before yesterday that the Senate should process Supreme Court nominations only in odd-numbered years. The situation today is much like when Justice Kagan was confirmed in 2010 and when Justice Breyer was confirmed in 1994 and Justice Souter in 1990. In each case, the President was about a year and a half into his first term.

So just as on numerous other occasions, the process to confirm Justice Kennedy's successor will take place this year. As in the case of Justice Gorsuch, Senators will have the opportunity to meet with President Trump's nominee, examine his or her qualifications, and debate the nomination. I am confident Chairman GRASSLEY will capably lead the Judiciary Committee

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S4689

through the confirmation process that lies before us.

The President's nominee should be considered fairly and not subjected to personal attacks. Unfortunately, far-left special interest groups are already calling on Senate Democrats to oppose anyone—anyone—on President Trump's long list of potential nominees. The ink wasn't even dry on Justice Kennedy's resignation letter before my friend the Democratic leader seemed to echo that right here on the floor—that none of the exceptional legal minds on this list would be tolerable to him.

Think of that. These are 25 Americans from all over the country who have excelled in their professions. The idea that any of them—let alone all of them—would be automatically unacceptable is totally absurd.

Unfortunately, I am afraid this may just be a precursor of all the unfair attacks to come, both from inside and outside the Senate.

Fortunately, we have every reason to expect an outstanding selection. President Trump's judicial nominations to date have reflected a keen understanding of the vital role judges play in our constitutional order: interpreting the law fairly, applying it evenhandedly, setting aside personal preferences, and assessing what the law actually says. These traits have characterized the excellent nominees the President has sent to the Senate. I look forward to another such nomination.

Mr. President, on another matter, we hope to wrap up our consideration of the farm bill, a victory for American agriculture. All week, I have highlighted some of the ways this important legislation will support the family farmers whose harvest feeds America and supplies the world.

It is an understatement to say this bill comes at an opportune time. American farm communities need stability, and they need predictability—and they need it urgently.

The industry is filled with uncertainty. There are volatile world markets. There are persisting low commodity prices. There are natural disasters beyond their control. All of these things make it harder for our growers to go about their business. They depend on the kind of long-term certainty that this legislation will provide.

This subject is extremely important to me, as the proud senior Senator from the Commonwealth of Kentucky and as a Member who has served on the Agriculture Committee since my first day in office. Agriculture is in the bones of our State. It is a huge part of who we are. From soybeans and corn to hay and tobacco, to poultry and livestock, Kentucky agriculture encompasses a multibillion-dollar industry that supports thousands and thousands of good jobs in nearly every corner of the Commonwealth. Kentuckians know as well as anyone just how important

American agriculture is, and we understand as well as anyone all of the unique challenges it faces.

That is why I am pleased to support this bill, which will bolster the safety net programs for our producers. It will also enhance infrastructure investment in rural communities on everything from local water projects to broadband internet, to helping curb the drug epidemic in rural America. And it gets Washington out of farmers' way in areas where bureaucracy is holding them back.

One such area is industrial hemp. Consumers across America buy hundreds of millions in retail products every year that contain hemp. But due to outdated Federal regulations that do not sufficiently distinguish this industrial crop from its illicit cousin, American farmers have been mostly unable to meet that demand themselves. It has left consumers with little choice but to buy imported hemp products from foreign-produced hemp.

Fortunately, this farm bill will change that. It builds on the success of the pilot program I initiated 5 years ago and will break down the major Federal barriers that prevent American farmers from fully exploring the burgeoning hemp market. When this becomes law—subject to proper regulation and oversight—U.S. producers will no longer be barred from this legitimate U.S. market.

I am also proud of how this farm bill has come about. The chairman and ranking member, Senators ROBERTS and STABENOW, assembled it through an exemplary bipartisan committee process that included 73 amendments. Here on the floor, 18 more bipartisan amendments were adopted in the substitute amendment. It was my personal hope that we could have had even more amendment votes, but the Senate is a consent-based institution, and Members have the ability to object. Nevertheless, the transparent and open leadership of Chairman ROBERTS and Ranking Member STABENOW has been commendable.

Now the time has come to deliver. The farm bill is too important a subject to keep our farmers and their families waiting. After all, the groups charged with advocating on their behalf overwhelmingly support it. More than 500 industry groups and advocates representing agriculture, food, nutrition, hunger, forestry, conservation, faith-based and research interests have already publicly backed the Senate bill. Nearly 70 such groups had this to say in a recent letter to Congress: "During a prolonged recession in agriculture, failure to pass a farm bill on time would undermine the financial security of America's food, fuel, crop and fiber producers."

The Senate must not fail that test. It is time to pass the farm bill.

TAX REFORM

Mr. President, on another matter, it has been a little over 6 months since this Republican Congress passed his-

toric tax reform legislation. Already, we have seen big headlines: millions of worker bonuses, plans for thousands of new jobs, and billions of dollars being invested here in the United States; individual companies announcing billions in new American investments; small business optimism at its highest level since President Reagan's first term.

But these national headlines don't tell the whole story on their own. This week, I have discussed how tax reform is already transforming American families' kitchen-table conversations: how lower rates and larger deductions are letting them pocket more of their hard-earned money and how our new corporate tax structure has already started paving the way for higher wages.

If you pick up a local paper in almost any State, you will find yet another angle to this story. From Montana to Florida, Americans are paying less to keep the lights on. That is right. Despite warnings from our Democratic colleagues that tax reform savings would never reach consumers, utilities all across America are already making that happen.

In my home State of Kentucky, the new Tax Code led to announced rate cuts of up to 6 percent for Kentucky Utilities and Louisville Gas & Electric customers.

Just this month, Idaho Power announced a 7-percent rate cut for consumers.

In Pennsylvania, Metropolitan Edison is one of 17 utilities that is planning to deliver rate savings, thanks to the new tax law. On July 1, more than half a million customers in Philadelphia can expect their electric bills to drop by as much as 8 percent.

Help with the monthly bills, higher take-home pay, and new job opportunities because American enterprise is thriving are what tax reform means around middle-class kitchen tables. This is why Republicans passed this historic law.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

FILLING THE UPCOMING SUPREME COURT VACANCY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, yesterday, Justice Anthony Kennedy announced his retirement, creating a vacancy on the Supreme Court. After Kennedy's departure, the Supreme Court will be evenly divided between Justices appointed by Republican Presidents and Justices appointed by Democratic Presidents. Whoever fills Justice Kennedy's seat on the Court will have an opportunity to impact the

laws of the United States and the rights of its citizens for a generation.

Because Justice Kennedy was frequently independently minded and was a deciding vote on important issues like marriage equality and a woman's right to choose, a more ideological successor could upend decades of precedent and drag America backward to a time before Americans with pre-existing conditions could affordably access healthcare, to a time before women could not be prosecuted as criminals for exercising their reproductive rights, to a time before gay and lesbian Americans could marry whom they love. An ideological Justice more extreme in his views than Kennedy could eviscerate the rights of workers to organize and bargain collectively for a fair wage and stretch the bounds of Executive power for a President who has demonstrated little respect for them.

Of course, if Republicans were consistent, they would wait to consider Justice Kennedy's successor until after the midterm elections. Time and again, Leader MCCONNELL justified his unjustifiable blockade of Merrick Garland by claiming the American people should have a voice in deciding the next Supreme Court Justice. That was in February of an election year. It is now almost July.

If the Senate's constitutional duty to advise and consent is just as important as the President's right to nominate, which the Constitution says it is, why should a midterm election be any less important than a Presidential election? Leader MCCONNELL is simply engaging in hypocrisy.

Whomever the President picks, it is all too likely they are going to overturn healthcare protections and *Roe v. Wade*. We don't need to guess. President Trump has said time and again he would appoint judges who would do those two things—overturn *Roe v. Wade* and overturn healthcare protections. On November 11, 2016, then President-Elect Trump said: "I am pro-life; the judges will be pro-life." In a debate against Secretary Clinton, then-Candidate Trump said: "Because I am pro-life, and I will be appointing pro-life judges, I would think that that will go back to the individual states." It is impossible to conclude that President Trump will appoint a Justice whom we can have faith will leave *Roe v. Wade* as settled law. President Trump said, in his own words, that he wants to appoint a Justice to give the Court a majority that will overturn *Roe v. Wade*, so count on it.

President Trump will, in all likelihood, nominate a Justice willing to send *Roe* "back to the states"—again, those are President Trump's own words—where several are preparing, if not already prepared, to roll back a woman's right to choose. In fact, according to the Guttmacher Institute, there are at least 18 States where abortion would be wholly or partially illegal almost immediately. That is

against what America wants. It is because the President and his hard-right ideological judicial acolytes are way far away from where the American people are and are trying to create a Court that will turn the clock backward in so many ways, with *Roe* at the top of the list.

We also know President Trump will likely nominate a Justice willing to reinterpret the Court's ruling that our current healthcare law is constitutional. Again, listen to President Trump's own words. On January 1, 2016, Candidate Trump said that "Justice Roberts turned out to be an absolute disaster because he gave us *ObamaCare*." Later, he said: "I don't think I'll have any catastrophic appointment like Justice Roberts."

Even Justice Roberts was too far to the middle for the President on healthcare. President Trump made it crystal clear that he is going to nominate somebody hostile to the Court's ruling on healthcare. There is no other way to interpret President Trump's words, so count on it. He will appoint a nominee who will roll back healthcare protections for tens of millions of Americans. America doesn't want that, but, again, the hard-right acolytes whom President Trump listens to want to use the Court to roll back America's rights and privileges.

We can be sure the next nominee, of course, will obfuscate, deny, and hide behind the shop-worn judicial dodge: "I will follow settled law." As we saw this week in the *Janus* decision, settled law is only settled until the Supreme Court Justices on the Court decide it isn't. Yesterday, they reversed 40 years of precedent in a ruling that stretched the meaning of the First Amendment to meet their ideological predispositions—their anti-union bias.

Already there is a case wending its way through the courts that questions the constitutionality of the healthcare law. By repealing the coverage requirement, Republicans have removed the foundation upon which the Chief Justice based his ruling to uphold the law. If the change in the law changes Justice Roberts' mind, which is very likely, and the new jurist is as biased against our healthcare system as President Trump said he or she will be, millions of Americans could see their pre-existing condition protections wiped out.

I say to America, 80 percent to 90 percent of you believe we should have pre-existing condition protections. The nominee of the President is likely to undo them and leave tens of millions of American families helpless. Stand up now, America, before this happens.

The Trump administration decided the Federal Government will not defend the law protecting preexisting conditions in the Court. The next Supreme Court Justice may indeed be faced with casting a deciding vote on the fate of our healthcare, and we already know, unfortunately, the kind of vote President Trump wants.

Now, my friend Leader MCCONNELL warned the Senate to not get into personal attacks on the President's nominee. Of course, he doesn't seem to mind the President who makes personal attacks his daily MO, but be that as it may, I can assure my friend the Republican leader that there is no desire and no need to get into personal attacks.

There are so many weighty issues hanging over the vacant seat: a woman's right to choose, the fate of our healthcare law, the right of workers to organize, the pernicious influence of dark money in politics, the right of Americans to marry whom they love, the right to vote. We will discuss these issues on the merits and consider a nominee in light of these issues, but discussing a preordained list of candidates who meet the hard right's ideological litmus tests? That is certainly legitimate, and we are going to continue to bring that up. We will evaluate the President's nominees on the issues, but every American should have his or her eyes wide open to the fact that President Trump is not picking the best legal mind. He has sworn to nominate a Justice culled from a preordained list, vetted by the Heritage Foundation and the Federalist Society—organizations whose mission has been to repeal *Roe v. Wade* and strike at the heart of our healthcare law. Does anyone believe a nominee on that prevetted list doesn't want to challenge *Roe*? How do you think they got to be on that list, with the Federalist Society, led by Leonard Leo, whose goal is to repeal *Roe v. Wade*, putting it together, and Trump rubberstamping it? Given what the President has said, it is virtually certain that members of the list of 25 would vote to overturn *Roe*.

So let this be a call to action for Americans from all corners of the country to rise up and speak out. Don't let this new Court—this new nominee, whomever he or she may be—turn back the clock on issue after issue because President Trump has embraced a hard-right group who has a veto power over nominees. Don't let us turn back the clock, America. Stand up. Speak out. Democrats, Republicans, liberals, conservatives—all should want a much fairer process.

America, tell your Senators that if you do not want a Supreme Court Justice who will overturn *Roe v. Wade*, those Senators should not vote for a candidate from the list.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. President, a word on immigration. Yesterday, the House Republican majority tried and failed to pass two distinct immigration proposals. They cannot find agreement, even within their own caucus, on how to handle the situation at the border or broader reforms to our immigration system. It is as clear an indication to date that President Trump must fix this situation on his own. He has the power to immediately and administratively reverse his family separation policy at

the border, which remains intact. He has the power to appoint a family reunification czar, to marshal and organize the various Federal agencies in charge of reunifying families. President Trump should exercise that power to start cleaning up the mess he made with his slapdash family separation policy.

RUSSIA

Mr. President, this morning, the President tweeted that “Russia continues to say they had nothing to do with meddling in our election” before trying to turn the focus back on the FBI. Why does President Trump take the word of bullies like Mr. Putin at face value, while constantly questioning the credibility of our own intelligence agencies? It’s outrageous. We don’t ask the bank robber if they robbed a bank.

Seventeen intelligence agencies have concluded, definitively, that Russia has meddled in our election. There is no reason to question their findings. The President just continues to deliberately spread falsehoods for the sake of his personal political interests.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, I again rise, especially today, as the Senate continues to consider legislation on an issue that is critically important to our Nation. It is the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, or what we call the farm bill.

I want to emphasize again—and I don’t know how I can emphasize this more strongly—that I hope my colleagues will understand that the responsibility, the absolute requirement is to provide farmers, ranchers, growers, and everyone within America’s food chain certainty and predictability during these very difficult times that we are experiencing in agriculture.

As I speak, right now in Kansas, farmers are on combines, and trucks are taking grain to the elevator or to storage, more likely, with the wheat harvest. I can see in several counties, probably up in Northwest Kansas. We have finished that in the southern part of our State. These are the same folks who have had combines on the move from Texas to Oklahoma and now in Kansas. I can see a farmer who had planned on harvesting this week, but, perhaps, due to a hail storm, he is in a bad situation. Luckily for him, he has crop insurance, and luckily for him, we have been able to preserve crop insurance after going through several iterations of attempts to cut it—or, as some people say, reform it. I can see

him saying: When is the Congress going to pass the farm bill? When can I go to my banker, my lender, and tell him I have assurance that I can keep going on the farm next year, especially if his crop has been destroyed, which happens.

That is the person I am thinking about, especially today, when I think we ought to wrap this up. It is time, especially with regard to what we have accomplished so far. The bill passed the Ag Committee. This bill had a strong bipartisan vote of 20 to 1.

This month, this bill exactly provides the certainty and the predictability that I have just mentioned. The Ag Committee product also includes portions of 67 stand-alone bills, and an additional 74 amendments were adopted in the committee, and we have included 18 amendments thus far during consideration in the full Senate. We have worked to include as many priorities for Members as possible, and we want to work on a possible managers’ package to include a handful of additional amendments. So it is not like a situation where Members have not had an opportunity to vote. Senator STABENOW and I have extended our out-reached hands to Members to say that we stand ready to consider your amendments.

We are endeavoring to craft a farm bill that meets the need of producers across all regions and all crops. In Michigan, where oftentimes I go with Senator STABENOW and have agriculture roundtables, or even individual visits, I look at that great State’s production with regard, more specially, to special crops. They are struggling. Kansas farmers are struggling. California growers are struggling. All of agriculture is struggling—not just one or two commodities. We must have a bill that works across all of our great Nation.

More than 500 organizations representing thousands in agriculture, food, nutrition, hunger, forestry, conservation, rural business, faith-based organizations, research, and academic issues have issued statements supporting this bill. This is what happens when the Senate works in a bipartisan fashion. We are doing just that. This is a good bill that accomplishes what we set out to do—again, to provide certainty and predictability for farmers, families, and rural America.

It is especially timely when we have a trade policy that has a question mark at the end of it. I dearly hope that the President is successful with trade negotiations—with NAFTA. I think we should take another look at TPP or China and the problem with tariffs. I know the administration is trying to send a very strong message and address the trade deficit that we have had, but the moment that happens, there is retaliation, and 90 percent of the time, the retaliation comes at agriculture and small manufacturers all across the country, and for that matter, everybody up and down the

food chain and in many other areas of the economy as well.

So, again, that farmer is out there on that combine in Kansas trying to finish up his crop. Hopefully, the weather has not destroyed it, but, again, if that has happened, he at least has crop insurance. He wants assurance, and I know what he is saying because I visit with them all the time.

In my entire public career, this is my eighth farm bill. This is not our first rodeo, Senator STABENOW, as you well know.

I know what he is thinking. He is thinking: ROBERTS said he would get us a bill. Senator MORAN says he is going to get us a bill. The entire Kansas delegation says: We are working on a farm bill. And we do that every time.

We need to wrap this up today. I look forward to working with my colleagues on continuing to move this process forward. I would simply say that we need to get this done. Again, the paramount issue is to get it done and to provide farmers certainty and predictability.

If I sound like I am repeating that 10 times, I intend to. All other issues, which I know Senators feel are terribly important, come into second place. I have strong issues. I mean, this is not the best possible bill. It is the best bill possible, and we worked very hard to produce that.

I yield to my distinguished colleague from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I am here to join Chairman ROBERTS with his sense of urgency and his comments this morning.

We have worked very hard, and the distinguished Presiding Officer, who is part of the committee, knows that we have produced a bill that is a strong bipartisan bill. It has gone on to address many other interests and needs that Members have brought forward in the substitute, and we are now working with Members as well. But there is a sense of urgency in the country. There are so many things right now that are up in the air for farmers and ranchers. It is a very difficult time.

This bill, really, is a bill that provides a safety net for farmers and a safety net for families. As for families, because the economy is getting better, we are actually saving money. Over \$80 billion is going to be saved in taxpayer dollars not used over the next 10 years because the economy is getting better. People don’t need temporary help.

But for our farmers, because of prices that have dropped significantly, because of questions about trade and markets, because of questions about labor and so many other things, they are under tremendous stress.

Then, you add the weather. I was just in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan on Sunday night and Monday, where rain came crashing down in just a few hours and created flooding and mudslides and wiped out homes and key operations and other things that are going to take

weeks and months for folks to recover from. The riskiest business in the world is farming. Nobody else is getting up in the morning and looking at the weather report and determining whether they are even going to have a business.

By the way, we want them to have a business. We have the safest, most affordable food supply in the world because of the folks who are willing to get up every day and do this and take this risk for us and, frankly, for the world. So we have a responsibility to them.

It just breaks my heart when I see headlines in the paper now about the suicide rate going up for farmers. It is higher than for any other group of people. Our strong dairy farmers are people who put everything on the line, family operations, and because of the stress coming at them from every way now, they are in a terrible situation. They are counting on us to do what we can to provide certainty and stability for them, and the No. 1 way we can do that is to get this bill passed. I can't think of a better way to say "Happy Fourth of July" than to say that the U.S. Senate, on a bipartisan basis, has overwhelmingly passed a bill to support them.

We know there are other issues on both sides of the aisle. We know in conference committee there is going to be a wild and woolly debate as we go forward on a number of things. We understand there are other issues we can revisit at that time. We both have been through conference committees. We know what that is all about.

Here is what we know right now: We have a strong, bipartisan bill that helps every single region of this country. We have a big, diverse country, and we help all of our farmers and ranchers. We address conservation in every part of our country. We address food access and create integrity in programs that are very important to have, and we do all of that in a bill we can be proud to pass on a bipartisan basis. So now is the time to do that. Then we will continue working.

We know there is more we need to do to work with the House in coming to a broader consensus. We know there are other issues our colleagues will want to bring forward in that process, but today—today—we can say to farmers and ranchers, large and small: We hear you. We understand what is going on, and we are going to do what we can today to provide the certainty and predictability they need and a sense of confidence that there are people who are fighting for them and who are going to continue to fight for them until we can get them the certainty and predictability they need. I hope we are on path to doing that today.

It has been my great pleasure to work with the chairman of the committee. I am very grateful for our friendship and a great working relationship. We are going to do everything we can today, working with our colleagues, to get that done.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank my colleague and my friend.

How many times have we heard from the folks back home: Why on Earth do you folks back there keep fussing at one another? Why don't you work together to get something done? Well, amen to that. That is the bill we have produced.

I remember the gold medal ceremony of Senator Bob Dole. He was presented a gold medal for his tremendous leadership in the Senate. He was known for working across the aisle and getting things done. When we awarded that gold medal several months ago in Statuary Hall, Bob, at 94 years old, stood up when they played the national anthem, from his wheelchair, on his own.

For a time on a Tuesday, we were partisan in the House and to some degree in the Senate. I could go into all the cloture votes I have felt were not necessary—104, 105; I don't know how many we have had—and 4 months of delay, but I am not going to do that. So on Tuesday, we were partisan; Wednesday, we were bipartisan, paying tribute to Bob. Everybody said: Well, why can't you emulate his example and work together? Then, after Wednesday, on Thursday, we were back to some partisan differences or philosophical differences. Compromise, again, was a dirty word.

Well, this is our opportunity. We have proved that we can work together on the Ag Committee. We are the least partisan committee in the Congress. For goodness' sake, when agriculture is almost in a crisis and we desperately need to provide the farmers with the knowledge that we are fashioning a bill to their benefit and that it is a good bill, why on Earth can't we get this done?

I thank my colleague for her comments.

I yield the floor.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, if I might just take one more moment, I just want to underscore what Chairman ROBERTS had said earlier. We have 500 different organizations in support of this, from every piece of the 12 titles, every part of the country, every agricultural group, every conservation—we have hunting and fishing groups. We have folks who care about international trade, folks who care about trading at home with their neighbors, and people who care about food access. There are 500 organizations that have come together around this bill with a sense of urgency to get it done, so I am very hopeful we can do that today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. PERDUE. Madam President, I rise today to comment on something that is somewhat misunderstood in many parts of our country, and that is the farm bill.

I have the privilege to sit in a seat of the U.S. Senate once held by Saxby Chambliss, a former chairman of this

Agriculture Committee. I am fortunate to be from a State where agriculture is our largest industry. I am fortunate to sit on this committee, and we have just heard from two people, two leaders, the ranking member, Senator STABENOW from Michigan, who is my good friend, and my good friend Senator PAT ROBERTS, the chairman. This is a bipartisan committee.

People sent me up here 3 years ago. They said: Look, we need you to go there and get something done. I said: OK, fine.

We know we have two opposing views in Washington, so that means you are going to have to compromise. I made the comment that no one gets everything they want. I remind people, anyone, that I am married; I mean, this is something that is the American way. I come from the American business community. I can tell you that nobody gets 100 percent of everything they want in any deal. That is what we are talking about today.

This is a bill that moves this agenda forward. It provides certainty—and that is what this is about—for our agriculture industry. It is not about subsidies. It is not about protection. It is about certainty. It is about protecting a strategic industry in our country. I want to make that point upfront. This is very definitely a strategic industry.

The United States today enjoys a God-given position in the world. We are one of the three major bread baskets in the world. The world needs us to be successful in our agricultural industry.

There are hungry people in the world whom we can feed in our capacity here in the United States. Our productivity in many of our commodities has gone up in my lifetime dramatically.

I grew up working on a farm, and I can tell you, I know we produce a lot more corn per acre today than we did when I was 6 years old. This is an amazing productivity story, and the rest of the world needs that today.

A big reason our State continues to be the best State in the country is that we understand this. We have a port that we can export from. We have God-given land and water and God-given people who understand how to work that land with that given water, and we produce great products not only for our country but for the world.

For the last year and a half, we have been working on this farm bill, and all the members of that committee, myself included, have gone all over the country, listening to farmers and ranchers around the country. I have been all over my State talking to our farmers and ranchers about what is important to them.

I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for providing the framework, really, for this particular farm bill. This is, indeed, a strategic industry. It must survive, and it is different.

Getting to a farm bill that balances the needs of every commodity and every region is not an easy task. This

is not a partisan problem. It is not even a regional problem. This is the United States trying to make the best use of our God-given blessings. I am happy to say that this year's farm bill does that.

Over the last year, we have all traveled around and heard what has been said. One thing is very clear; this farm bill is indeed a jobs bill. Getting it across the finish line today, hopefully, is simply a must for rural communities in Georgia and around the country.

We have worked on this in a bipartisan fashion. I am proud to say to the people back home that this is a compromise they wanted us to come up here and achieve, and it does exactly what we wanted. It achieves the objective of providing certainty for an agricultural industry that is indeed a strategic asset in the United States.

We have kept programs in place that have helped farmers in Georgia and around the country weather the low commodity market we have seen in the last couple of years. The chairman just mentioned that there are some entities and commodities that are at historic lows.

We have cracked down on fraud within the food stamps program. We have advanced turf grass and timber research. We have included provisions important to land grant universities.

This farm bill is not perfect, but as I said, it is a great compromise that achieves the objective.

One provision that has been eliminated would help ensure that American textile mills have the tools they need to compete with other countries, for example. I hope we can find a way to fix that.

However, as I said earlier, growing up and working on the land, I learned many hard lessons. At an early age, I learned that agriculture is not just a business; it is a way of life for many people around our country.

This farm bill is an investment in those people, in our ag industry, and, indeed, in our country. It is not just the product that is grown in the soil; it is the processing, transportation, retail, and, indeed, the end consumer.

There are things here meant to assist farmers only during tough times. When we say "strategic industry," we have to be responsible for the survival and the transfer of the industry from generation to generation.

Madam President, as you well know, in your home State, as in mine, most of the agricultural production in the country comes from family farms. President Trump is working to renegotiate trade deals with other countries and create a level playing field with the rest of the world. This is absolutely critical.

I have lived in this trade world for most of my career. The President is trying to get equal access in other markets around the world. I know this is a tough thing after 50, 60 years of having an imbalanced trade environment, where the United States served a

purpose to develop the rest of the world. We have to now stand up and provide a balance within those trade deals.

We have reduced global poverty. Since 1965, when the Great Society was signed, the United States almost singlehandedly—on the back of our open market, on the back of our trade deals, and on the back of the our military, which provided for safe transportation of goods around the world—has reduced poverty by more than 60 percent. I have seen that happen in my career, in my lifetime.

Unfortunately, in the United States, the poverty rate today is basically the same as it was in the sixties. That is not a partisan comment. We all bear responsibility for that.

What this President is trying to do is say: Hey, wait a minute. Something is out of balance. Our ag community has been harmed by that. What we are trying to do is create a level playing field, and this farm bill supports that.

Over the long term, this bill will bring certainty to the American agricultural community. The last things family farms need from Washington today are more burdens, more regulations, and more intrusion. All of that takes away from the certainty and the planning it takes to manage a family farm.

Some people are planting a plant that will not mature for 20 years, in some cases. Some of these men and women in these families are putting product in the ground that they will not benefit from, that their heirs will benefit from. They will have to harvest it after they are dead, in many cases.

People say: Well, we need to take care of the land. Well, absolutely. Do you know that the best husbands of the land and the water and the air around the world, in my experience, have been farmers? There is a very simple reason why. If they don't take care of their God-given blessings in the land, in the water, and in the air, and if they don't produce what they need, they surely can't hand it down to the next generation.

Farms across our country have considerable differences, based on things from region, to crops, to climate conditions. Given these differences, one-size-fits-all measurements clearly don't work. A farm in Iowa is different from a farm in Georgia, in many cases.

As I have said, this farm bill is not perfect. It is unfortunate that there is now an amendment on this farm bill that would measure appropriate and significant contributions to the family farm by applying a single manual labor threshold for farms across the country, and I think this is just wrong. The opportunity to qualify as an active contributor—and I put that in quotes, "active contributor"—to the farm through management, bookkeeping, and other activities is important because it recognizes the contributions of all family members and individuals who actually participate in farming operations. I can

tell my colleagues from personal experience that if it were not for my aunts, my cousins, my uncles, our farms would not have been successful. I have lived it. I know the difference that we are talking about here from region to region.

If the full scope of active participants in the farm is not taken into consideration, a bank may be reluctant to actually finance the operation. I have lived that.

The point is this: Even if an individual never drives a tractor, never plows a field, never milks a cow, he or she can still provide an important contribution to the vitality of the farm operation. It is a business, after all. Businesses have marketing, they have finance, they have sales, they have operations, and they have planning. Management contributions are as important as manual labor in this industry, just like it is in every other industry.

Amendments like this will lead to burdensome recordkeeping for family farms and could indeed put in jeopardy the ability to transfer that farm to the next generation.

President Trump has promised to roll back overreaching regulations and look out for rural America. Since he took office, over 870 regulations have been reversed, bringing relief to family farms and rural Americans. With this farm bill, the Trump administration and the U.S. Senate Agriculture Committee have prioritized rolling back those overreaches. These should be our shared interests because it is good for our entire country and our economy.

Between now and when this farm bill reaches President Trump's desk, I hope this problem with the bill gets fixed, and there are ways to do that.

As I said, while the current farm bill is not perfect, I am proud to stand today and encourage every Member of this body to support it and vote for it. It does provide certainty in a very uncertain world for our agriculture community and the families who are the backbone of that industry.

I am delighted to be a member of this committee. I take that honor very seriously. The legacy, as I mentioned to begin with, coming in behind an esteemed Senator, Saxby Chambliss as chairman—I take this responsibility very seriously.

I want to commend the chairman and ranking member for pulling together this farm bill, and I hope to see it come to a vote, hopefully today.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RETIREMENT OF JUSTICE ANTHONY KENNEDY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I am a day late with the news, but Justice Anthony Kennedy, of course, announced

he is leaving the bench at the end of the month, and I would be remiss if I didn't start my remarks this morning by thanking him for his 40-plus years of service to this country on the Federal bench.

He has presided over and authored the majority opinion in many high-stakes cases of national importance. As the news has pointed out, after Sandra Day O'Connor left the Court, he has been that pivotal fifth vote in a lot of really significant cases, which is to say, you can't really typecast Justice Kennedy, but I do believe he has remained committed to upholding the integrity of the legal system throughout the course of his career.

I can say, as a former State supreme court justice myself, I know the work he has been doing has been painstaking, time-consuming, and extraordinarily important all at the same time. So I express my gratitude, on behalf of my constituents, to Justice Kennedy for his willingness, ability, and determination to carry out that work.

While serving on the Supreme Court for the last three decades, after having been appointed by President Reagan, he has furthered the pursuit of American justice, one case at a time, which is exactly what Justices are supposed to do, through calm times and politically turbulent times—perhaps, some might say, times like the present. He recognizes that our core institutions are essentially democratic institutions, answerable to the people through their elected representatives.

While the Court has a unique role in interpreting the Constitution—which is the fundamental bedrock law of the Nation—in cases that don't turn on the constitutionality of the statute, it is important to defer to decisions made by the elected representatives of the people because we are the ones accountable to the electorate for those decisions. Judges, by their nature, are not because they aren't elected. They don't run for election. So their fidelity is supposed to be to the law and not to a personal agenda or politics or any other agenda.

Justice Kennedy was an important member of the Court that recognized an individual right to bear arms under the Second Amendment and recently upheld the President's prerogatives to protect national security.

As Justice Kennedy concludes his term this next month, we, of course, wish him well, along with his wife Mary and their children, and we wish them many more happy—and, hopefully, a little less stressful—years together.

FILLING THE UPCOMING SUPREME COURT VACANCY

Meanwhile, the Senate will conduct our constitutional role of offering our advice and consent on whomever President Trump nominates. As the senior Senator from Connecticut said yesterday, "The Senate should do nothing to artificially delay" consideration of the

next Justice. I have heard conflicting views, but I agree with the senior Senator from Connecticut.

This is consistent with the standard set by former President Obama and Vice President Biden. In 2010—which was a midterm election—Senate Democrats confirmed President Obama's nominee to the court, Elena Kagan. Before that, when he was a Senator, Joe Biden argued that Supreme Court nominees should not be confirmed during Presidential election years. So one was a midterm, Elena Kagan. Merrick Garland—whom we will hear more about from our Senate Democratic colleagues—came up during a Presidential election, a time during which Joe Biden said that nominees should not be confirmed in the runup to a Presidential election.

After President Trump makes his selection, Senators will have the opportunity to meet with the nominee, examine his or her qualifications, and debate them. We will have a hearing under the Senate Judiciary Committee. This will be the sixth Supreme Court Justice nominee I will have had the privilege to serve on the Senate Judiciary Committee for and question. Then, this fall, we will vote to confirm Justice Kennedy's successor.

Justice Kennedy placed a deadline on his time in office. He is retiring July 31. So any idea of delaying this and leaving the Court short-handed, particularly under these circumstances, really is beside the point.

I know Chairman GRASSLEY will, as usual, manage a fair, thorough, and efficient confirmation process. He always does. It is crucial that as this process begins to unfold, the President's nominee not be subjected to personal attacks from an increasingly agitated and vitriolic political base.

My philosophy on the role of a judge is simple: Decisions should not be made on the basis of the judge's personal beliefs but from the analysis of legal doctrine and actual reading of the legal texts. The President, I believe, understands that. That is the sort of model out of which Neil Gorsuch's nomination came. That is also why we confirmed so many of his excellent choices in the 18 months of his administration.

I look forward to another outstanding selection and a thorough and efficient confirmation process. Then, in the end, we will vote to confirm the President's nominee this fall.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT RISK REVIEW MODERNIZATION ACT

Mr. President, on a separate note, yesterday, the White House released a statement from President Trump regarding an important piece of bipartisan legislation, which I introduced with the senior Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, called the Foreign Investment Risk Review Modernization Act or FIRRMA.

This concerns, as the Presiding Officer knows, the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States. Our adversaries around the world have sim-

ply figured ways to game foreign investment in the United States to get access to intellectual property and the know-how to duplicate that property surreptitiously, taking advantage of the gaps in the Committee on Foreign Investment's jurisdiction. So we are updating that legislation. It passed unanimously out of the Banking Committee, passed then out of the Armed Services Committee, and now is a part of the Senate-passed Defense authorization bill.

As President Trump mentioned, this bill will enhance our ability to protect the United States from new and evolving threats posed by foreign investment while, at the same time, preserving our ability to engage in international commerce and create new opportunities benefiting our economy and our people.

Let me make clear, this is not to discourage foreign investment. I think foreign investment is a good thing, but when our adversaries look to exploit gaps and antiquated language in some of our statutes in order to gain unfair advantage and seek access to intellectual property in dual-use technology that has national security implications, we need to act, and that is what we have done.

The President concluded that FIRRMA will provide much needed tools to combat the predatory investment practices that threaten our critical technology and national security. I think he is exactly right, and I am glad he pledged to implement FIRRMA promptly and enforce it rigorously once it is enacted into law.

I wish to express my appreciation to Treasury Secretary Mnuchin—who is the convening authority of the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States—and the entire Cabinet for their input and their support for what we are trying to do.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks the statement in its entirety. I will read a couple paragraphs because it was pretty strong. The President of the United States said:

Should Congress fail to pass strong FIRRMA legislation that better protects the crown jewels of American technology and intellectual property from transfers and acquisitions that threaten our national security—and future economic prosperity—I will direct my Administration to deploy new tools, developed under existing authorities, that will do so globally.

What the President is saying, and what was reinforced by Secretary Mnuchin in my conversations with him, is the President is depending on this bipartisan legislation being enacted into law and providing the tools necessary to protect our national security. If Congress, for some reason, stumbles and fails to pass this legislation, the President has made clear he intends to act unilaterally to fill that void.

I applaud the President and this administration for giving Congress a

chance to work with the administration to fill this gap through a bipartisan, bicameral legislative process and to not just leap into that void and try to do it unilaterally, perhaps causing more confusion and less predictability.

In conclusion, the President said:

I applaud Congress on its progress toward passing robust FIRRMA legislation. I urge Congress to send me a strong bill as soon as possible and look forward to implementing it to protect America's security and prosperity.

The Senate bill we passed takes a carefully tailored approach, and the House passed a similar version earlier this week by a vote of 400 to 2.

I look forward to working with my colleagues throughout the Senate-House conference process to ensure the CFIUS review process is sufficiently strengthened and meets the goals that we and the President share.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT FROM THE PRESIDENT REGARDING
INVESTMENT RESTRICTIONS

(Issued on: June 27, 2018)

I have often noted, consistent with the Section 301 action initiated by the United States Trade Representative, that certain countries direct and facilitate systematic investment in United States companies and assets in order to obtain cutting-edge technologies and intellectual property in industries those countries deem important. Accordingly, I directed the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with other senior executive branch officials, to report to me regarding appropriate measures to address these concerns.

I have been advised by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the United States Trade Representative, the Assistant to the President for Economic Policy, and the Director of the Office of Trade and Manufacturing Policy, among others, that Congress has made significant progress toward passing legislation that will modernize our tools for protecting the Nation's critical technologies from harmful foreign acquisitions. This legislation, the Foreign Investment Risk Review Modernization Act (FIRRMA), will enhance our ability to protect the United States from new and evolving threats posed by foreign investment while also sustaining the strong, open investment environment to which our country is committed and which benefits our economy and our people.

After reviewing the current versions of FIRRMA with my team of advisors—and after discussing them with many Members of Congress—I have concluded that such legislation will provide additional tools to combat the predatory investment practices that threaten our critical technology leadership, national security, and future economic prosperity. Therefore, upon enactment of FIRRMA legislation, I will direct my Administration to implement it promptly and enforce it rigorously, with a view toward addressing the concerns regarding state-directed investment in critical technologies identified in the Section 301 investigation.

Should Congress fail to pass strong FIRRMA legislation that better protects the crown jewels of American technology and intellectual property from transfers and acquisitions that threaten our national security—and future economic prosperity—I will direct my Administration to deploy new tools, developed under existing authorities, that will do so globally.

To further ensure a robust defense of American technology and intellectual property, I have also directed the Secretary of Commerce to lead an examination of issues related to the transfer and export of critical technologies. Through this review, we will assess our Nation's export controls and make any modifications that may be needed to strengthen them to defend our national security and technological leadership. Additionally, I have directed the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Defense, and the United States Trade Representative to engage with our allies and partners to support their efforts to combat harmful technology transfer and intellectual property theft.

I applaud Congress on its progress toward passing robust FIRRMA legislation. I urge Congress to send me a strong bill as soon as possible and look forward to implementing it to protect America's security and prosperity.

Mr. CORNYN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President pro tempore.

FILLING THE UPCOMING SUPREME COURT
VACANCY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I come to this lectern to speak on a subject of perennial importance. It is a subject I know a little something about—one that will not only influence the Senate agenda in the near term but will determine the direction of our democracy for decades to come. I speak, of course, on the future of the Supreme Court.

Yesterday, Justice Anthony Kennedy—a great friend of mine and a wonderful Justice on the Court—announced his intention to step down, effective July 31. Justice Kennedy has served this Nation with the highest distinction. Over the course of his tenure, he has exercised outsized influence on the Supreme Court and has played a pivotal role in some of the most consequential Court decisions of modern times—from *McDonald v. City of Chicago* to *Citizens United v. FEC*.

As a testament to his independence, he rightly gained a reputation as the Supreme Court's swing vote. Sometimes he sided with the Court's liberal wing. At other times, he sided with the conservatives. Yet he always sided with what he believed to be the correct interpretation of the law. What more could we ask from a judge?

Throughout his public service, Justice Kennedy has mentored a generation of jurists who went on to become luminaries in their own right. Not the least among them is Justice Neil Gorsuch, a former Kennedy clerk who now serves as his equal on the Supreme Court. With his onetime pupil now working alongside him—and with dozens of former clerks now serving on the Federal bench—Justice Kennedy leaves behind a legal legacy that is almost without equal. Although he will be stepping down next month, his influence on our judicial system will be felt for generations to come.

With Justice Kennedy's impending retirement, the responsibility now falls on us to confirm an able replacement. In the coming weeks, the President will announce his nominee to fill Justice Kennedy's seat. In doing so, he will

seek the advice and consent of the Senate, which is a process that entails confirmation hearings and extended hours of debate in order to fully vet the qualifications of the President's nominee.

The questions we should ask during this confirmation hearing should focus solely on the judge's qualifications: Does he or she have the requisite experience to adjudicate wisely from the bench? Does he or she understand the proper role of a judge under the Constitution? Does he or she respect our Constitution? Is he or she committed to upholding its principles no matter the consequence?

This process should be simple, straightforward, and, most importantly, nonpolitical, but it rarely is. That is because we already know the Democrats will do everything they can to politicize a process that should not be politicized. We already know that many of them will ask questions of the nominee and will have an ulterior motive in mind—to divine his or her partisan leanings rather than to evaluate the quality of his or her jurisprudence.

How do we know the Democrats will do this? It is because we have seen them do it time and again. It started with the character assassination of Robert Bork, and it culminated in the unholy inquisition of Clarence Thomas. Tensions seemed to subside for a time, but then came the unprecedented filibuster of Samuel Alito and, most recently, the public flagellation of Neil Gorsuch.

In every case, the nominee in question possessed indisputable credentials and an airtight judicial record, but in every case, my colleagues sought to drag these men into the partisan gutter—asking questions designed to parse their political positions rather than their legal philosophies.

In my 42 years of Senate service, I have witnessed the gradual deterioration of the judicial confirmation process. As the former chairman of the Judiciary Committee and now as its longest serving Republican member, I have taken an active role in the confirmation of every Justice who is currently sitting on the Supreme Court and in the confirmations of a number who have retired. Moreover, I have participated in the confirmations of half of all article III judges who have ever served.

Throughout this process, I have met some of the brightest legal minds this world has had to offer, and I have watched in disgust as my friends on the Democratic side have sought to undo these men and women for political gain. Judicial obstruction is a serious issue in its own right, but it is merely a symptom of a much larger problem—the politicization of our courts. In today's America, Republicans and Democrats espouse two vastly different visions for the judicial branch.

On the right, we believe in the judiciary as it is outlined in the Constitution—an integral but necessarily limited branch of government that interprets laws but doesn't make them. We

believe in a judiciary that is filled with sober-minded judges who are committed to upholding the Constitution as written, not to molding it to fit their political preferences.

On the left, you have a starkly different vision. The left believes the judiciary should assume an activist role and step in to fill the gaps of legislation when Congress fails. In doing so, the judiciary becomes its own quasi legislative body—a Congress 2.0 of sorts—that is filled with hundreds of judges who are unelected and therefore unaccountable to the American people.

This conception of judicial power is inherently anti-democratic. It undermines the principle of representative government and cedes lawmaking power to a cadre of black-robed philosopher kings—a cloistered group of men and women who have no constitutional authority to make legislation but seek to do so anyway through its opinions.

Given the left's radical vision of judicial power, it is no wonder the confirmation wars have escalated over the years, and it is no wonder the Democrats have made a circus of confirmation hearings. They seek to politicize the process because ultimately they seek political judges.

As usual, what the left wants is not what America needs. America doesn't need political judges. It doesn't need an army of super legislators who tell us what to do. It certainly doesn't need a second Congress that makes laws on a whim. Isn't the one we have dysfunctional enough?

No. What is best for America is wholly different from what the left envisions. America needs a judiciary that is insulated from the corrupting influence of politics. Accordingly, we need principled judges who put the law before any partisan concern.

As opposed to political judges, we need impartial judges—judges who understand their limited role under the Constitution, judges who are content to say what the law is, not what they want it to be, judges who act as umpires, calling balls and strikes instead of swinging at every pitch that comes their way. In short, we need judges who will interpret the Constitution, not remake it in their own image.

In taking Justice Gorsuch as an example, I have every confidence that the President's nominee to the Supreme Court will be qualified, competent, and impartial in every way. If the Democrats' treatment of Justice Gorsuch is any indication of things to come, then I have every reason to believe they will again do everything in their power to politicize this important confirmation process.

They will do everything they can to malign the nominee, no matter his or her background or credentials, and will depict his or her as an extremist who is outside the mainstream. They will press, prod, and pry in an attempt to unearth a political agenda where none is to be found. They will bring all resources to bear in an effort to prevent

a principled, constitutionalist judge from taking Justice Kennedy's seat. They will pull out all the stops to accelerate the politicization of the Supreme Court, but we will not let them.

It is up to us to preserve the integrity of the judicial branch. We can begin by confirming a Supreme Court nominee who is committed to upholding the principles of the Constitution at all costs—a nominee who understands that the lawmaking power lies with Congress, not with the courts.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in this endeavor in the weeks to come. Yet I have to say I have seen a lot of abuse in the area of picking judges and in confirming judges throughout the years. Both sides have been complicit in some ways, but I have never seen more of a politicization of the courts than that which has come from the other side. I hope they will not do that this time.

I don't know who the President is going to pick. I have a pretty good idea of the list of people from which he is going to pick. I know he will chat with me about it, as he will with others, but I can guarantee you this: He is going to pick somebody who has the ability to go on that Court and do the job from the beginning. It is not going to be pleasing, perhaps, to some of my Democratic colleagues, and it may not be pleasing to some of my Republican colleagues. The fact is, I think we can rely on this President to pick an excellent person to fulfill this responsibility.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FAMILY SEPARATION

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues Senator TOM UDALL and Senator RICHARD BLUMENTHAL for joining me to visit the southwest border last week. We went to the border to seek answers and to demand accountability for the very real human impacts of President Trump's cruel and unnecessary policy of separating children from their parents.

The permanent trauma these policies are inflicting on parents and their innocent children, many of whom are refugees who are fleeing violence and seeking asylum, is inhumane and horrific. Taking thousands of children—some as young as infants and toddlers—away from their parents and detaining them as a form of punishment or deterrence is ineffective and morally indefensible.

After all, under the rule of law, refugees who flee violence have a right to request asylum. As of now, only about 500 children of the over 2,000 children in custody have been reunited with their families since President Trump signed an Executive order last Wednesday that ended his family separation pol-

icy. There is still no clear plan from the White House that ensures all children will be reunited with their families. This is simply unacceptable.

This crisis was born from malice, and, frankly, it has been inflamed by incompetence. As an American and as a father, I will not just sit by. What we saw last Friday along the border, which has been ground zero for President Trump's so-called zero tolerance policies, has had a profound impact on me.

We learned that there are over 250 teenagers who are being housed in a temporary tent city detention facility in Tornillo, TX. We met with families who are being held at a Border Patrol station in El Paso who told us about their difficult journeys and the violence they experienced in their home countries that they are desperately trying to escape. Let me share the story of just one of these families who was in the Border Patrol's custody.

I met a father who is in his midtwenties who came here with his, roughly, 2-year-old daughter, named Gabriella. He told us they fled here, seeking asylum, because his home country of Honduras was violent and unstable, and he wanted a better future for his daughter.

If he had arrived before President Trump's Executive order last week, just a few days earlier, his little girl would have been, literally, torn from his arms. I can't tell you whether Gabriella and her father will be granted asylum. I suspect that will be decided by an immigration judge, but at least we know he will be able to keep his daughter by his side through this difficult process. It is unforgivable that thousands of families facing similar circumstances are still separated, with no knowledge of where their children are, with no knowledge of if or when they will be reunited—all because of the Trump administration.

During our visit we also learned troubling details about the process facing asylum seekers who are attempting to enter our Nation legally at our ports of entry. At the Paseo del Norte Port of Entry in El Paso, we learned firsthand how the Trump administration's actions are creating unnecessary delays on asylum claims for those fleeing violence and persecution. What is more, the mixed messages and outright lies coming from the White House and administration officials are creating real confusion and chaos on the ground for those actually responsible for carrying out the President's policies. There is not enough transparency from the White House or from Federal agencies. There is not enough oversight from this administration.

We absolutely need to know what is going on. That is why we are calling for immediate hearings on the Trump administration's inhumane border policies and accountability and oversight of those responsible for carrying those policies out. Anything short of accounting for every single child affected

by this policy is unacceptable and unconscionable. We must hold the White House accountable for adhering to our laws, to American values, and for executing a clear plan to right these wrongs.

It is important for us to recognize that the intentionally cruel separation of families that we have witnessed in recent weeks and months is only one piece of a larger systemic campaign by this administration to dehumanize our immigrant communities. These inhumane enforcement policies follow President Trump's discriminatory Muslim travel ban. They follow his refusal to offer refugee status to those from war-torn countries, such as Syria. They follow his cancellation of legal status for immigrants who escaped natural disasters and unthinkable violence in Haiti, Honduras, and El Salvador. They follow his unjust ending of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or the DACA Program, and his repeated efforts to derail any efforts in Congress to reach a bipartisan consensus on responsible immigration policies that would make smart investments in security at our borders, that would keep our communities safe, and that would recognize the dignity and vibrancy of those border communities.

Despite President Trump's continued determination to sabotage any good-faith efforts, I continue to believe that our Nation desperately needs Congress to pass comprehensive immigration legislation. That includes a visa system that meets the needs of our economy, a fair path to earn citizenship for the estimated 11 million people in our country who are undocumented, and a plan that ensures security at our Nation's borders. Rather than stirring up division and targeting law-abiding immigrants who are working hard to support their families and pay taxes, we should focus our enforcement activities and resources on violent criminals. We must also act with a sense of urgency to find a responsible way forward for the hundreds of thousands of Dreamers who are just as much a part of our communities as any one of us. They are Americans in every way except on paper. I will not give up on them.

None of President Trump's callous actions on immigration represent the values of the America that I know and love—the America that welcomed my father and his family as they emigrated here from Germany in the 1930s. When I think about immigration, I always wonder how different my life would be if America had turned my family away, had turned my father away, or had broken his family apart.

Sadly, that is not an abstraction. It is not an abstract question for thousands of families still desperately hoping to be reunited now. Just like my father's family, these families are mothers, fathers, and children who are overwhelmingly people seeking to come to America because of the promise that our Nation represents. I take heart in the groundswell of decency

that we have witnessed from thousands of Americans who have made their voices heard.

After we visited the border on Friday, Senator UDALL and I joined hundreds of New Mexicans for a community event in Las Cruces. I want to share an image of a little girl who I saw at the event.

As you can see on this graphic, her sign reads: "I love my family and I need them every day." That is really what this is all about. I am sure that the innocent children who have been separated from their parents and placed in detention facilities feel exactly the same way.

At the root of this often difficult debate, I believe we need to reaffirm the humanity of these children and their parents. We cannot stop fighting for compassionate and responsible immigration policies that respect the dignity of these families. We must not turn our backs on the ideals and fundamental values that made the United States both the most powerful Nation on Earth and a beacon of moral leadership. We must continue to make our voices heard and demand reunification for all of these children with their families.

I want to assure New Mexicans and all Americans that I stand with you in saying that this is not what we stand for. I will not rest until our country is once again seen as the moral leader of the free world.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to join the debate this morning on the farm bill and to make sure we get the farm bill passed. It is so important to the State of Washington and to our country.

I know many of my colleagues have been down here talking about agriculture, but in the State of Washington, it is responsible for about 164,000 jobs. And while we produce about \$10-plus billion of economic activity, about \$180 billion of economic activity goes through our ports every year. So if you are growing an agricultural product in the United States, there is a good chance you are shipping that product through Washington ports, going to Asia and a variety of places.

The agriculture and food industry is a huge part of our U.S. economy as well, and provides 11 percent of total U.S. employment. So to say this bill is an important economic tool is an understatement.

We know that in the United States of America, a trade surplus in agriculture has existed for 50 years. So when we

are talking about making investments and opening new markets and protecting agriculture from the trade war that we are seeing, it is very important that this bill helps recognize the hard work that the farmers in the United States of America have done in growing our economy. We must make sure they continue to have those economic opportunities in the future.

Since U.S. exports gained access to markets like South Korea more than a decade ago, Washington farmers in my State have seen increases in exports of up to 80 percent for potatoes and 200 percent for cherries. Agriculture exports support more than a million jobs around the United States, so it's important to maintain our agriculture trade surplus.

I am proud to say that, working with our colleagues, the chairman of the committee, Senator ROBERTS, and the ranking member, Senator STABENOW, we have worked to make sure that we are making improvements and increasing MAP, the Market Access Program. This critical program provides technical assistance and more flexibility for the Secretary of Agriculture to help our farmers increase access to new markets. This is so important at a time when we are seeing so much chaos in the marketplace. We want to make sure we continue to have an aggressive attitude toward opening markets—not closing them.

From 1977 to 2014, it is estimated that our market access programs produced an average return on investment of \$28 for every dollar that was invested—that is, when you are opening a market to sell U.S. products abroad. That is a huge investment for us to export our product into those countries.

I know that some of our colleagues have been working across the aisle to help make sure that MAP funding is more secure and that we invest more. I am working with my colleague, Senator CRAPO from Idaho, to make sure that provisions are in this bill that give the Secretary more flexibility to help us on things like our fruit products and potato products from the Pacific Northwest. I appreciate his help making sure this bill represents at least some of us who want to increase those opportunities for the future.

Washington State is the third largest exporter of food and agricultural products in the United States. Our agricultural sector accounts for 13 percent of our economy annually, and we are proud to grow about 300 different types of products. There are nearly 40,000 farms, and, as I said, 164,000 Washingtonians are employed in that sector.

We continue to work to make sure that the type of research that is represented in this bill—the R&D that is done in great institutions in our State, such as Washington State University, provide good information for us. And our agricultural extension programs need to be funded to make sure that conservation continues to be an opportunity for our farmers. Our farmers

must have resources to diversify their crops.

All of these things are important in moving a farm bill through the Senate and on to the President's desk eventually.

I am very concerned that my colleagues in the House of Representatives want to cut or limit the SNAP program. This has been an essential tool as part of ag for a long time and should continue. The notion that we are going to hold up an ag bill at a critical time, when concerns about tariffs are impacting our farmers, is wrong. What we need to do is move forward on giving the assurances to our farmers that we want them to have the research and development, we want them to have the tools of conservation, and that we certainly want them to have the Market Access Program so they can continue to reach markets all around the globe.

Our ag economy is so important to us in the Pacific Northwest. This bill is helping us make a downpayment on it and giving us a little flexibility.

I am going to take the Secretary of Agriculture at his word today. I heard him on television saying he is going to mitigate any kind of damage being done to farmers based on tariffs. I am going to hold him to his word.

Believe me, as we move this legislation through the process, I am going to make sure that every tool is available for the great products that we grow in Washington State. I want them to reach market destinations. I don't want them to be retaliated against in a trade war.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. SMITH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. SMITH. Madam President, I rise today to voice my strong support for the farm bill that the Senate is currently considering.

First, I would like to thank Chairman ROBERTS and Ranking Member STABENOW for their strong leadership on this bipartisan bill. When I first became a Senator just months ago, I asked for a seat on the Agriculture Committee, and I immediately formed a farm bill working group in Minnesota so that I could hear from farmers and ranchers, foresters, researchers, rural community leaders, and Tribes, as well as experts on nutrition, energy, and conservation, to make sure that Minnesota's priorities were included in this farm bill.

In the last few months, in Minnesota, my staff and I have convened over 30 listening sessions around the State, and I am very grateful for the input and ideas we have gotten through the farm bill process.

The farm bill touches the lives of virtually every American, and it is vital to my State's economy. This bill will provide important stability and predictability to Minnesota farmers, ranchers, rural communities, and Indian Country, while also sustaining tens of thousands of Minnesota jobs.

The farm bill works when all three pillars of the bill work together: traditional farm programs, rural development, and nutrition. If we remove one of these pillars, the farm bill will not be able to stand.

The nutrition programs reauthorized by the Senate farm bill are of vital importance. According to the Agriculture Department, in 2016, over 41 million people, including millions of children across the country, lived in food-insecure households. This is why, when you talk to farmers and ranchers in my State, they know how important it is to support nutrition programs, and they understand, as I do, that any efforts to weaken nutrition programs will ensure that this bill does not pass.

I was proud to be able to participate in crafting the farm bill as a member of the Agriculture Committee. It was a truly bipartisan process, an example of how we can get things done when we work together.

I am very happy that this bill includes many of the provisions I worked hard on, on behalf of Minnesota. For example, the Senate bill maintains the sugar program, which is so important to Minnesota's sugar beet farmers. The sugar industry employs about 29,000 people in Minnesota and provides 142,000 jobs nationwide. Sugar is a \$20 billion-a-year industry—\$3.4 billion in my State alone.

The U.S. sugar policy runs at zero cost and ensures that American farmers are on an even playing field against subsidized foreign sugar. Any amendment that threatens the safety net for sugar farmers could put many farmers into bankruptcy and should be opposed.

This farm bill also expands gains made in the dairy safety net earlier this year. I pushed for these improvements to help Minnesota dairy farmers who are facing falling milk prices.

I am pleased that this farm bill will establish a new national animal disease preparedness, response, and recovery program. I heard about the need for vaccine banks and animal disease readiness at a poultry testing lab in Willmar, MN. When Minnesota was hit hard by the avian flu outbreak that resulted in the deaths of nearly 9 million turkeys and chickens, we knew this new program was needed.

I have also pushed for other Minnesota priorities that came out of the many conversations we had with Minnesotans. I worked hard to make sure this bill advances conservation programs so farmers have the opportunity to start new conservation plans and then keep them going over the long term to protect the environment and increase productivity.

I supported Ranking Member STABENOW's Timber Innovation Act. This bill

encourages new and innovative uses for wood in building construction, which is important for the timber industry in my State.

I am very proud that this bill expands programs I advocated for to help beginning farmers and traditionally disadvantaged farmers. We need to make sure producers from diverse backgrounds are able to access USDA services. In my State, this means Native American farmers, Hmong, Latino, Somali farmers, and veteran farmers.

Today, as our farmers face deep uncertainty around tariffs, this bill includes bipartisan provisions to increase funding for USDA trade promotion activities. International markets are essential to the profitability of many farmers, including in Minnesota.

This bill also helps to protect Native food products from fraudulent imposters on the market. For example, some food businesses are trying to mimic or replicate unique Tribal food products, such as Minnesota wild rice, and then sell those foods on the marketplace as "traditional" food items.

Developing new international markets through trade promotion is something Minnesota farmers and leaders in Indian Country have been calling for, and we do it in this bill.

As ranking member of the Rural Development and Energy Subcommittee, I am very happy that this bill has a strong energy title. I introduced legislation outlining a roadmap for this title in the farm bill, and I led a bipartisan coalition of my colleagues urging the committee to fund and strengthen the many successful energy programs at USDA.

One example is the Rural Energy for America Program, which helps ag producers, local businesses, and rural communities develop energy efficiency and renewable energy projects that create jobs, cut energy bills, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Another example is the Biorefinery, Renewable Chemical, and Biobased Product Program. American farmers can provide the raw material for high-value products that replace and improve on products typically made from oil. Bioplastics, for example, are better for the planet than traditional plastics.

Another message I hear all the time as I meet with rural development leaders across Minnesota is the need for reliable internet service. Broadband is the infrastructure of the 21st-century economy. It is not just nice to have; it is necessary if we are going to build an economy that works for everyone. Whether you are a student doing your homework, a business owner selling your products, a farmer using modern precision agriculture equipment, or a person who is trying to access healthcare, you need access to broadband internet service. I am very glad this bill incorporates my Community Connect Grant Program Act to authorize and increase funding for this important effort. The bill also seeks to modernize speeds so that those living

in rural communities don't get stuck with lower service quality than those living in urban areas.

The Community Connect Broadband Grant Program will create better broadband access to unserved remote and Tribal communities and help spur economic growth in rural America. It is a step forward and one of the many things that we need to do to connect Minnesotans to people across the Nation with affordable, reliable internet service.

I also hear from Minnesotans about their love of local produce and the importance of supporting regional food economies. I am happy to see that this bill creates a streamlined Local Agriculture Market Program to support developing local and regional food systems, and it increases mandatory funding for organic research, another priority of mine.

I am proud that this bill includes the Rural Health Liaison legislation, which I worked on with Senator JONES from Alabama and Senator ROUNDS of South Dakota. The Rural Health Liaison will encourage collaboration between USDA and Health and Human Services to address the specific healthcare needs of rural communities.

I am pleased to see the inclusion of my bill encouraging USDA to assist veterans in joining the agriculture workforce after leaving service. This is going to expand access and job opportunities for returning servicemembers.

As we consider the farm bill on the Senate floor, we also need to listen to all of our communities, including leaders in Indian Country. We have many good provisions in the bill for Native communities. In addition to addressing Tribal food fraud, this bill requires the Secretary of Agriculture to support greater inclusion of Tribal products in Federal trade promotion efforts. It also expands eligibility for forestry program funding to include the 1994 Tribal colleges so more students in Minnesota and around the country can get involved in forestry research.

I was glad to join Senator HEITKAMP in supporting a new technical assistance program that will help Tribes access rural development initiatives and will authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to designate Tribal promise zones to further improve access to Federal economic development resources.

Finally, I am eager to see Native farmers in Minnesota take advantage of the improved resources for socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers in this bill. There are so many opportunities for success in agriculture, and it is important that USDA resources are available to all communities. But there is a lot left to be done. We still need to access many more USDA programs for Native Americans and empower Tribes to make sure that these programs work for Tribal communities.

We need more investment in conservation projects, and we should allow Tribes to develop their own technical standards for conservation based on

their traditions and ecological knowledge.

When I first became a Senator, I asked to be a member of the Indian Affairs Committee. As the newest member of that committee, I have picked up on a couple of themes.

One is that virtually every program for Indian Country is underfunded, and, two, we have to empower Tribes to create solutions that work for their members. We need to listen to leaders in Indian Country and make sure that the farm bill works for them.

I introduced an amendment to make sure that Tribes have the authority to administer the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP. This is a top priority of the Native Farm Bill Coalition.

Over 360 federally recognized Tribes participate in Tribal self-governance programs at the Indian Health Service and at the Department of the Interior. With a 30-year proven track record, Tribal self-governance is widely considered by Tribes and stakeholders as one of the most successful Federal Indian policies. Approximately 25 percent of Native Americans receive some type of Federal food assistance, and in some Tribal communities, participation is as high as 80 percent. Giving Tribes the authority to administer SNAP will allow them to meet the specific needs of their communities to fight hunger.

I am hopeful that this very important, bipartisan amendment will get proper consideration.

We need to pass this farm bill now to give the farmers and ranchers certainty.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

KNOWLEDGEABLE INNOVATORS AND WORTHY INVESTORS ACT

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 2245 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2245) to include New Zealand in the list of foreign states whose nationals are eligible for admission into the United States as E-1 and E-2 nonimmigrants if United States nationals are treated similarly by the Government of New Zealand.

There being no objection, the Senate proceed to consider the bill.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be

considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2245) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2245

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Knowledgeable Innovators and Worthy Investors Act" or the "KIWI Act".

SEC. 2. NONIMMIGRANT TRADERS AND INVESTORS.

For purposes of clauses (i) and (ii) of section 101(a)(15)(E) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(E)), New Zealand shall be considered to be a foreign state described in such section if the Government of New Zealand provides similar non-immigrant status to nationals of the United States.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, it is an honor to be involved in the passage of this important legislation. The Knowledgeable Innovators and Worthy Investors Act, or KIWI Act, is a bipartisan bill that legislatively extends E-1 and E-2 visas to citizens of New Zealand. It does not increase the number of available visas.

Granting access to these visas to New Zealand would increase both investment and trade into the United States and strengthen our relationship with New Zealand.

New Zealand is, of course, a country that is critical to our relationships. We have a critical strategic military and economic partner in the Asia-Pacific region with New Zealand, and this legislation will further strengthen America's presence in the Asia-Pacific region.

E-1 and E-2 visas allow qualified foreign nationals to engage in substantial trade or to develop and direct the operations of an enterprise in which the individual is heavily invested.

The United States will benefit from increased investment in trade with New Zealand. New Zealand's citizens and businesses currently make substantial investments in the United States. These businesses have created more than 10,000 jobs. In 2017, \$10.5 billion in trade passed between the United States and New Zealand.

Allowing New Zealanders to apply for E-1 and E-2 visas will affirm reciprocity and strengthen the United States' relationship with New Zealand. Again, this is a country that is a critical ally and a partner in the Asia-Pacific region, and it will also increase the United States' presence in that region.

New Zealand is the only Five-Eyes country whose citizens are currently ineligible to apply for these visas, while American citizens are currently eligible for reciprocal visas in New Zealand. So I am grateful and honored to be involved in moving this legislation.

I am grateful to my colleagues for consenting to this. I am grateful to have worked on this with my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Hawaii, who worked hard with me to put together this bipartisan piece of legislation that we have been fortunate enough to pass through the Senate today.

Thank you.

I see that my colleague from Hawaii is here.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, I want to thank my colleague, the Senator from Utah, Mr. LEE, for working with me on the act that we just passed.

AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2018—Continued

FILLING THE UPCOMING SUPREME COURT VACANCY

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, if this week has shown us anything, it is that courts matter. In three important decisions over 2 days, the Supreme Court majority endorsed Donald Trump's bigotry and handed him the power to exclude any group of people for any reason, as long as he couches it as a national security matter.

Justice Alito led a narrow majority in a concerted effort to destroy unions—in this case, public sector unions—and Justice Thomas told States that they cannot tell women what reproductive services are available to them.

We have also seen a Federal trial court judge in San Diego, who combined his understanding of the law with his capacity for human kindness, order that children who were separated from their parents at the southern border be reunited with them in short order.

We have seen the Third Circuit Court of Appeals rule in favor of transgender public school students being able to use the bathrooms that match their gender identity.

The work that judges do affects the real lives of people living and working in this country—people who are trying to care for their families, to serve their country, to earn a living; people who count on us here in Congress to make sure that they are safe and that their rights are protected. In the Judiciary Committee on which I sit, that responsibility is normally never greater than when we consider a nomination to the U.S. Supreme Court.

These are not normal times. When we have a President who avows that the Supreme Court should always be Republican, ignoring the independent role of the Court, the Senate's advice and consent process is even more crucial.

Take a look at the President's tweet. He believes the Supreme Court is an extension of his political party. Last March, he reiterated: "We need more Republicans in 2018," he said, "and must ALWAYS"—he likes to capitalize—"ALWAYS hold the Supreme

Court!" Any nominee from this President comes to us with this taint attached.

The President is not the only one to politicize the courts. Neil Gorsuch would never have made it to the Supreme Court if not for the majority leader, whose proudest achievement, according to him, is Neil Gorsuch's confirmation to the U.S. Supreme Court.

There is no question that the majority leader wants to ensure a conservative majority on the Supreme Court to upend the fundamental rights of millions of Americans. It started in 2016 when he refused to even meet with the President's Supreme Court nominee and would not grant him a hearing. The majority leader held this seat hostage precisely because he wanted someone who would serve as a rubberstamp for his radical conservative agenda.

Here is what MITCH MCCONNELL said when he did this. He said that the American people should have a voice in the selection of their next Court Justice. Under the McConnell rule, this vacancy created by Justice Kennedy's resignation and retirement should be treated no differently.

If the people's voice should have been heard in 2016, it is no less important now, because these are clearly not normal times. On Tuesday—the same day the Supreme Court ruled that the President could discriminate against people coming to our country on the basis of religion—the majority leader tweeted this picture of himself with Neil Gorsuch.

The message is clear. The twisted process got the Republicans just what they wanted, and they want to do it again. They want to keep doing it, and we should not let them.

Democrats should do everything we can to ensure that the Supreme Court stays independent and protects fundamental rights and values. The American people certainly deserve no less.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. ROUNDS. Madam President, I rise today to discuss the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, or what is commonly known in our part of the country as the farm bill, which we are considering on the Senate floor this week.

The farm bill is a vital piece of legislation to the people of my home State of South Dakota, where our economy depends on agriculture to survive. With more than 31,500 farms across the State, South Dakota ranks in the top 10 for ag production, providing a \$25 billion impact on our economy annually. Stability and certainty for our farmers, which this farm bill helps to provide, is crucial as they do their part to feed and fuel a growing global population.

I would like to thank Chairman PAT ROBERTS, Ranking Member DEBBIE STABENOW, and all of the other members of the Senate Ag Committee and

their staff, who worked tirelessly to get this marketed-oriented bill to the floor for consideration by the full Senate body. This bipartisan bill will provide much needed certainty to our ag community at a pivotal time, when the ag economy is facing significant challenges. The ag economy is down more than 50 percent over the past 5 years, and the numbers don't look much better for 2018. According to the Department of Agriculture's own Economic Research Service, net farm income is projected to fall an additional 7 percent this year to \$58 billion.

A 5-year farm bill is necessary to give South Dakota producers the certainty they need to help weather times of economic downturn, such as the one we are experiencing right now in ag country. Additionally, the uncertainty surrounding trade and tariffs has created instability in the market, which is having a significant effect on our commodity prices.

For example, in my home State of South Dakota, soybeans are one of the top commodities, and we rely heavily on exports to sell our soybean crop each year. A significant importer of U.S. soybeans is China, which accounts for about 25 percent of all of the U.S. soybean sales and 60 percent of all soybean exports.

While the tariffs on soybeans have not taken effect yet, they are already having a real impact on the market prices. Since the tariffs on Chinese goods were announced in early March, soybeans are down \$1.86 per bushel on the cash market, representing a \$449 million loss in South Dakota alone when we look at farmers' balance sheets. The USDA had projected ag exports to be flat in 2018 before tariffs were levied on the ag industry—or at least before those tariffs were suggested to be added to the ag industry.

With so much uncertainty surrounding trade deals since tariffs were announced, reauthorizing programs like the Market Access Program, or MAP, and the Foreign Market Development Program, FMD, are vital to help gain access to new markets for U.S. products. This bill does exactly that.

These programs help encourage the development, maintenance, and expansion of the ag export market to foreign customers.

I am pleased that this legislation also strengthens the crop insurance program with outlays projected to be approximately \$7.6 billion annually. Crop insurance is a highly effective public-private safety net that helps farmers customize protection for their individual operations. Sometimes I don't think we emphasize that this is one of those safety net items for which farmers and ranchers actually pay premiums to participate. Crops in my home State of South Dakota contribute roughly \$10.3 billion to our economy. Last year, in South Dakota alone, more than 50,000 crop insurance policies were written to provide \$4.8 billion in protection for over 17.5 million acres of cropland. Nationwide,

more than 310 million acres were enrolled in crop insurance, backing more than \$106 billion of crop value. It is vital as a risk management tool for farmers across the entire country. By maintaining strong crop insurance provisions, this bill will help our producers weather these very tough times in ag country.

Additionally, this legislation provides a modest increase in the cap of the Conservation Reserve Program, or CRP, to 25 million acres. That would be up from 24 million acres currently in the existing farm bill. While we would have preferred a more significant increase in CRP acres, to the tune of perhaps 30 million acres or more, a strong CRP program is an important tool to assist farmers and ranchers during these adverse times, such as during a drought like we experienced in South Dakota last year, or possible flood damage, which I fear we will be experiencing this year.

This legislation also gives the Secretary of Ag the necessary authority to reorganize the USDA. Ag Secretary Sonny Perdue recently introduced a plan to reorganize the agency, including combining the Natural Resources Conservation Service with the Farm Service Agency and the Risk Management Agency, creating a new farm production and conservation mission, which would be under the Under Secretary, Bill Northey. Streamlining these programs will help sharpen the agency's focus on domestic agricultural issues, providing farmers and ranchers with a one-stop shop so that USDA can better meet their needs.

Last year, as the Senate Ag Committee discussions on this farm bill took shape, I wrote to the chairman and ranking member of the committee to ask them to establish a foot-and-mouth disease vaccination bank to combat economic, food, and national security concerns. A major outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease, or FMD, would be financially devastating to our producers, and I am pleased this bill highlights an FMD disease bank as a priority at USDA.

The final thing I will mention about the Ag Improvement Act of 2018 is that it increases the cap for individuals seeking loans under the Farm Service Agency loan guarantee program. This program provides financial assistance to farmers and ranchers who want to expand and improve their operations. Under this legislation, the FSA direct loan program cap will go from \$300,000 to \$600,000 for direct ownership loans, \$400,000 for direct operating loans, and from \$1.39 million to \$1.75 million for guaranteed ownership and operating loans. Increasing both the individual cap for these loans and the total amount of money available for lending will allow a greater number of producers to utilize the program. Farming and ranching have become increasingly costly, and increasing these limits will more accurately reflect inflation and increasing costs of ag production today

and make sure that lenders have flexibility during times of hardship.

South Dakota producers work hard every day to feed and fuel a growing global population. As in all businesses, some years are simply better than others. During those more difficult times, it is important that our farmers and ranchers have access to tools that can help them keep their operations vital. The certainty and stability of this farm bill will do that by allowing them to work to weather this current economic downturn, as well as strengthen the agricultural economy.

I support the Senate's efforts to provide certainty to our farmers, and I will continue to work with my colleagues to see this bill across the finish line so that we can provide our ag economy with much needed certainty and help get our ag economy back on track.

Let me also add that I believe we may very well see some very well-meaning amendments today that make good sense, but these amendments might very well not be supported by enough of our Members to where the actual bill itself would survive if the amendments were included. My interest is in making certain that this farm bill is allowed to continue forward, to be reconciled with the House, and become law as quickly as possible. I would ask the other Members to seriously consider the impacts; while we may very well have some great ideas on how to make improvements, unless we have enough to maintain that 60-vote margin in the U.S. Senate on a bipartisan basis, then we will have failed in providing that stability to the ag community in this time when they desperately need that reassurance.

With that, Madam President, I thank you for the opportunity to visit and talk about this very important piece of legislation.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mrs. ERNST. Madam President, I rise today on behalf of Iowa's farmers and ranchers in support of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 or what we refer to as the farm bill. I thank Chairman ROBERTS and Ranking Member STABENOW for bringing this critical piece of bipartisan legislation to the floor for consideration.

Farmers, ranchers, and rural communities are resilient—some of the toughest in the face of adversity. But low commodity prices, trade tensions, and unpredictable weather have taken a toll on many of our folks back home. These are the people Americans rely on day in and day out to put food on our tables, clothes on our backs, and fuel in our cars.

In trying times, it is essential that we provide farmers and ranchers with the certainty and the predictability they need and they deserve. These folks helped guide my priorities for this bipartisan farm bill, which maintains a robust crop insurance, makes

improvements to commodity programs, and promotes soil health and water quality.

I am thankful that several of my provisions and amendments can be found within this bill. Long overdue reforms to the Conservation Reserve Program will refocus the program's intent on highly erodible and environmentally sensitive land and provide opportunities for the next generation of American farmers to access land to build economically viable farm operations.

This bill also strengthens the ARC-County Program, limiting payment discrepancies and ensuring that farmers receive the necessary support they deserve. It also puts farmers first by providing critical support and mental health resources to those in need or those facing tough times.

I do want to note one area of the bill where I think we need to do more, and that is on the issue of SNAP reform. Most notably, the bill misses an opportunity to help able-bodied SNAP recipients rise up out of poverty. SNAP is a program that is relied on by children, in addition to elderly Americans, people with disabilities, and many working families who are struggling to make ends meet. No American should go hungry, and SNAP provides critical assistance to our most vulnerable citizens.

We also have an obligation to ensure that this safety net does not perpetuate a cycle of poverty and is not abused by those who should not be taking this benefit. Unfortunately, we have seen some shocking stories that show how SNAP has, at times, been misused. For example, I am reminded of the 28-year-old, lobster-eating, Cadillac-Escalade-driving surfer from San Diego, CA, who had not worked in over a year and was receiving food stamps. He was unabashedly abusing the system and taking benefits away from those who need those benefits the most. Surfing is a pretty physically active sport—I think we can all agree to that—and it was safe to presume that this young man was able-bodied. We should not allow this type of behavior to continue, and we should not allow more examples of people taking advantage of a safety net that is set up to help those who need it the most.

While this example is an exception rather than the rule, I am concerned that the ability to abuse the system could increase the number of folks who simply choose to sit back and decide they will also ride the free waves, rather than get in the game and return to employment.

We need to encourage those who can to start working again. Getting people back to work is the most effective way to prevent poverty, both in the near term and for people's long-term stability. Programs like SNAP should encourage able-bodied adults to participate in the labor force. According to the Census Bureau, 30.5 percent of adults who did not work lived in poverty in 2016. However, on the flip side,

just 2.2 percent of full-time workers and 14.7 percent of part-time or part-year workers lived below the poverty line.

Folks who are employed are not only better off financially, they also benefit from the sense of purpose and confidence that comes from a job. As I always say, there is dignity in a job. Take, for example, April, a Missouri woman who was on government assistance from the age of 16 to the age of 30, receiving food stamps and housing assistance. When she was caught shoplifting, she was forced to do community service. She volunteered at Watered Gardens, a rescue mission in Joplin, where folks living in poverty get the help they need while they are also working at the gardens. April was so inspired by her time there that she started a women's discipleship center in her community and is now living a fulfilling life.

SNAP currently requires able-bodied adults without dependents to work, participate in training, or volunteer for at least 20 hours a week to receive assistance. That is the current requirement, but unfortunately 35 percent of Americans live in an area where work requirements for able-bodied adults without dependents have been waived. They have been waived. Of the 1,200 areas where this has been waived, over half have unemployment rates below 5 percent, and over 500 of those areas are at full employment. These waivers were intended for States and communities that are experiencing economic downturns, not States like California, which has a statewide waiver, despite a record low 4.2-percent unemployment.

Our economy is booming right now. We have a 3.8-percent unemployment rate. For the first time on record, the number of job openings exceeds the number of Americans looking for work.

This is the best possible time for us to encourage work among able-bodied SNAP recipients. That is why I introduced an amendment which would strengthen the waiver process to ensure that areas with low levels of unemployment are not exempt from SNAP's requirement for able-bodied adults without dependents to work, train, or volunteer.

I planned to offer this amendment today. I am not going to because I want to keep the farm bill moving for the sake of our farmers, but I do want to see this done at conference. Despite its imperfections, we have a bill before us that will feed hungry Americans, protect natural resources, mitigate risk, and support rural jobs.

With heavy rainfall this past week across Northern Iowa, some hard-working men and women are now facing even greater challenges. Flooded fields have producers worrying about crop damage. This all underscores the need for a strong and reliable safety net and timely passage of the farm bill.

The goal and absolute requirement is to provide farmers and ranchers across our Nation the certainty and predict-

ability they deserve during difficult times. I look forward to working alongside my colleagues to meet this goal by passing this farm bill, and I encourage support.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I come to talk about the farm bill and an amendment I filed along with Senators CORNYN and HELLER, but I first want to thank Chairman ROBERTS for doing the remarkable job he does bringing people together on the Agriculture Committee. For the first 2 years I was in the Senate, beginning in 2015, I was on Agriculture, and I really enjoyed watching the way he worked trying to bridge the gaps between different interests.

In the Agriculture Committee, it is less along partisan lines and more along regional lines. So the fact that we have a farm bill before us, which I will support and I believe is good for farmers, is a testament to the leadership of Chairman ROBERTS and Ranking Member STABENOW.

A lot of people probably don't realize that although North Carolina is a relatively small State, with the majority of our population in urban centers, we are also one of the top 10 agriculture States. We have over 80 commodities raised in our State which contribute about \$84 billion to our State in revenue. So it is a very important sector—in fact, I would argue, the most important sector.

It is absolutely important that we get the farm bill right and that we have fair treatment for all crops. Chairman ROBERTS is working on that, and I am going to do everything I can to help him as we work with the House Members in conference.

I want to spend the remaining part of my time talking about something that is also very important.

About 80 percent of the farm bill is dedicated to the SNAP program. We heard Senator ERNST talk about it in her comments. It is a very important program for nutritional assistance, but it is also important we implement policies that make sure it is sustainable over time and that for those who are reliant on it, we ultimately do everything we can for those who are capable to no longer rely on it. How do we do that?

Right now, there is a program for adults where, if you don't have dependents, there is an expectation about work requirements, but I believe we have to make sure we have more people looking for work, being trained for work as a requirement for getting the SNAP benefits.

There will be a lot of people who are going to talk about the heartless nature of this program, but let's talk about what is really being proposed versus what you may hear in a floor speech or in the press.

What this program is about is for people between the ages of 18 and 50

who do not have children under the age of 6. Why 6? Because at that point they are generally going to school, so daycare issues are not as great. We are not talking about people who have a health problem or someone who has a disability. They are exempted.

We are talking about adults who may have older children, who are able-bodied, and should be expected to work or do some sort of community service as a condition for getting the SNAP benefit.

There are a lot of people we think we can provide the benefit, get them to work a minimum of 20 hours a week, and ultimately maybe get them a job where they would no longer need the SNAP benefit and be free of any dependence on government to make their ends meet.

There are also people who may not have skills that can get them into a job at this point. So if you can't find a 20-hour-a-week job, you can at least perhaps get into a job training program so you have the necessary skills to make a living wage.

A couple of months ago, I was visiting a center in Charlotte, about 15 minutes out of my hometown, which has been stood up by Goodwill. It takes all comers. Anybody who wants new job skills can come to this facility. They can pursue certifications. They can do the prerequisite work there to then go to a community college or university. This program is about saying: If you don't have the skills you need today to get into that job that would free you from government assistance, then I think it is reasonable to expect that maybe 20 hours a week you go to training programs like this so you are better prepared to do it over time.

That is essentially the nature of the amendment I have filed, along with the support of Senator CORNYN and Senator HELLER.

There are a couple of reasons why you want to do this. We need to make sure we can get as many people to work, No. 1, so they can be free of government assistance; and, No. 2, to make sure the economic burden on taxpayers does not become so great that, at some point, the only way we can pay for the SNAP benefit is to cut the SNAP benefit. In other words, I want to make sure these safety nets are always well-funded and always there for people who need it.

I think this amendment and an opportunity to talk about it, and potentially make progress on this farm bill, is something I am excited about. I think we can do it in a way to make sure people who genuinely need it will get it, but those who genuinely have an opportunity to free themselves from government assistance over time can do that too.

I will leave you with this. When I was 17 years old, I was supposed to go into the Air Force, and I was discharged because of an automobile accident. I had moved out of our home when I was 17. I found myself not going to college and actually not being employed. Fortunately, for me, there was a community

college or a technical school back in Nashville, TN, that I went to which gave me the job skills that, over a very short period of time, gave me a job which ultimately led to my professional career, and I guess ultimately led to me being a U.S. Senator. So I am speaking from personal experience.

If I had taken the path of maybe just looking for a program that didn't have a work requirement, didn't necessarily have the motivation to go down the path I did—there are people out there whom I think we are going to lose who could be some of the greatest business executives, plant managers, artisans, and trades men and women we have ever seen. That is why programs like this and amendments like this I think require serious consideration and hopefully the support of the Senate.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have been a member of the Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee since I was first elected to the Senate. The work that committee has done throughout my tenure in the Senate has proven that a bipartisan, reasonable process is not only possible but is preferable to the rancor and rhetoric that so often curtails the important work before the Senate.

The 2018 farm bill process once again demonstrates this distinctive quality of the Agriculture Committee, which has produced a vital legislative product that will improve our Nation's agricultural, food, and environmental systems. As a former chairman and ranking member of the Agriculture Committee, I know just how much work it takes to draft and advance a bill of this size, breadth, and influence, and I thank Chairman ROBERTS and Ranking Member STABENOW for working together to get this done.

This bill stands in stark contrast to the version passed by the House of Representatives just last week, in which an ugly partisan process resulted in legislation full of environmental riders and harmful policy constraints that would devastate the millions of families that depend on our nutrition programs for basic nutrition. I urge all Senators to recognize that the bipartisan product reported nearly unanimously by the committee is a strong bill that provides leadership on food, agriculture, nutrition, natural resources, and rural development issues. The policies it advances are based on the best available science and will provide for effective management.

This bill is so much more than just a "farm bill" or even a "food bill." This is a bill that addresses a wide swath of American life and helps to set priorities for the policies that affect every single one of us. It is our chance to show farmers, foresters, families, rural communities, and every American consumer that we hear their concerns and can help everyone live a healthier, fuller life. Vermont farmers and families expect that the programs and guidance within the farm bill will help our

struggling farms, large and small, to stay productive, ensure that children are well nourished, and protect our environment. This is a bill for every America and a bill for future generations.

I have heard countless heartbreaking stories from Vermont dairy farmers who are struggling to stay afloat right now amid perilously low milk prices. In addition to dairy, I know that agriculture across the country is facing increasing difficulties when it comes to competition, trade, dropping prices, and dramatic weather challenges that have farmers everywhere on edge. I am proud that this bill will continue to address these. I particularly want to thank the chair and ranking member for the inclusion of the improved Dairy Risk Coverage Program that builds on the important margin protection improvements I was able to secure in February for our struggling dairy farmers. The bill also provides important support for the rapidly growing organic industry and local food systems and the opportunity for farmers to diversify their crops by growing and selling hemp products.

We continue the proud tradition of providing nutritional assistance to our fellow Americans with the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, and this bill continues our commitment to worldwide stability and productivity with programs like McGovern-Dole, Food for Peace, the Global Crop Diversity Trust, as well as valuable research to support farmers here at home and around the world. We know that, when families and children do not have to wonder where their next meal may come from, children do better in school, workers are more productive, and our Nation is stronger. The same is true when we support international efforts that combat poverty and provide lifesaving humanitarian assistance, we alleviate poverty and build stronger U.S. partners.

Our Nation's conservation tradition is reinforced in this bill, with significant funding and necessary improvements to programs that allow farmers and forestland owners to make environmentally friendly improvements to their land and take care of the natural areas that make our lands and our countryside so vital, productive, and unique. Wildlife, biodiverse ecosystems, and the air, land, and water we rely on will be cleaner and healthier because of this bill. Through the support of the committee's chair and ranking member, the bill does not include problematic changes that would have weakened pesticide and forestry laws.

This farm bill provides critical economic development support to address the unique challenges and needs faced by our rural communities. I am proud of the steps this bill makes possible to improve the lives of rural citizens everywhere by investing in rural community infrastructure and facilities, including a new priority for treatment

centers for substance abuse disorders, while providing and expanding much-needed technical assistance and access to affordable capital for small and growing rural businesses that serve as economic engines in our rural towns.

This bill is a good bill, a strong bill, and it is a breath of bipartisan fresh air. Coming on the heels of our recent passage of the first package of Senate appropriations bills for fiscal year 2019 earlier this week, we are again proving that the Senate can move important and complicated legislation with bipartisan support when we take the time to work with each other and we commit to keeping these bills free of controversial items.

This bill serves as an example of why we are all here: to help those who need it, to make sure our Nation is secure, and to protect our natural resources for generations to come. I will work with the chairman and ranking member to ensure that this bill passes and that we are able to send a strong and balanced bill to the President that we can all stand behind.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to amendment No. 3074.

Agriculture is the economic engine of Nebraska, and the beef industry is the largest segment of Nebraska agriculture.

In fact, in Nebraska, cattle outnumber people by more than three to one.

The industry plays a critical role in my State's economic viability with nearly \$7.2 billion in annual cash receipts.

Nebraska is also the No. 1 cattle-on-feed State, illustrating our commitment to provide American families and dinner tables around the world with affordable, safe, high-quality Nebraska beef.

As a Nebraska cattle rancher, I understand the purpose of the checkoff program and its direct impact on producers' ability to market their products.

It is an investment into the future of my State's No. 1 industry.

Funds collected from producers are used for research and promotion programs designed by producers to benefit the entire industry.

Producer control has been a defining feature of the beef checkoff since its inception and is what drives its success.

Since 1985, producers have proven perfectly capable of deciding how to spend their money and should be allowed to continue to do so.

This amendment would harm agricultural producers and the rural communities they support.

I strongly urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I have some remarks with which to explain the two unanimous consent requests

that I am making. I understand, to accommodate the schedule of the Senator from Wisconsin, I will make the unanimous consent requests prior to my remarks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized upon the disposition of the unanimous consent requests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2880

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 2880, a bill to establish a pilot program for long-term rental assistance for families affected by major disasters, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as chairman of the committee of jurisdiction, I have reached out to the Federal Emergency Management Agency for its views, and the Agency opposes this legislation.

According to the Agency:

FEMA has spent more than \$432 million on . . . [the Transitional Shelter Assistance program], and provided rental assistance to more than 25,000 TSA participant families to help them find permanent housing solutions. [Ninety-seven] percent of those enrolled in the program have successfully transitioned to more permanent housing.

The remaining households in [the Transitional Shelter Assistance program] have either received rental or repair assistance from FEMA; have a habitable home with utilities on; or are not eligible for additional FEMA housing assistance.

Federal, state, and voluntary organization partners will continue to provide assistance through disaster case management to those who still require long-term solutions.

Again, as the chairman of the committee with oversight and jurisdiction over FEMA, I really do believe it is important to support FEMA's objection to this. For those reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I have another unanimous consent request.

Let me just say, as to the unanimous consent request that the Senator from Wisconsin has just objected to, indeed, FEMA does oppose this. That is the whole purpose of the UC request, for people are about to get shut out of the temporary housing that they have in their having been evacuated from Puerto Rico to Florida.

According to FEMA, this program runs out on June 30. In fact, a law on the books says that FEMA could activate that program just as it did after Hurricane Katrina for the poor people in New Orleans who had to evacuate from their homes. In that case, most of

them evacuated to a different State. A lot of them went to Houston, TX.

If the Presiding Officer hears emotion in this Senator's voice, indeed, it is there. I will address the remarks later.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2066

Mr. President, my second unanimous consent request involves a matter of Medicaid assistance and housing assistance to families who have been affected by a major disaster.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee, of which this Senator is a part, be discharged from further consideration of S. 2066, a bill to provide housing and Medicaid assistance to families affected by a major disaster; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I have been asked by the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee to object on his behalf. On his behalf, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, both of these UC requests are because there are a lot of people who are hurting in the aftermath of two hurricanes having hit Puerto Rico and because the island is still in great distress. Our fellow U.S. citizens on the island of Puerto Rico are, indeed, in great distress. It is not only because of the slow assistance by FEMA but because of the lack of electricity, as parts of Puerto Rico today are without electricity, with its going on 10 months after the hurricane. It is because of the number of people who are fleeing the island and, therefore, the jobs are not available because the economy has been so crippled. Naturally, a number of those people have fled to where they can find safety and shelter and put their children in school. By the way, there are a number of schools in Puerto Rico that are closed.

Not just tens of thousands but hundreds of thousands of Puerto Ricans have fled the island to the States where there will be decent opportunities to get jobs, and a good number of them are in my State of Florida.

In Florida, there are 600 families who have been in temporary housing. It is called TSA. It is called temporary shelter assistance. About 100 of those families have moved on to other States, and another 100 of those families have returned to the island. Yet 400 of those families are still in our State, and a good number of those 400 families are still in temporary shelter assistance.

At least FEMA did not stop this assistance in March. We got them to extend it until the end of May and then pointed out that a lot of these families

in that temporary assistance had children in school and that they needed to complete the academic year. The assistance was extended until 2 days from now, June 30.

They have nowhere to go. By both husband and wife working two jobs, some of them have collected enough savings to be able to afford apartments. The problem is that the apartment rentals want security deposits that are three or four times the monthly rents. Many of these families do not have that much money saved as a result of their being unable to find work.

It seems to me that the humane thing to do is to activate again the part of the law that is still on the books that was activated after Hurricane Katrina hit New Orleans, of which this Senator asked for unanimous consent and to which it has been objected by the Republican side, for the purpose of there being transitional housing assistance. That bill was filed by a number of us. It was the only way to get action since we just heard the chairman of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee say that FEMA was not going to extend it and does not support it.

If it were good enough for the people who fled New Orleans during Hurricane Katrina, why isn't it good enough for the people in Florida, our fellow U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico, who have been equally devastated after their having fled the deplorable conditions on their native island?

In the wake of those hurricanes, there are thousands of displaced families who are still unable to return to their homes. This includes the hundreds of families—and we estimate its being about 400 families—who are in the State of Florida. Despite that fact, FEMA is still saying that it is ending this transitional shelter assistance.

This decision to stop providing assistance to these families has many of them very scared. They are scrambling to figure out what they are going to do and to find affordable places. We have reached out to churches, and we have reached out to other charitable organizations to try to help them afford the deposits even when they have the income now from one or both spouses having worked two jobs to be able to afford the apartments.

So what we have been trying to do with this legislation, now rejected by our Republican friends, is we have been trying to urge the Agency to do the right thing—use the existing law and activate it. It was done for New Orleans; why not now for Puerto Rico?

The situation that many of these families find themselves in is a situation no family should have to go through. I suspect that what we are going to see come Sunday in Florida by the news organizations will be a chronicle of some who will be living in a car or going down to a homeless shelter. Some of them have lost everything because of these storms. Too many are

still unable to find work or to find affordable housing and especially the security deposit. For many of them, the only thing they have is the help FEMA is providing, but that is only good for 2 more days.

We have tried, but the Senator from Wisconsin, at the direction of the Republican leader, has said they are not going to let this legislation come up.

These folks are not looking for a handout; they just need a little help getting back on their feet after the storms took everything from them. The fact that FEMA has put an arbitrary deadline on this aid rather than trying to work with the people defies logic. FEMA's TSA Program is critical and it has been critical to providing for them. While I recognize that the TSA Program was a temporary fix, you just can't end a temporary fix when people are being thrown out on the streets. So that was an attempt to force FEMA to act, this request to pass the legislation forcing them to act. That is why this Senator made the unanimous consent request.

The second unanimous consent request this Senator asked for was to activate a housing program of additional section 8 housing. Florida has used up its meager allocation. This would have given additional section 8 housing for those among the least fortunate of us. I thank my cosponsors—Senators BLUMENTHAL, WARREN, MARKEY, GILLIBRAND, HARRIS, and BALDWIN—for their understanding of this situation and for signing on as cosponsors with me.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RUSSIA

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about a problem that is growing and needs to be confronted or we will regret our decision to lay down in the face of Russian aggression and Syrian aggression inside of Syria.

As you well know, we have been trying to find a solution in Syria for quite a while. We were able to reach an agreement about deescalation zones in southwestern Syria where, basically, the parties would disengage, and we reached a settlement with the Russians, U.N. Resolution 2254, to create some space to stop the fighting and the killing.

What have we found? In recent days, the Syrian regime has intensified military operations within the southwest Syria deescalation zone negotiated by Jordan, Russia, and the United States. The Russian Air Force is flying in this area, and we are doing nothing about it.

The bottom line is that if we allow Russia to get away with this and Assad

to get away with this, it is going to hurt us everywhere else in the Mideast. When President Trump meets with President Putin on July 16, I hope he will bring this up.

The question is this: Are we going to let Putin walk all over us? We had 8 years of that, and I am kind of tired of it.

Now, 6,000 civilians have already fled their homes. A lot of them have been killed in this area where we reached an agreement with the Russians and the Jordanians and the world at-large. These people were assured under this agreement that they would not be bombed or slaughtered anymore. Now the slaughtering and the bombing has started anew. They are going to look at us and everybody in the region is going to look at us as all talk and no action. The United Nations is going to be seen as weak.

I like a strong President. I appreciate what President Trump has done to rebuild the military. I like the fact that we are talking with North Korea to avoid a conflict with North Korea, but I also like the fact that the President has told North Korea: We are going to stop your nuclear program and missile program. We would rather do it peacefully, but it is going to stop. Stop threatening the United States. We are trying to make it a win-win.

We have taken the fight to ISIS in a new way. There are a lot of things to say about our military and foreign policy under President Trump, like getting out of the Iran deal, which was terrible. It is all good. It is about to erode in a big way.

If we let Russia and Assad violate the agreement that we negotiated and they don't pay a price, then it is going to hurt our standing everywhere, and it is going to embolden Russia and Assad even more.

This is a nightmare for Israel. Syrians have suffered enough at the hands of Assad and Russia. It is a nightmare for the Kurds, and it really affects our standing in the world.

When this meeting happens on July 16 in Finland, I hope the President will bring this up if it is not resolved before then because, President Trump, if you let Putin get away with this and Assad get away with this, then, good luck everywhere else in the world.

We have had 8 years of letting bad people get away with bad things. I hope you will bring it up and bring it to an end because our word should matter. Thousands of people have been displaced from their homes. Hundreds have been killed in violation of an agreement we signed, I think, last year.

Secondly, the meeting with Putin is a good thing. You have to talk to your enemies, your friends, and everybody in between. National Security Advisor Bolton had it right. There are things we can work on with Russia and there are things we can't. Russia is an enemy. They are not a friend. They are an enemy of democracy, but you have

to talk to your enemies as well as your friends.

We do have some common ground—maybe even in Syria. Russia has had bases in Syria for a long time. I don't mind that they continue to have bases. I don't want to turn Damascus over to the Iranians, and I don't want Syria to be run by the Russians. I want Syria to be run by Syrians.

There was a statement today by the President that Russia denies meddling in our election. You are right, Mr. President, they deny it, but they are lying. When you meet with Putin and he says we had nothing to do with it, I would take the opportunity to show him why we disagree. When you meet with Putin, I would explain to him what happens if you continue to meddle in our election.

Not only did they meddle in the 2016 election—I am not alleging they changed the outcome, and I have seen no evidence of collusion between the Trump campaign and the Russians—but I am 100 percent convinced that it was the Russians who stole the Democratic National Committee emails and Podesta's emails. It was the Russians who took out ads all over the country pitting one American against the other.

The bottom line is this: Russia did interfere in our democracy. They are doing it everywhere else in the world. When they say they didn't, they are lying.

President Trump, if you don't bring this up, it will be a huge mistake. If you don't push back against the lie, it will be a huge mistake.

As to what they are doing now, I hope President Trump will tell President Putin: We know what you are doing, and you had better knock it off because you continue to do this at your own peril. If we have a face-to-face between President Trump and President Putin and there is not a clear understanding by President Putin that we have had it with his interference in our democracy and his destabilizing the world at-large, then it will be a huge mistake and a great opportunity lost.

There are areas on which we can agree with the Russians and places where we can work with the Russians, but to have a good relationship with Russia, you have to have an honest relationship with Russia. Here is the honest relationship with Russia: Putin is no friend of democracy. He interfered in the 2016 election, and he is going to do it again in 2018. He really is not a Republican or a Democrat. He hates us equally.

Remember the dossier—this piece of garbage that was collected in Russia by a foreign agent paid for by the Democratic Party? Where do you think they got that information from? Do you think Putin would hesitate 1 minute to undercut you if he thought it was in his interest? He will do what is in his interest, and when the pain is too great, he will back off.

I am counting on you, and the American people are counting on you, President Trump, and the world is counting on you to set the record straight when it comes to Putin's interference in democracy, including ours. I hope he understands after this meeting is over with that if he continues to go down this path, it is at his own peril. If we don't make it painful, he will keep doing it.

We are doing a lot of good things in terms of pushing back against Russia but not enough, because if we were doing enough, they would not be interfering in the 2018 elections, and they are.

Finally, as to whether or not they did it, every intelligence agency we have, under the Obama administration and now the Trump administration, says without equivocation that the Russians interfered in our election. It wasn't some 300-pound guy sitting on a bed somewhere. They stole the emails. They gave them to WikiLeaks. They are trying to divide us. They are not a friend of Republicans. They are an enemy to all of us.

President Trump, use this opportunity to clear up the record and set it straight when it comes to Russia's interference in our democracy. Find common ground where you can. It makes sense to work with the Russians in Syria, and it makes sense to work with them in North Korea. It makes no sense to believe the lie or to make them believe that we believe the lie, and the lie is that they didn't interfere.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the 2018 farm bill and the importance of passing this bill.

I thank Chairman ROBERTS and Ranking Member STABENOW for their dedication and determination in producing a truly bipartisan bill that cleared the Agriculture Committee 2 weeks ago with a strong bipartisan vote. Senator MCCONNELL and Senator SCHUMER have been dedicated to moving this bill to the floor. Under Chairman ROBERTS' and Ranking Member STABENOW's leadership, the committee held six hearings, examining every title of the bill, passed a bill out of committee on a nearly unanimous 20-to-1 vote, and included almost 70 amendments before getting it to the floor this week.

The Agriculture Committee and the farm bill are models of how we can work across the aisle on tough problems and on major legislation that impacts every American—the farmers and ranchers who grow and raise the crops

and livestock that sustain us, the hunters and conservationists who rely on the wetlands and grasslands protected, the families who rely on access to healthy foods.

This is an important bill. I hear it every day from people in my State—fishermen and hunters, farmers in rural communities and leaders. They understand that we do not want to be a country that becomes dependent on foreign food. We don't want that to happen.

In Minnesota, we produce a lot of food. Our economy is diverse from north to south and east to west—corn, soybeans, hogs, and turkeys in the southern and western part of our State; wheat, canola, and sugar beets in the northwest; and dairy and cattle in the central and southwest. As a State, we are No. 1 in turkeys. Yes, Mr. President, that is true. Minnesota is No. 1 in turkeys and sugar beets. We are No. 2 in hogs, No. 3 in soybeans, No. 4 in corn, and fifth overall in agricultural production. But the prices farmers have received when selling these goods have been declining since 2013. USDA's Economic Research Service is forecasting net farm income to fall another 6.7 percent this year, which would represent the lowest level since 2006.

These commodities are increasingly sent around the world. From 2006 to 2016, Minnesota producers sent \$7.1 billion worth of ag products to markets around the world, making us the fourth largest agricultural exporting State in the United States. Our soybeans and dairy go to China, pork to Canada, beef to South Korea, and corn and poultry to Mexico. These exports are a crucial part of our economy, and the unknown on trade and the threat of terrorists, especially from allies with allies, such as Canada and what we have been seeing there—and I hope we will have a reasonable approach with our allies going forward—those headlines are having real impacts on many farmers' bottom lines.

Finally, no matter where the farm is located or what crops they grow, all Minnesota farms and rural communities face weather risks. This spring, many farmers and ranchers were delayed getting into their fields because of an April blizzard. We had rains that were unexpected, and the uncertainty out there in the countryside makes our work on the 2018 farm bill even more important.

What do I like about this bill? First of all, it continues to protect and improve the tools that help our farmers deal with risk. The improvements included in the commodity title will ensure more consistent payments across counties in the Agricultural Risk Coverage Program and more access to risk management tools, such as crop insurance.

It also replaces the Margin Protection Program for dairy producers and invests additional funds in the new Dairy Risk Coverage Program. This is a major challenge in my State and many others.

We have also started a vaccine bank for the first time—something Senator CORNYN and I worked on. He is here in the Chamber, and I thank him for his leadership in working on this vaccine bank that we have started. It will help us with avian flu, H1N1, and other diseases that we see with our animals.

Senator THUNE and I worked together on several provisions in the conservation title of the bill to help farmers get more out of their land. We also worked to increase the CRP cap to 25 million acres and to fix a loophole in the conservation sodsaver program.

This bill includes a number of amendments. I see Senator STABENOW is here on the floor, and I again thank her for her leadership in helping us. Michigan, just like Minnesota, understands how important agriculture-based energy, biobased manufacturing, and clean energy technology programs and initiatives are. Those amendments were all included in this farm bill. I truly appreciate it, as well as the work that Senator HOEVEN and I did to increase access to credit, while providing for better data reporting on borrowers and participation rates.

I close with this: In these times of uncertainty in agriculture, we need to work to strengthen the farms and rural communities that sustain us every day. Whether it is hemp in Kentucky, hogs in Iowa, sugar beets and sweet corn in Minnesota, or energy in Michigan, this farm bill is about our Nation's future, and it is about adjusting what is working, making it a bill that meets the challenges ahead, and making sure we are investing in the farmers and the workers of the Midwest and not the oil cartels of the Mideast.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, before the Senator from Minnesota leaves, I want to thank her for her amazing leadership as one of the senior members of the Agriculture Committee. She has not only made a significant difference as it relates to energy—and she talked about bioenergy and the biobased economy, which is so important for us, for jobs and energy independence. She has been a real leader there, as well as in conservation, commodities titles, local foods, and all of the ways in which this bill has come together. So I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

AMENDMENT NO. 3383

(Purpose: To provide for certain work requirements for able-bodied adults without dependents and to require State agencies to operate a work activation program for eligible participants in the supplemental nutrition assistance program)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 3383 to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 3224.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. KENNEDY] proposes an amendment numbered 3383 to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 3224.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with and for the opportunity to make a few remarks about my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. KENNEDY. Thank you.

Mr. President, I am joined in this amendment with Senators Cruz and Lee. I thank Senator ROBERTS and Senator STABENOW for their work on this bill.

The farm bill is a must-pass bill. It is important. I realize that. America was born on the farm. Seventy percent of the cost of this bill has to do with food stamps, and I am pleased to have the opportunity for us to discuss a way to improve our food stamp program.

As I said yesterday, I don't want to take away food stamps from people in need. I do want fewer people to need food stamps. In our country, I am very proud of the fact that if you are hungry, we feed you. If you are homeless, we house you. If you are too poor to be sick, we pay for your doctor. But the best way to continue the food stamp program and our other social programs is to make sure that they are efficient and that we save as much money as we can from those who would abuse the program in order to really help those in need.

This amendment will make responsible changes to the SNAP program by updating photo identification requirements related to electronic benefits transfer systems in the Food and Nutrition Act, and it will also take the very important step of having work requirements for able-bodied adult individuals without dependents. We are not talking about someone with kids or taking Grandpa out of the nursing home. And it would require State agencies to operate work activation programs for eligible SNAP participants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I am proud to join with Senator KENNEDY and Senator LEE in offering this amendment.

The farm bill has many good and important elements in it that benefit our farmers and ranchers, who are a critical part of our economy in my home State of Texas and all across this country.

A major component of this bill is, of course, the food stamp program. The food stamp program provides important support for people who are in need, but at the same time, we should not be trapping people into dependency.

The amendment that I have joined with Senator KENNEDY and Senator LEE in offering strengthens the work

requirements for food stamps for able-bodied adults. Right now, more than a third of the country lives in areas with no work requirements. Thirty-three States have some kind of waiver on the work requirements. Twenty-eight States have partial waivers. Five States and the District of Columbia have total waivers on work requirements. That is not right, and it has led to a troubling development. In recent years, a rapidly growing group of food stamp recipients has been able-bodied adults between the ages of 18 to 49, in prime working ages, who are not disabled and have no dependents or children to support. This population has quintupled, rising from 1 million recipients in 2008 to about 5 million recipients in 2015.

As a Senate, this should be a bipartisan proposal. We should come together to include work requirements to get people who are on food stamps back into the workplace, providing for their families.

I urge our colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I want to step back and look at the reality of SNAP and the food assistance program today.

The farm bill has two kinds of safety nets. It is a safety net for farmers and a safety net for families.

The good news is, because the economy is doing better, we are going to save over \$80 billion in the next 10 years on the food and family side because the economy is getting better and people don't need temporary help and they are going back to work. The challenge for us is that in this bill, we have a lot of farmers who need a safety net because we have seen prices drop by 50 percent and weather disasters and other things that have been very challenging for them.

So, No. 1, I think this is an amendment in search of a problem. No. 2, we already have work requirements—let's make that very, very clear. Despite things that have been said before, we already have work requirements in the SNAP program.

Now, 75 percent of those who get food help are senior citizens, people with disabilities, and children and their parents—75 percent. Of the 25 percent—they are required to work at least 20 hours a week, and if they do not, then the most they can receive is up to 3 months' worth of food help in a 3-year period.

The amendment essentially would limit and change that for people. For instance, it would subject parents of children as young as 1 years old to new work requirements, but there is no funding for training or support for childcare or anything to help that mom be successful.

In the underlying bill, we have funded 10 States to help those who have extra challenges get into full-time em-

ployment, and we add 8 more States to that. That is the positive way to do it, not just saying that moms of children as young as 1 years old have to meet a work requirement in order to feed their children. This also eliminates waivers that States use in high-unemployment areas, like Tribal areas.

Basically, what is being said here is that we shouldn't trust States. I think about all the times we hear from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle about State block grants and about supporting States. This goes in the exact opposite direction—taking away the opportunity for States to be able to ask for waivers in high-unemployment areas.

It also slashes work exemptions that States use to cover special populations, such as veterans. It would incentivize States to cut people off of SNAP by forcing States to meet unrealistic workforce targets or face stiff penalties, and it would cut the amount of time that someone—again, I mentioned that you have to work 20 hours a week; otherwise, you can receive no more than 3 months' worth of food help in a 3-year period. This would say "No, no, no; 3 months is too much out of 3 years" and it would take it down to 1 month.

Finally, there is the Kennedy provision specifically requiring household members to show picture IDs to purchase food. Colleagues should know that this is strongly opposed by the Food Marketing Institute and the National Grocers Association and the manufacturers. It would impose new liabilities on more than 200,000 stores, including small businesses that participate in SNAP, which would then be liable and responsible for what happens under this provision.

It would create barriers for seniors, people with disabilities who rely on caregivers to purchase their groceries, and others who depend on someone else to get them their food assistance, and homeless individuals, including veterans, without IDs might be denied food as a result of this provision.

I join with the distinguished chairman who will be making a motion to table this amendment. We will have the opportunity to thoughtfully address these issues in a conference committee.

This amendment, in my judgment, would undermine what has been a very positive bipartisan effort to get a farm bill done and, in fact, would stop us from being able to complete this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I think I owe an apology to many of my Republican colleagues, if I could call for regular order, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I think I owe an apology to many of my Republican colleagues, and I hope I can get their attention.

We have talked a lot about the need for a farm bill. We have talked about

how we are in a rough patch in agriculture and how it affects every part of the country—all regions, all crops—and that we have crafted a farm bill in a bipartisan way with most of the titles.

I have not talked enough to stress what we have done with regard to the SNAP program, in terms of reform and efficiencies, and solving that bonus program that was full of errors, prompting the IG to fine several States.

Bear with me. I want to go over some of this progress that I think my colleagues will be interested in.

I thank my colleague for his amendment, which would modify the work requirements under SNAP, as has been indicated, and require a photo ID with the use of a SNAP EBT card. I understand the intent to work toward self-sufficiency among SNAP participants. By the way, the best thing we have done is we have seen the economy improve and have seen to it that people have jobs and can get jobs and actually get off of food stamps.

While I understand the intent is to promote work by broadening the application of the requirements, our bill would focus more on employment and training in the work requirements. The point I am trying to make is that in addition, many of the provisions in the amendment are duplicative of current law and regulations and would create significant administrative burdens for the Department of Agriculture and State agencies—something we don't want.

Our bill is focused on more accountability in the employment and training programs to get folks back on the path to employment. Ten States have pilot programs, taking a look at exactly how they can accomplish this goal. Eight more we deal with in this bill. That is 18 States where we have pilot programs where we can actually make progress and that is by States innovating, by adopting State pilot programs, as I have just mentioned.

We authorize new State innovation employment and training pilots. I just basically addressed that. We make sure State work programs consult with local employers when setting up and evaluating a training program. That means we are much more specific. We set up a process for groups of employers and nonprofit stakeholders to conduct their own training programs that count for SNAP participants with minimal regulatory burden.

So we are achieving regulatory reform while, at the same time, getting basically nonprofit stakeholders to come in and actually take part. That is a good thing.

These are all things that will provide the tools to States, to people, to employers, and to nonprofits that will get people working again.

I urge my colleagues to support my motion to table this amendment, and then we can find the appropriate balance in getting people working again. Obviously, we point out that this issue

is going to come up again when we go to conference—if we can get a bill; if we can at least keep on the bipartisan track to get a farm bill done.

Again, I appreciate the effort to combat fraud in SNAP, but I am in opposition to this amendment, along with the independent grocers, the convenience stores, and retailers all across the country.

Current law allows States to have a photo on EBT cards, but most States have concluded that the cost of putting a photo on the card would outweigh any savings from fraud prevention. For the few States that have opted for a photo EBT card, it has created so much confusion at the register for many retailers, since EBT cards are shared with different people in a household. It is a problem.

While I share concerns about the SNAP program's integrity, the bill already includes several provisions that would improve the integrity of the program, such as the use of increased data matches across the program.

These are efficiencies I haven't talked about to my Republican colleagues. I know the ranking member certainly has made her caucus aware of them. Therefore, I respectfully urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. President, I move to table the Kennedy amendment No. 3383 and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 141 Leg.]

YEAS—68

Alexander	Grassley	Nelson
Baldwin	Harris	Perdue
Bennet	Hassan	Peters
Blumenthal	Hatch	Portman
Blunt	Heinrich	Reed
Booker	Heitkamp	Roberts
Boozman	Hirono	Rounds
Brown	Hoeven	Sanders
Cantwell	Isakson	Schatz
Capito	Jones	Schumer
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	King	Shelby
Casey	Klobuchar	Smith
Collins	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Manchin	Sullivan
Corker	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	McCaskill	Udall
Crapo	Menendez	Van Hollen
Donnelly	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Moran	Warren
Feinstein	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murphy	Wyden
Graham	Murray	

NAYS—30

Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Burr	Gardner	Risch
Cassidy	Heller	Rubio
Cornyn	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Cotton	Inhofe	Scott
Cruz	Johnson	Thune
Daines	Kennedy	Tillis
Enzi	Lankford	Toomey
Ernst	Lee	Wicker
Fischer	McConnell	Young

NOT VOTING—2

Duckworth McCain

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Thank you, Mr. President.

We are getting very close to finalizing the farm bill on a bipartisan basis. We just have some UC requests we are going over. Stay tuned. I hope Members understand that when we do have a vote—this vote was over 60 minutes. There was some commentary on it. I understand that, but certainly we can do better than that on behalf of our ranchers, farmers, growers, and the great State of Texas. Thank you very much, and we will be back to you just as quickly as we can. I know people have very important schedules to meet.

I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I will join with Chairman ROBERTS. We are close to the final UC and to the final vote. We will ask folks to stay close, and we hope to begin that process shortly, with everyone's support and indulgence. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF TARA SWEENEY

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to take a few minutes while we have an interlude here with the farm bill to speak along with my colleague Senator SULLIVAN about the nomination of, in my view, an extraordinary Alaskan—Tara MacLean Sweeney, who has been nominated to serve as Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs at the Department of Interior.

It is certainly my very strong hope that Ms. Sweeney can be confirmed to this position before we leave for the Fourth of July recess. I see no reason why this body should delay confirmation.

I want to give just a little bit of background and share, along with my colleague Senator SULLIVAN, some of the attributes we are talking about here.

Ms. Sweeney is truly a noncontroversial nominee. She has support across

the political spectrum. She was reported out of the Committee on Indian Affairs by a voice vote. There was no dissent. She is endorsed by the National Congress of American Indians, and she enjoys strong support across Indian Country—not only from Alaska Natives up in our State but truly across Indian Country. She is Inupiaq. She is a very distinguished leader, respected among indigenous peoples not only here in the United States but abroad. She is truly eminently qualified for the position.

So I want to share briefly the history of how we got here. It has been many months—many, many months—and I think it is important to know the process she has gone through. The President announced his intent to nominate Ms. Sweeney on October 16, 2017. We received it in the Senate about a week later, and from there she entered into this frustrating bureaucratic purgatory is probably the best way to describe it.

So I mentioned that Ms. Sweeney is an Inupiaq from the North Slope, and like every other Alaska Native who was born before December 18, 1971, she is a beneficiary of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act. Under that legislation, Ms. Sweeney received 100 shares of stock in the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation. This is one of the 13 corporations that has been created by Congress. Ms. Sweeney also inherited some additional shares from her mother who died in 1996.

The Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act prohibits Ms. Sweeney from disposing of those shares. Why is that? These are not shares that are like shares in IBM or General Electric. These shares are her birthright as an Alaskan Native. The Department of Interior has concluded that Ms. Sweeney's continued ownership of those shares creates no ethical impediments to the discharge of her duties—none whatsoever. She has also entered into an ethics agreement under which she will recuse herself from matters involving the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation, where she served as a corporate officer prior to her nomination.

Really, there is no conceptual difference between Ms. Sweeney's service with her Native corporation and the service of her predecessor Assistant Secretaries for Indian Affairs who all came to the office after serving as elected Tribal leaders. In those instances, none of the predecessors to Ms. Sweeney were disqualified for confirmation for Tribal service, and she certainly should not be either.

Ms. Sweeney's corporation manages lands set aside for Native people; so do nearly all of the federally recognized Tribes. Her corporation engages in a variety of successful business activities that parallel those engaged in by federally recognized Tribes in the lower 48. Voting membership in Ms. Sweeney's corporation is constituted entirely of Native people, just like membership in the lower 48 Tribes, and the governing body in Ms. Sweeney's corporation is

constituted entirely of Native people, just as the governing bodies of the lower 48 Tribes. There is no valid reason—certainly no valid reason to delay the confirmation of Tara Sweeney to the post of Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs.

This is an agency that I think those of us who have been involved on the Indian Affairs Committee, as I have for my entire tenure in the Senate, know that leadership in this critical agency for our first peoples is absolutely a priority.

There is so much that needs to be done within the Agency. The Bureau of Indian Education, which Ms. Sweeney will oversee as an Assistant Secretary, has earned a place on the Government Accountability Office's list of high-risk programs for the 115th Congress. One of her challenges will be to improve the Bureau of Indian Education.

When you think about the responsibilities you have as Assistant Secretary with NBIA to address not only the education issues, the health and safety issues, and the life and well-being of our Native people, she has a lot of work to do. So leadership at the top is going to require a handful of things. The first is steady leadership and a strong commitment to lead. You just can't get to leading the agency until you have been confirmed to the position. The second thing that has to happen is to ensure that the agency is staffed and has the resources to care for our Native children. The third is to have an action plan in place that identifies the root causes of the agency's problems and to identify real solutions. The fourth is the formulation of corrective measures and to validate the work. The final one is to demonstrate progress that the agency has overcome some of these issues.

I can tell you for a fact that Tara Sweeney is ready. She is beyond ready. She has been teed up to do this, in my view, literally, her whole life. She has gone through a very rigorous process. She has been overwhelmingly endorsed by Native peoples across the country, those whom she would serve in this capacity. She knows there are significant issues and problems within the BIA that need to be addressed that are going to be difficult, and she has said in front of us and to those of us who know her well: I am not afraid to kick down doors. I am not afraid to stand up and speak out loud for the people whom I will serve.

I know she takes these responsibilities very seriously. I know her leadership skills. I know her managerial skills. I have no doubt that she will do everything in her power to overcome these deficiencies that the GAO has identified, but I also should be clear that there will be no progress within the agency until one of the single most important positions to Indian Country is permanently filled with an Assistant Secretary.

I know we are having challenges moving through nominees on this floor

right now, but I would urge my colleagues to look at Tara Sweeney's credentials. Look at her background. Look at how she has come to this place. She is not a controversial nominee. She is well-qualified. She did extremely well at her hearing before the Indian Affairs Committee. She has answered every question that has been asked of her. Indian Country is united in support of her.

I just ask that, for the good of the first peoples in this country, they have that leadership at the top to come in and address so many of these serious issues that face them today. Let us come together with this nominee and move her through the process in a prompt and expedient way.

I will close with one last comment before turning to my colleague, and that is that of the 12 previous Assistant Secretaries at the BIA over the years, 11 of those 12 have moved through confirmation here in the Senate unanimously, without even a vote. Only one was required to have a vote. As I recall, the outcome in support of that individual was 87 votes in favor. This is not a controversial position. This is not partisan in any way.

This has to be an individual that is willing to bring together people—our first peoples and those of us at government levels—to work together to address the very real, serious, and significant concerns that we have.

Tara Sweeney is just that person. I would urge colleagues: Please, please, let's advance her quickly and expeditiously across the floor of the Senate.

I would turn to my colleague who has worked very hard and also knows Ms. Sweeney to be an extraordinarily capable Alaskan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague Senator MURKOWSKI from the great State of Alaska—our great State—for talking about someone we really care about and someone who will do really important things for the entire country.

Senator MURKOWSKI talked about Tara Sweeney's background. When we had the confirmation hearing in Indian Affairs, I had the honor of introducing her. She did fantastic in that interview. Republicans and Democrats all agree.

When you look at her background, she is a leader. You can read her resume. You can see all of the things that this relatively young woman has accomplished. Senator MURKOWSKI mentioned some. She was, for example, the cochair of the Alaska Federation of Natives. That is an elected position in Alaska. Almost 20 percent of our population is Alaska Native. She was one of the youngest cochairs ever on that incredibly important organization.

She was the chair of the Arctic Economic Conference. She has also served in leadership positions at her Alaska Native Regional Corporations and the

National Congress of American Indians, and she is ready to lead an organization that needs leadership. She is clearly qualified.

Sometimes there can be confusion in terms of the laws that this body passes. In 1971 the Congress of the United States passed, and the President of the United States signed, the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, or ANCSA back home. As Senator MURKOWSKI mentioned, this set up not reservation systems like we have in the lower 48 but a very innovative approach to Alaska Native claims for their land, and 44 million acres of State and Federal land went to the possession and ownership of the first peoples of Alaska. It was very innovative.

This body created Alaska regional corporations and village corporations, of which all our Alaska Native people are shareholders. My wife is a shareholder. My daughters are shareholders. That was mandated by the Congress. Yet, as Tara Sweeney has gone through her confirmation process, the Federal Government seemed to wake up to the fact that Alaska Native individuals owned shares in these Alaska corporations that Congress created, and time and again, they started to seemingly almost hold it against her.

Let me give you a little bit of a timeline of the delays that Senator MURKOWSKI mentioned. She was nominated by the President to serve as the Assistant Secretary on October 16, 2017. That is almost 9 months ago.

First, her nomination went through a very long process through the Office of Government Ethics—again, because of the birthright shares that she is entitled to as an Alaskan Native because Congress told them that. So there was confusion. Again, a lot of people didn't know what this was. At one point, there was even the sense that she couldn't have the job until she sold her shares. But she can't sell her shares, as Senator MURKOWSKI said. It is not like owning IBM or Microsoft.

Certainly, we were saying that if that were the precedent, you would rule out an entire class of great people—our constituents—from serving in the Federal Government. That couldn't be the precedent.

She has worked through this with the Office of Government Ethics, which has completely cleared her with regard to how she is going to manage these shares and recuse herself from anything her regional corporation has before her, which, by the way, historically, has almost never happened. She said she would do this in writing. That satisfied the Office of Government Ethics.

Her nomination hearing was held on May 9, where she again committed to recuse herself from matters that pertain to her regional corporation.

On June 6, she was unanimously voted out of the Senate Indian Affairs Committee. During the confirmation hearing, she said several times that she would recuse herself. In that hearing,

as I mentioned, members on both sides again asked for assurances that she would recuse herself from issues pertaining to her regional corporation, and again, she provided assurances in writing after the hearing.

You are starting to see a pattern here. I am not sure there is anyone who has gone through Senate confirmation recently who has had to reassure and say she is going to recuse herself again and again on an issue more than Tara Sweeney has. It is pretty remarkable, when you think about the fact that the reason she has these shares is because this body voted to create the act in 1971, and yet there is amnesia all over this city and, certainly, in this body.

Once again, as we are trying to move her to the floor, it looks like there has been another demand for another assurance and another letter on the same issues. So once again, Ms. Sweeney has provided that. Certainly, I hope that my colleagues—whoever is demanding this—will say: That is enough. If this very highly qualified person owned IBM or Microsoft or something like that, this would have been done and over. She would have recused herself. Yet, somehow, because she is an Alaska Native shareholder, there seems to be cause for additional delay. I think that is sad.

I certainly hope that is not intended to somehow focus on making it more difficult for an Alaska Native to serve in such an important position. I hope that is not what is going on here. The pattern is starting to get a little bit difficult to endure.

I think further delay, as Senator MURKOWSKI mentioned, is a disservice to someone as qualified as Tara Sweeney, and it is not reasonable. She has been waiting for months. Every time there has been a demand made on her, she does it. Every time there is a letter to ask her to reassure something, she has reassured several times. She does it, but there is delay. That is not good for the individual. It is not good, actually, for trying to get good people to serve in the Federal Government, which we all want.

Senator MURKOWSKI also underscored that further delay is not good for anyone who is an Alaska Native or an American Indian or somebody who cares about them, like we do, because right now, the most important position in the Federal Government, the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs at the Department of Interior—which will be headed by someone who is immensely qualified in Tara Sweeney—is not filled. As Senator MURKOWSKI mentioned, there is so much work to be done. This woman is a leader. She will get on it. She will get on it to help Alaska Native people and to help lower 48 American Indians.

We all know there are significant challenges on reservations and in some of the Alaska Native villages. We need a leader, and we have the leader. We have her. I am really concerned if there is going to be any more delay. What

this body should do is confirm her right now.

Senator MURKOWSKI and I are getting ready to ask at a certain point today, before the Senate moves to recess for the Fourth of July recess, for a unanimous consent request. As far as I can tell, almost every Senator knows that this is important. I am certainly hoping all my colleagues are not going to ask for further delay. I am certainly hoping they are not going to ask for further delay that somehow relates to her being an Alaska Native. That would be highly inappropriate.

Hopefully, we can move this nomination forward for confirmation today so that Tara Sweeney can get to work for some of the most important people in this country. We have been without a leader in this position for way too long.

I am certainly encouraging my colleagues—everybody here—to clear this unanimous consent request when we make it, and that we get her confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I come to the floor this afternoon to talk about the Nation's first line of defense against hunger—the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP.

Since day one in the Senate, I have fought to pass a farm bill that stands up for North Dakota's farmers, ranchers, and low-income families. In 2014 we passed a strong farm bill, which I helped to write, negotiate, and pass. Since then, I have been working on the next farm bill.

Now the Senate is incredibly close to passing the next farm bill, which we crafted with strong support from Democrats and Republicans. This important bill shows that the Senate can work to find compromise and support the American people.

A key component of any farm bill is the safety net for farmers and ranchers during tough times, like crop insurance. It also includes a safety net for families who fall on hard times.

Our Nation is one of the most prosperous nations in the world. Yet, despite our great wealth, more than one out of seven Americans live below the poverty line. SNAP provides the critical safety net for these Americans who are food-insecure.

In my own State of North Dakota, about 54,000 North Dakotans participate in SNAP on any given day. SNAP plays a critical role in helping these families put food on the table in what is oftentimes one of the most stressful periods in a person's life. Of those 54,000 North Dakotans, 43 percent are children, 28 percent are seniors, and about 4 percent are veterans.

Families can find themselves needing this assistance for a number of reasons. First, their hours may have been reduced at work, they may have been laid off, their places of employment may have gone out of business, or an individual may be unable to work due to a disability or serious illness. Additionally, nearly 9 percent of seniors

live below the poverty level. SNAP helps those seniors with their basic needs, many of whom live on fixed incomes.

Not one of us can predict when an unexpected life event will happen to us. Thankfully, SNAP is available to provide at-risk families with the safety net they need.

Other than those with disabilities, the elderly, or others who cannot work, very few people stay on SNAP for more than 3 months in a 36-month period. Half of those new to the SNAP program will leave it within 9 months once they become financially stable.

Yesterday, I stood here to talk about the critical, bipartisan work of the chairman and ranking member on the Senate Ag Committee and what they have done for ranchers and farmers.

This bipartisan farm bill includes a number of provisions that work to improve employment and job-training opportunities and programs that help parents find new jobs or obtain new skills so that they can qualify for higher paying jobs. This includes expanding SNAP employment and training demonstration pilots that were authorized under the 2014 farm bill. These pilot programs create more opportunities to build evidence on what works best in helping SNAP participants secure and retain jobs and advance in the labor market.

Additionally, the Senate farm bill encourages States to create new public-private partnerships around job training and leverage existing private sector job-training programs for SNAP participants.

During consideration of the 2014 farm bill, the Senate Ag Committee, on which I proudly sit, also worked to responsibly cut \$4 billion of waste, fraud, and abuse from the program, while protecting low-income families who rely on this lifesaving program during times of need. The Senate bill continues to improve SNAP's integrity by preventing dual participation by enabling States to check whether applicants have already enrolled in other States.

In other words, the SNAP program as laid out in the farm bill that we will be considering is a program that has the necessary reforms and the necessary balance. No one—no one—in this body wants someone who is unworthy to receive SNAP benefits, but we also do not want families who need that critical benefit to find it onerous or impossible to access food for their children, food for their grandchildren, or food for our veterans.

A week ago, the House of Representatives narrowly passed its version of the farm bill by two votes, which would drastically cut SNAP. This partisan bill was even opposed by 20 Republican Members. As ranking member of the House Agriculture Committee, COLLIN PETERSON said the following about the vote:

The partisan approach of the Majority has produced a bill that simply doesn't do

enough for the people it's supposed to serve. It still leaves farmers and ranchers vulnerable, it worsens hunger, and it fails rural communities.

This approach makes reckless cuts to the nutrition safety net and in so doing significantly jeopardizes our chances of passing a farm bill. Any effort to separate farm programs from nutrition programs threatens the urban-rural coalition that has kept the farm bill a bipartisan effort for years.

Simply put, the House bill threatens these critical lifelines for struggling families, seniors, and Americans with disabilities. There is no place for politics when it comes to protecting these vulnerable members of our society.

According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, the House farm bill would cause more than 2 million individuals in more than 1 million households to lose their benefits. This simply will not impact single adults, but when a parent loses their food assistance, there isn't enough money to buy for the whole household, including children.

The House farm bill would pull the rug out from underneath low-income families by expanding the already rigid work requirements in SNAP. This includes working parents, children, seniors, veterans, and disabled Americans. A quarter of a million children would lose their access to school lunch.

Last Saturday, I was asked to participate in a discussion with the faith-based community in my State regarding their concerns about the SNAP program. At that time, we were told a couple of stories that I think are significant for review here in the Senate.

I want to start off by telling you about Kim. Kim is a woman, a single mom with two beautiful children. She lives in Bismarck, ND. She works as an accounting assistant, and when she doesn't have full-time hours, she works as a substitute at area daycares. Since her divorce 3 years ago, her family has been eligible for SNAP benefits.

Kim said: "We do what we can, but usually we are eating ramen by the end of the month—don't want to eat cheap food, but there's never enough money to buy healthy foods."

To stretch their food budget, Kim tries to get the children to The Banquet, which is a local feeding ministry, for meals two to three times a week. They also visit the local food pantry.

She told us:

I can only speak for myself, but I'm grateful for this program every single day. I'm working hard. If I don't have enough to eat, I can't work. If I'm not healthy, I'll need even more support.

This is an incredibly common theme among SNAP families.

I think it is worth mentioning that the average meal benefit in North Dakota—I want to repeat this—the average benefit per meal in North Dakota is \$1.32. You can't even get a bowl of Senate bean soup for \$1.32.

Next, there is Ricky. Ricky was born in Minot, ND, where he grew up in pov-

erty, and his family spent the majority of their lives on what was then known as food stamps. Ricky has since moved to Fargo, and a number of years ago, Ricky suffered an unfortunate accident in his workplace. So Ricky was working. He got injured, and he woke up from a coma 3 weeks later. He was later diagnosed with epilepsy, and he no longer can drive or work. Like Ricky, his parents are also disabled, and the program has offered them a consistent safety net during their difficult times.

From his childhood, Ricky recalled that his family rarely had money for food. He said:

If it wasn't for food stamps, we could have starved easily. There were times when my family couldn't even celebrate birthdays because we didn't have anything.

Now in his late twenties and living on his own in Fargo, unfortunately the difficult times surrounding hunger are still a concern for Ricky, for reasons outside of his control. Understanding his difficult situation and all that the SNAP program has meant to him and his family, Ricky is passionate about stopping lawmakers from making unnecessary cuts to this program. For Ricky and his family, the SNAP benefits they have received are more than just a benefit; they are a way of life and a lifeline.

For individuals who are homeless or trying to get back on the right track, SNAP can play an invaluable role in providing a bit of security.

Folks who have benefited from the helping hand SNAP provides are all around us. They could be our neighbors. They could be our friends. They could even be a rural pastor.

Many years ago—about 6 years ago—when I was traveling the State, I had an opportunity to have a discussion in a rural community. That discussion went something like this:

Many people raised concerns about people taking government benefits when they didn't need them. I sympathized. I don't think that we should. I think we need to stop waste, fraud, and abuse. But we know those government programs are there for a purpose.

After there was a long discussion about SNAP, or food stamps, the room cleared, and a young pastor came up to me. His wife was with him, holding their latest child, who looked to be about a 2-year-old toddler.

He said: I didn't want to say this in front of the community. I didn't want to tell you about this in front of the community, but I want you to know that I am on SNAP. My family is on SNAP. We still can't buy milk. We still buy powdered milk to feed our children. If I want to do my rural ministry, I am not paid enough to support and feed my family, so I am working, and I am on SNAP. I can't afford food as a rural pastor.

I think many times we don't realize those around us who are struggling, those who contribute as teachers, as teachers' aides, CNAs. People are working hard. They may be tripped up by

some of the onerous standards and onerous bureaucratic requirements in the farm bill that was passed by the House.

I think it is critically important that we understand that there are very, very few people in America who are abusers of this program. There are very, very few people in America who would take a handout unless they absolutely needed it. They need a hand up. They need job training. They need sympathy for their disabilities. And they need to know that we live in a country that cares for the hungry around us.

As we consider the farm bill, it is important to remind ourselves about those who are not as fortunate as we are, those who struggle to put food on the table for their families or who might not be able to put food on the table because they were laid off or their hours were reduced at their minimum wage jobs.

The chairman and ranking member have worked diligently to find ways to continue to improve SNAP's integrity and operations.

I hope the Senate votes on and passes this strong bipartisan farm bill in the next few days. I hope the House decides to keep working through August, just as the Senate will do, to reach an agreement and pass a strong farm bill before it expires and jeopardizes SNAP further.

The farm bill gives farmers the certainty they need to get through tough times, and it is important that it also maintain a strong safety net to give certainty to our Nation's families that they can get the support and food they need at the same time.

I urge all of my colleagues to stand with the ranking member and the chairman and all of the Senate Agriculture Committee in supporting this farm bill and supporting the nutrition title of this bill.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, most people in America are probably familiar with the advertising slogans: "Pork, the other white meat" and "Beef, it's what's for dinner," but what they might not know, what they might not be as aware of is the cronyist underbelly of slogans like these.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture checkoff programs behind these very slogans and others like them tend to collect compulsory fees from producers of milk, eggs, beef, and other agricultural products. These funds are then used to promote and do research on those particular commodities.

Unfortunately, these programs have been rife with opportunities for abuse. Many of these programs have crept far

beyond the scope of their statutory mandate by engaging in illegal lobbying and anticompetitive activities. Take, for example, the case of a small California company called JUST, Inc., formerly known as Hampton Creek, which a few years ago was attacked for selling its vegan mayonnaise known as Just Mayo in stores nationwide. It turns out that a Federal entity called the American Egg Board conspired with USDA employees and top executives from the egg industry to threaten and coerce retailers into not carrying the Just Mayo brand.

The original intent of these programs was to research and promote certain commodities, not to disparage other ones, and they certainly were not intended to prevent any new products from having a fair chance in the marketplace.

Let me just stop, by the way, while we are talking about Just Mayo and that incident, to take note of the fact that it ought to be very concerning to us that the Federal Government became involved in a campaign to pressure someone about whether they could set up a brand of vegan mayonnaise and call it that.

So what were supposed to be promotional boards have instead become protectionist boards. What is more, checkoff programs force farmers to pay into a system that sometimes actively works against their interests and, on top of that, the boards for these programs have come under fire for a lack of transparency and for misuse of their funds. Some have gone so far as failing to submit congressionally mandated spending reports, refusing and delaying requests under FOIA, and even engaging in protracted legal battles to prevent public audits from being disclosed.

In short, these programs—the so-called checkoff programs—are in significant need of reform. This is why I have worked hard with my colleagues—Senator BOOKER, Senator HASSAN, Senator PAUL, and Senator WARREN—to introduce amendment No. 3074. This amendment would address some of the most grievous abuses of these commodity checkoff programs.

First, the amendment would prohibit them—these checkoff programs—from contracting with any organization that lobbies on agricultural policy with an exemption for research at institutions of higher education. It would also prohibit employees and agents of the checkoff boards from engaging in activities that may pose a conflict of interest. Furthermore, the amendment would establish uniform standards for checkoff programs that prohibit anticompetitive activity and any unfair or deceptive practices.

While this amendment would not abolish checkoff programs, it would implement much needed transparency measures so farmers can see what their checkoff dollars are actually being spent to do. These commonsense reforms will not be convenient perhaps to

the giants of the agricultural industry—at least not the ones using checkoff dollars to rig the system in their favor. These commonsense reforms will help farmers—and particularly the little guys—from the small farms and the startup companies to see exactly where the fees they pay are going and ensure that their hard-earned money is not being used unfairly against them.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment to bring about much needed reform with checkoff programs.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, the amendment offered by Senator LEE and Senator BOOKER would prohibit checkoffs from partnering with farm groups and others that engage with government. This prohibition would extend far beyond farm country, and it would have negative impacts on the general public. This is because checkoffs partner with a diverse number of entities, not just farm organizations, to conduct research and education campaigns on environmental, conservation, improved nutrition, and other critical areas that benefit our entire society.

Examples of entities who have contracted with checkoffs and would be barred from continuing checkoff work because they engage in lobbying include the American Heart Association, the American Association of Pediatricians, and the National Women, Infants and Children Association. These organizations and many others would be prohibited from partnering with checkoffs if this amendment were adopted.

I urge my colleagues to think carefully about the impact this amendment would have, and I urge a "no" vote on the Lee-Booker amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I join with the chairman in asking members to vote no on this amendment. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be agreed to en bloc: the amendment by Senator ISAKSON, No. 3348; Senators WYDEN and MURKOWSKI, No. 3346; Senator ENZI, No. 3181; Senators KING and COLLINS, No. 3221; Senators GILLIBRAND and TOOMEY, No. 3390; Senator HEINRICH, No. 3287; Senator RUBIO, No. 3364; Senator SULLIVAN, No. 3303, Senator HIRONO, No. 3321; Senators CORTEZ MASTO and PORTMAN, No. 3388; Senator DURBIN, No. 3389; Senators BROWN and PORTMAN, No. 3323; Senator CANTWELL, No. 3365; Senator MORAN, No. 3171; and Senator THUNE, No. 3371. I further ask that it be in order for the following amendment to be called up and reported by number: the amendment by Senator LEE, No. 3074. I further ask that the cloture motions with respect to H.R. 2 be withdrawn and the Senate now vote on the

following amendments in the order listed: Senator LEE, No. 3074; Senator THUNE, No. 3134; and Senator ROBERTS, the substitute No. 3224; further, that the Lee amendment be subject to a 60-vote affirmative threshold for adoption; and that following disposition of the Roberts amendment, the bill, as amended, if amended, be read a third time and the Senate vote on passage with no intervening action or debate and that passage be subject to a 60-vote affirmative threshold.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments (Nos. 3348, 3346, 3181, 3221, 3390, 3287, 3364, 3303, 3321, 3388, 3389, 3323, 3365, 3171, and 3371) were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3348

(Purpose: To modify the provision relating to economic adjustment assistance for upland cotton users, to provide payments for losses relating to peach and blueberry crops, and to strike the provision relating to the use of the Commodity Credit Corporation)

On page 26, line 16, strike “2020” and insert “2021”.

At the end of subtitle E of title I, add the following:

SEC. 15. LOSS OF PEACH AND BLUEBERRY CROPS DUE TO EXTREME COLD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide compensation for expenses relating to losses of peach and blueberry crops that occurred—

(1) during calendar year 2017; and

(2) due to extreme cold, as determined by the Secretary.

(b) FUNDING.—Of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary shall use to carry out this section \$18,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Strike section 1710.

AMENDMENT NO. 3346

(Purpose: To provide that research and extension grants may be made for the purposes of researching hop plant health)

On page 1203, strike line 3 and insert the following:

“(16) HOP PLANT HEALTH INITIATIVE.—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purposes of developing and disseminating science-based tools and treatments to combat diseases of hops caused by the plant pathogens *Podosphaera macularis* and *Pseudoperonospora humuli*.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3181

(Purpose: To improve the Rural Energy for America Program)

Strike section 9107 and insert the following:

SEC. 9107. RURAL ENERGY FOR AMERICA PROGRAM.

Section 9007 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8107) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) to purchase and install efficient energy equipment or systems.”;

(2) in subsection (e), by striking “(g)” each place it appears and inserting “(f)”;

(3) by striking subsection (f);

(4) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (f); and

(5) in subsection (f) (as so redesignated), in paragraph (3), by striking “\$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” and inserting “\$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3221

(Purpose: To provide for a report on funding for the National Institute of Food and Agriculture and other extension programs)

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 125. REPORT ON FUNDING FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE AND OTHER EXTENSION PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date on which the census of agriculture required to be conducted in calendar year 2017 under section 2 of the Census of Agriculture Act of 1997 (7 U.S.C. 2204g) is released, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the funding necessary to adequately address the needs of the National Institute of Food and Agriculture, activities carried out under the Smith-Lever Act (7 U.S.C. 341 et seq.), and research and extension programs carried out at an 1890 Institution (as defined in section 2 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7601)) or an institution designated under the Act of July 2, 1862 (commonly known as the “First Morrill Act”) (12 Stat. 503, chapter 130; 7 U.S.C. 301 et seq.), to provide adequate services for the growth and development of the economies of rural communities based on the changing demographic in the rural and farming communities in the various States.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In preparing the report under subsection (a), the Secretary shall focus on the funding needs of the programs described in subsection (a) with respect to carrying out activities relating to small and diverse farms and ranches, veteran farmers and ranchers, value-added agriculture, direct-to-consumer sales, and specialty crops.

AMENDMENT NO. 3390

(Purpose: To prohibit the slaughter of dogs and cats for human consumption)

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 125. PROHIBITION ON SLAUGHTER OF DOGS AND CATS FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (c), no person may—

(1) knowingly slaughter a dog or cat for human consumption; or

(2) knowingly ship, transport, move, deliver, receive, possess, purchase, sell, or donate—

(A) a dog or cat to be slaughtered for human consumption; or

(B) a dog or cat part for human consumption.

(b) SCOPE.—Subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to conduct—

(1) in interstate commerce or foreign commerce; or

(2) within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

(c) EXCEPTION FOR INDIAN TRIBES.—The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to an Indian (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304)) carrying out any activity described in subsection (a) for the purpose of a religious ceremony.

(d) PENALTY.—Any person who violates subsection (a) shall be subject to a fine in an amount not greater than \$5,000 for each violation.

(e) EFFECT ON STATE LAW.—Nothing in this section—

(1) limits any State or local law or regulation protecting the welfare of animals; or

(2) prevents a State or unit of local government from adopting and enforcing an animal welfare law or regulation that is more stringent than this section.

AMENDMENT NO. 3287

(Purpose: To modify the study of marketplace fraud of traditional foods)

Strike section 12518 and insert the following:

SEC. 12518. STUDY OF MARKETPLACE FRAUD OF TRADITIONAL FOODS AND TRIBAL SEEDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on—

(1) the market impact of traditional foods, Tribally produced products, and products that use traditional foods;

(2) fraudulent foods that mimic traditional foods or Tribal seeds that are available in the commercial marketplace as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(3) the means by which authentic traditional foods and Tribally produced foods might be protected against the impact of fraudulent foods in the marketplace; and

(4) the availability and long-term viability of Tribal seeds, including an analysis of the storage, cultivation, harvesting, and commercialization of Tribal seeds.

(b) INCLUSIONS.—The study conducted under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a consideration of the circumstances under which fraudulent foods in the marketplace occur; and

(2) an analysis of Federal laws, including intellectual property laws and trademark laws, that might offer protections for Tribal seeds and traditional foods and against fraudulent foods.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of completion of the study, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report describing the results of the study under this section to—

(1) the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives;

(2) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives;

(3) the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate;

(4) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

(5) the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate.

(d) PRIVACY OF INFORMATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Comptroller General of the United States shall protect sensitive Tribal information gained through the study conducted under subsection (a), including information about Indian sacred places.

AMENDMENT NO. 3364

(Purpose: To prohibit the use of funds to carry out programs in Cuba in contravention of the National Security Presidential Memorandum prohibiting transactions with entities owned, controlled, or operated by or on behalf of military intelligence or security services of Cuba)

On page 257, line 2, insert after the period the following: “Funds may not be used as described in the previous sentence in contravention with directives set forth under the National Security Presidential Memorandum entitled ‘Strengthening the Policy of the United States Toward Cuba’ issued by the President on June 16, 2017, during the period in which that memorandum is in effect.”

AMENDMENT NO. 3303

(Purpose: To ensure that the Secretary of Agriculture enforces certain Buy American requirements with respect to fish harvested within United States waters)

On page 1203, strike lines 20 through 22 and insert the following:

(1) fully enforce the Buy American provisions applicable to domestic food assistance programs administered by the Food and Nutrition Service, including, for use in those domestic food assistance programs, the purchase of a fish or fish product that substantially contains—

(A) fish (including tuna) harvested within—

(i) a State;

(ii) the District of Columbia; or

(iii) the Exclusive Economic Zone of the United States, as described in Presidential Proclamation 5030 (48 Fed. Reg. 10605; March 10, 1983); or

(B) tuna harvested by a United States flagged vessel; and

AMENDMENT NO. 3321

(Purpose: To provide additional assistance under the noninsured crop assistance program for certain producers)

At the end of subtitle F of title I, add the following:

SEC. 1602. ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN PRODUCERS.

(a) **DEFINITION OF QUALIFYING NATURAL DISASTER DECLARATION.**—In this section, the term “qualifying natural disaster declaration” means—

(1) a natural disaster declared by the Secretary under section 321(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1961(a)); or

(2) a major disaster or emergency designated by the President under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.).

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE.**—As soon as practicable after October 1, 2018, the Secretary shall make available assistance under section 196 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7333) to producers of an eligible crop (as defined in subsection (a)(2) of that section) that suffered losses in a county covered by a qualifying natural disaster declaration for production losses due to volcanic activity.

(c) **AMOUNT.**—The Secretary shall make assistance available under subsection (b) in an amount equal to the amount of assistance determined under section 196(d) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7333(d)), less any fees that are owed by producers under section 196(k) of that Act (7 U.S.C. 7333(k)).

AMENDMENT NO. 3388

(Purpose: To establish the Council on Rural Community Innovation and Economic Development.)

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of June 27, 2018, under “Text of Amendments.”)

AMENDMENT NO. 3389

(Purpose: To reauthorize the rural emergency medical services training and equipment assistance program under section 330J of the Public Health Service Act)

At the end of subtitle F of title XII, add the following:

SEC. ____ . REAUTHORIZATION OF RURAL EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES TRAINING AND EQUIPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Supporting and Improving Rural EMS Needs Act of 2018” or the “SIREN Act of 2018”.

(b) **AMENDMENTS.**—Section 330J of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254c–15) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “in rural areas” and inserting “in rural areas or to residents of rural areas”;

(2) by striking subsections (b) through (f) and inserting the following:

“(b) **ELIGIBILITY; APPLICATION.**—To be eligible to receive grant under this section, an entity shall—

“(1) be—

“(A) an emergency medical services agency operated by a local or tribal government (including fire-based and non-fire based); or

“(B) an emergency medical services agency that is described in section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code; and

“(2) submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

“(c) **USE OF FUNDS.**—An entity—

“(1) shall use amounts received through a grant under subsection (a) to—

“(A) train emergency medical services personnel as appropriate to obtain and maintain licenses and certifications relevant to service in an emergency medical services agency described in subsection (b)(1);

“(B) conduct courses that qualify graduates to serve in an emergency medical services agency described in subsection (b)(1) in accordance with State and local requirements;

“(C) fund specific training to meet Federal or State licensing or certification requirements; and

“(D) acquire emergency medical services equipment; and

“(2) may use amounts received through a grant under subsection (a) to—

“(A) recruit and retain emergency medical services personnel, which may include volunteer personnel;

“(B) develop new ways to educate emergency health care providers through the use of technology-enhanced educational methods; or

“(C) acquire personal protective equipment for emergency medical services personnel as required by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

“(d) **GRANT AMOUNTS.**—Each grant awarded under this section shall be in an amount not to exceed \$200,000.

“(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘emergency medical services’—

“(A) means resources used by a public or private nonprofit licensed entity to deliver medical care outside of a medical facility under emergency conditions that occur as a result of the condition of the patient; and

“(B) includes services delivered (either on a compensated or volunteer basis) by an emergency medical services provider or other provider that is licensed or certified by the State involved as an emergency medical technician, a paramedic, or an equivalent professional (as determined by the State).

“(2) The term ‘rural area’ means—

“(A) a nonmetropolitan statistical area;

“(B) an area designated as a rural area by any law or regulation of a State; or

“(C) a rural census tract of a metropolitan statistical area (as determined under the most recent rural urban commuting area code as set forth by the Office of Management and Budget).

“(f) **MATCHING REQUIREMENT.**—The Secretary may not award a grant under this section to an entity unless the entity agrees that the entity will make available (directly or through contributions from other public or private entities) non-Federal contributions toward the activities to be carried out

under the grant in an amount equal to 25 percent of the amount received under the grant.”; and

(3) in subsection (g)(1), by striking “2002 through 2006” and inserting “2019 through 2023”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3323

(Purpose: To add a provision relating to extension and agricultural research at 1890 land-grant colleges)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . EXTENSION AND AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AT 1890 LAND-GRANT COLLEGES, INCLUDING TUSKEGEE UNIVERSITY.

(a) **EXTENSION.**—Section 1444 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3221) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

“(5) **FISCAL YEAR 2019, 2020, 2021, OR 2022.**—In addition to other amounts authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated for 1 of fiscal year 2019, 2020, 2021, or 2022 such sums as are necessary to ensure that an eligible institution receiving a distribution of funds under this section for that fiscal year receives not less than the amount of funds received by that eligible institution under this section for the preceding fiscal year.”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the undesignated matter following paragraph (2)(B)—

(i) by striking “paragraph (2) of this subsection” and inserting “this paragraph”; and

(ii) by striking “In computing” and inserting the following:

“(C) In computing”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking “Of the remainder” and inserting “Except as provided in paragraph (4), of the remainder”; and

(ii) by striking “(2) any funds” and inserting the following:

“(3) **ADDITIONAL AMOUNT.**—Any funds”;

(C) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “are allocated” and inserting “were allocated”; and

(ii) by striking “; and” and inserting “, as so designated as of that date.”;

(D) by striking “(b) Beginning” in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and all that follows through “any funds” in paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(b) **DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Funds made available under this section shall be distributed among eligible institutions in accordance with this subsection.

“(2) **BASE AMOUNT.**—Any funds”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) **SPECIAL AMOUNT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019, 2020, 2021, OR 2022.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subparagraph (B), for 1 of fiscal year 2019, 2020, 2021, or 2022, if the calculation under paragraph (3)(B) would result in a distribution of less than \$3,000,000 to an eligible institution that first received funds under this section after the date of enactment of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–79; 128 Stat. 649) for a fiscal year, that institution shall receive a distribution of \$3,000,000 for that fiscal year.

“(B) **LIMITATION.**—Subparagraph (A) shall apply only if amounts are appropriated under subsection (a)(5) to ensure that an eligible institution receiving a distribution of funds under this section for fiscal year 2019, 2020, 2021, or 2022, as applicable, receives not less than the amount of funds received by that eligible institution under this section for the preceding fiscal year.”.

(b) **RESEARCH.**—Section 1445 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and

Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3222) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

“(6) FISCAL YEAR 2019, 2020, 2021, OR 2022.—In addition to other amounts authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated for 1 of fiscal year 2019, 2020, 2021, or 2022 such sums as are necessary to ensure that an eligible institution receiving a distribution of funds under this section for that fiscal year receives not less than the amount of funds received by that eligible institution under this section for the preceding fiscal year.”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) SPECIAL AMOUNT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019, 2020, 2021, OR 2022.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), for 1 of fiscal year 2019, 2020, 2021, or 2022, if the calculation under subparagraph (C) would result in a distribution of less than \$3,000,000 to an eligible institution that first received funds under this section after the date of enactment of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-79; 128 Stat. 649), that institution shall receive a distribution of \$3,000,000 for that fiscal year.

“(ii) LIMITATION.—Clause (i) shall apply only if amounts are appropriated under subsection (a)(6) to ensure that an eligible institution receiving a distribution of funds under this section for fiscal year 2019, 2020, 2021, or 2022, as applicable, receives not less than the amount of funds received by that eligible institution under this section for the preceding fiscal year.”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “(B) Of funds” and inserting the following:

“(C) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT.—Except as provided in subparagraph (D), of funds”;

(iii) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “are allocated” and inserting “were allocated”;

(II) by inserting “, as so designated as of that date” before the period at the end; and

(III) by striking “(A) Funds” and inserting the following:

“(B) BASE AMOUNT.—Funds”; and

(iv) in the matter preceding subparagraph (B) (as so designated), by striking “(2) The” and all that follows through “follows:” and inserting the following:

“(3) DISTRIBUTIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—After allocating amounts under paragraph (2), the remainder shall be allotted among the eligible institutions in accordance with this paragraph.”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “(1) Three per centum” and inserting the following:

“(2) ADMINISTRATION.—3 percent”;

(C) in the matter preceding paragraph (2) (as so designated), by striking “(b) Beginning” and all that follows through “follows:” and inserting the following:

“(b) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Funds made available under this section shall be distributed among eligible institutions in accordance with this subsection.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3365

(Purpose: To avert the waiving of liability for a utility whose line clearing work ignites a wildfire)

In section 8632(f), strike paragraph (2) and insert the following:

(2) PROJECT WORK.—If the Secretary approves a supplement to an approved plan under subsection (c) of section 512 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1772) or an agreement entered into under subsection (d)(1) of that section that covers a vegetation management project under the pilot program, the liability provisions of subsection (g) of that section

shall apply to the vegetation management project.

AMENDMENT NO. 3171

(Purpose: To include a provision on requirements for the calculation of a separate actual crop revenue and agriculture risk coverage guarantee for irrigated and nonirrigated covered commodities)

In section 1104(5), redesignate subparagraphs (A) through (C) as subparagraphs (B) through (D), respectively.

In section 1104(5), insert before subparagraph (B) (as so redesignated) the following:

(A) in paragraph (2), by inserting “in accordance with subsection (h),” before “to the maximum extent practicable”;

In section 1104(6), strike “(h) PUBLICATIONS.—” and insert the following:

“(h) CALCULATION OF SEPARATE ACTUAL CROP REVENUE AND AGRICULTURE RISK COVERAGE GUARANTEE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—On request of a county Farm Service Agency committee, in coordination with a Farm Service Agency State committee, the Secretary shall consider a 1-time request to calculate a separate actual crop revenue and agriculture risk coverage guarantee for irrigated and nonirrigated covered commodities under subsection (g)(2) in a county if, during the 2014 through 2018 crop years—

“(A) an average of not less than 5 percent of the planted and considered planted acreage of a covered commodity in the county was irrigated; and

“(B) an average of not less than 5 percent of the planted and considered planted acreage of the covered commodity in the county was nonirrigated.

“(2) SOURCE OF INFORMATION.—In considering a request described in paragraph (1) and calculating a separate actual crop revenue and agriculture risk coverage guarantee for irrigated and nonirrigated covered commodities in a county, the Secretary may use other sources of yield information, including the yield history of representative farms in the State, region, or crop reporting district, as determined by the Secretary.

“(i) PUBLICATIONS.—

AMENDMENT NO. 3371

(Purpose: To provide that producers may change their election to participate in agriculture risk coverage or price loss coverage in the 2021 crop year)

At the end of subtitle A of title I, add the following:

SEC. 11. OPTION TO CHANGE PRODUCER ELECTION.

Section 1115 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9015) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) OPTION TO CHANGE PRODUCER ELECTION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), for the 2021 crop year, all of the producers on a farm may make a 1-time, irrevocable election to change the election applicable to the producers on the farm under that subsection or subsection (c), as applicable, to price loss coverage or agriculture risk coverage, as applicable, which shall apply to the producers on the farm for each of the 2021, 2022, and 2023 crop years.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3074 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3224

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], for Mr. LEE, proposes an amendment numbered 3074 to amendment No. 3224.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of June 25, 2018, under “Text of Amendments.”)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Lee amendment.

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted “nay.”

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 57, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 142 Leg.]

YEAS—38

Bennet	Hassan	Rubio
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Sanders
Booker	Heller	Schatz
Brown	Hirono	Schumer
Capito	Johnson	Scott
Cardin	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Lee	Tester
Cruz	McCaskey	Toomey
Durbin	Menendez	Udall
Flake	Merkley	Van Hollen
Gillibrand	Murphy	Warren
Grassley	Paul	Whitehouse
Harris	Reed	

NAYS—57

Baldwin	Feinstein	Murray
Barrasso	Fischer	Nelson
Blunt	Gardner	Perdue
Boozman	Graham	Peters
Burr	Hatch	Portman
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Risch
Carper	Hoeven	Roberts
Casey	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cassidy	Inhofe	Sasse
Collins	Isakson	Shaheen
Coons	Jones	Shelby
Corker	Kaine	Smith
Cornyn	King	Stabenow
Cotton	Klobuchar	Thune
Crapo	Lankford	Tillis
Daines	Manchin	Warner
Donnelly	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	Wyden
Ernst	Murkowski	Young

NOT VOTING—5

Alexander	Leahy	McCain
Duckworth	Markey	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUNT). Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 3134

The question now occurs on agreeing to the Thune amendment No. 3134.

The amendment (No. 3134) was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 3224

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on agreeing to the Roberts amendment No. 3224, as amended.

The amendment (No. 3224) in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 86, nays 11, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 143 Leg.]

YEAS—86

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Peters
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Bennet	Grassley	Reed
Blumenthal	Harris	Risch
Blunt	Hassan	Roberts
Booker	Hatch	Rounds
Boozman	Heinrich	Rubio
Brown	Heitkamp	Sanders
Cantwell	Hirono	Sasse
Capito	Hoeven	Schatz
Cardin	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Carper	Isakson	Scott
Casey	Jones	Shaheen
Cassidy	Kaine	Shelby
Collins	Kennedy	Smith
Coons	King	Stabenow
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Tester
Crapo	Markey	Thune
Cruz	McCaskill	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Udall
Donnelly	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Moran	Warren
Enzi	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murphy	Wicker
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden
Fischer	Nelson	Young
Gardner	Perdue	

NAYS—11

Burr	Heller	Lee
Corker	Inhofe	Paul
Cotton	Johnson	Toomey
Flake	Lankford	

NOT VOTING—3

Alexander	Leahy	McCain
-----------	-------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for passage of the bill, the bill, as amended, is passed.

The Senator from Kansas.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, which, I assure Members, I will not do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Kansas.

FARM BILL

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, with 171 amendments and a vote of 86 to 11, obviously, getting this farm bill done has been a tremendous team effort. You are only as good as your staff on both sides of the aisle, and they make us look good when we stand up here a little confused trying to get things a little sorted out.

I wish to thank my staff: James Glueck, DaNita Murray, Janae Brady, Fred Clark, Meghan Cline, Haley Donahue, Matt Erickson, Darin Guries, Chance Hunley, Chu Hwang, Chelsie Keys, Sarah Little, Curt Mann, Andy Rezendes, Bob Rosado, Anthony Seiler, Wayne Stoskopf—who, by the way, knows more about farm programs than anybody else on the staff, myself included—Andrew Vlasaty, and Katherine Thomas.

I also want to mention Jackie Cottrell, Amber Kirchhoefer, Will Stafford, Morgan Anderson, and Stacy Daniels in my personal office.

I want to especially thank the ranking member—vice chairman, really—Senator STABENOW, and her team, led by the indomitable Joe Shultz and Jacqlyn Schneider. The efforts of Jessie Williams, Amanda Kelly, Bobby Mehta, Katie Salay, and Micah Wortham have been valuable to the Ag Committee process.

Additionally, I thank the technical support from the Secretary of Agriculture, Sonny Perdue, and the staff at the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Thank you so much for your help.

I also appreciate the work of the Congressional Budget Office staff, including: Tiffany Arthur, Megan Carroll, Kathleen FitzGerald, Jennifer Gray, Jim Langley, and Robert Reese.

I now yield to my distinguished ranking member, Senator STABENOW.

I say to the Senator, thank you for being such a great partner.

Ms. STABENOW. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I thank my partner and friend. This has been a tremendous team effort, and it is a great pleasure to work with the chairman.

Today the Senate has proven that bipartisanship is the way we can get things done, and we all know that is the case. It is not always the easiest path to take. However, when we put our differences aside and focus on the needs of the communities and people we serve, that is how we deliver a good bill. In this case, it is a bill that serves our farmers, our families, and rural America. Over 500 food, agriculture, and conservation leaders agree that this bill will provide certainty to communities and to our farmers across the country.

From the start, we have had a collaborative process. We have built this bill on feedback. We heard from farmers and local leaders at field hearings and in our committee room. We added ideas proposed by Members on both sides of the aisle, both on and off the committee. From our committee markup to today, we have incorporated a total of 171 either bipartisan bills introduced by Members or bipartisan amendments—171.

We were able to get a bill done because we never lost sight of the importance of our agricultural economy and the 16 million jobs it supports. I am proud that we voted in a bipartisan way to move this bill forward. That is the good news for rural America and the men and women who work hard every day to give us the safest, most affordable food supply in the world.

Let me now give some thank-yous. As the chairman indicated, there are many.

I appreciate very much the work of our Democratic leader and his staff for their leadership and support through the process. I thank the majority leader, who knows how important agriculture is to Kentucky. I think we have some things in this bill that are going to make for an even stronger agricultural economy in Kentucky, as well as around the country. I appreciate that he moved this bill quickly on the Senate floor.

Of course, I have to thank my friend and partner Senator ROBERTS, who is chairman of the committee. He has stayed true to our commitment to deliver a bipartisan bill and has worked extremely hard to get us here today. I say: Congratulations, Mr. Chairman, and to all of our Senate colleagues who supported this important bill.

I thank my incredible staff, as well as Senator ROBERTS' incredible staff, for working together very hard, very consistently, putting together a bipartisan bill—really, a historic farm bill—and ultimately working as a team to get us over the goal line.

Of course, Joe Shultz and Jacqlyn Schneider, my staff director and deputy staff director and policy director for the committee—true leaders from start to finish. They have both been with me on the committee staff since the very beginning, in 2011, when I chaired the committee.

Joe has led our amazing team and has been living and breathing the farm bill for the past year. You can sleep tonight, Joe.

Jacqlyn has done so as well. Jacqlyn is the heart and soul of our Ag Committee, whose tremendous work over the past two farm bills has made sure that we were protecting our families and supporting our specialty crop producers. She led our efforts to develop groundbreaking new initiatives on food access, like Double Up Food Bucks.

Mary Beth Schultz, our chief counsel, had no idea what she was getting herself into when she came to the Ag Committee this last year. In no time, she

became a farm bill expert who kept track of every page and every amendment to make sure this process was successful.

Mike Schmidt and Kyle Varner, our amazing commodities and livestock team, understand the ins and outs of farm policy like nobody else. They have done so much to improve our dairy programs, expand risk management tools to specialty crops, and support new and beginning farmers.

Ashley McKeon led our work on the conservation title to expand our partnership programs. She brings her warmth, personality, and expertise to the job every day.

Sean Babington, our forestry and environmental expert, has impeccable judgment and negotiating skills that we rely on daily, and he helped get us to this point of there being a final farm bill as well.

Thanks to both Ashley and Sean, our country will have healthy forests, more wildlife habitat, and clean waters for generations to come.

Katie Naessens' hard work led to the major advances in this bill for urban agriculture, organics, beginning farmers, and veterans who want to go into agriculture. I am so proud of the Farmer Veterans Programs in Michigan.

Kevin Bailey led our efforts on expanding high-speed internet for rural communities and on the rural development and energy titles so we can continue to grow the bio-based economy in rural America.

Katie Bergh led our work on international trade and fought to preserve markets for Michigan producers from cherries to dairy, and she helped improve our food aid policies in the United States and abroad.

Rosalyn Brummette is the glue that keeps our team together. She kept the trains running on time and made sure we were all prepared to do what needed to be done. I thank her so much.

We also had fantastic help from farm bill veteran Susan Keith, who provided invaluable wisdom and counsel to our commodity and livestock team.

Ward Griffin, our CFTC detail to the committee, is not only an expert on financial issues, but he has become a full-fledged member of the team, jumping in to help wherever needed. We are grateful.

Jason Sherman, a lawyer and fellow from the Department of Energy, has a keen eye and legal mind. Both were invaluable on environmental and conservation issues.

Now to my personal Senate staff, who were a very important part of the team as well: I thank Matt VanKuiken, my chief of staff, who leads my personal office team, and my legislative director, Emily Carwell, who followed the floor procedure, was involved in negotiations, and made sure everything was happening the way it should have been. I thank them and all of our team in the personal office for being a part of this effort.

Of course, I thank Krystal Lattany, who always makes sure that I am get-

ting where I need to be, so I am in the right place for negotiations.

I thank Anne Stanski, my deputy chief of staff, Matt Williams, my communications director, and Jess McCarron, our ag press secretary, who made sure we were telling the story of the farmers and families who are affected by the farm bill.

We couldn't have done it without the help of the rest of our communications team: Miranda Margowsky, Nirmeen Fahmy, and Amy Phillips Bursch. I also thank my State team, which is led by Teresa Plachetka, and Kali Fox, who leads our agriculture work in Michigan.

I also thank Senator ROBERTS' team. It was truly wonderful working with James Glueck and DaNita Murray, who are true pros. I thank them for their hard work, creativity, and tenacity in helping to get us to this point. Our team spent many long hours together, and I am grateful that even our staffs worked together in a wonderful, bipartisan way just as the chairman and I did.

Of course, I thank Jessie Williams, Amanda Kelly, Bobby Mehta, and everyone who works behind the scenes on the Ag Committee.

Nothing would get done around here without the excellent floor staff, led by Gary Myrick and his team, including Tricia Engle and Ryan McConaghy.

The insights of Sean Byrne, with Senator SCHUMER's staff, and Reema Dodin, with Senator DURBIN, have been incredibly helpful.

I should really thank the folks at the CBO, who had late nights at the Senate Office of the Legislative Counsel. They worked on weekends and had late nights to make sure we had what we needed to get the bill done.

Finally, of course, I thank all of the members of the Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee and their staffs. We have so much talent and experience. It is a real privilege to serve as its ranking member.

This farm bill is the product of a year and a half of hard work by a long list of very talented people. I cannot thank every single one of them individually, but we wouldn't be here today without their help.

We passed a farm bill today that supports the 16 million jobs in America that depend on agriculture. We passed a bill that helps our farmers stay resilient, that protects our land and water, that helps families keep food on their tables, that invests in our small towns all across America, that recognizes the diversity of American agriculture, and that strengthens local food economies.

We should all be very proud of the work we have done today, and I thank my colleagues for joining us in such a strong "yes" vote in passing this bill.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I am very glad my Senate colleagues joined me in supporting the Senate farm bill,

in fact, with a very strong vote of 86 to 11.

This farm bill is good news for Montana farmers and for Montana ranchers, and it is going to help to provide certainty for Montana agriculture in these most difficult times because agriculture is Montana's No. 1 industry, and it supports tens of thousands of jobs in our State. Yet, with more than 25,000 family farms and ranches in Montana alone, it is clear that ag is more than just an economic driver in our State; it is very much a way of life.

That is why, as Montana's Representative on the U.S. Senate Ag Committee, I fought to ensure that this farm bill reflects the priorities that Montana farmers and Montana ranchers have shared directly with me. Some of these priorities are the crop insurance and the sugar program; ag research funding at Montana State University, as well as ag research stations all across Montana; and prioritizing rural broadband for Montana's underserved communities, as well as supporting and maintaining conservation programs that are important to our farmers, to our ranchers, and to our sportsmen.

This farm bill is also critically important to the health of our national forests. Last year in Montana, catastrophic wildfires harmed numerous communities, and it cost our State millions of dollars. I am glad to have secured important forest reforms that are critical to healthy forests, to Montana timber jobs, and to wildlife habitat, such as encouraging the coordination among the Forest Service and State forestry agencies to restore our forests to reduce the risk of wildfire and allowing the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to enter into agreements with counties, as well as with States and Tribes, to implement forest management projects on national forests and public lands. Additionally, there is a provision that will support more innovation, as well as to develop new markets for Montana's timber industry.

These are important wins, but I want to make something very clear that there is still so much more we can do to help improve the health of our forests and support Montana's farmers and ranchers. In fact, in Montana, as well as across the West, we are seeing extensive collaboration. Groups are collaborating—conservation groups, wildlife groups, wood products stakeholders, along with our counties—and they are working together to determine responsible forest management practices.

These partners know very well that active management is critical to restoring a healthy forest and that it helps to reduce wildfire risks. It is important that we don't allow extremists to hinder this most important work because, today, it takes 18 to 24 months to do many of these environmental reviews. After that is done, many projects in Montana are litigated, and this can add years of delay.

In fact, listen to this: There are 29 timber sales in Montana that are currently impacted by fringe litigation. Just today, we were informed that another timber project in Montana has been delayed by a restraining order because of litigation. That makes 30. This project was scheduled to start this coming Monday, July 2, and now those folks will be out of work. Reducing red-tape and combating chronic litigation doesn't erode public trust. In fact, it safeguards it. It does so by ensuring that the public feedback of the majority isn't obstructed by a few extreme dissenters.

This disastrous Ninth Circuit Cottonwood ruling must also be addressed because it imposed unnecessary paperwork that even the Obama administration has said had the "potential to cripple" Federal land management without conservation benefit.

My amendments would address this excessive redtape while continuing to ensure that robust, science-driven environmental review and public engagement would remain. Many similar provisions are found in the House bill as well.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the inclusion of these amendments as we work together now, with the House, in a conference of the final farm bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

KILAUEA VOLCANO

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I want to share an update about what is happening with the Kilauea volcano in my home State of Hawaii.

The first thing people need to know is that the State of Hawaii remains safe to visit and that the Island of Hawaii, where the volcano is erupting, is also safe to visit.

Let's start with a basic geography lesson. Hawaii has eight main islands, and the volcano is on the Island of Hawaii, which people often call the Big Island. It is about 4,000 square miles. This is Hawaii Island. It is about the size of Connecticut. Only 9 square miles are directly impacted by the volcano. So it is actually just this little area in this corner of the island. If you are in the town of Hilo, which is 25 miles away from the volcano, you can't even tell there is a volcano erupting for the most part.

Cruise lines are coming back, and officials are trying to set up areas where people can safely view this spectacular volcano. It is that safe. People need to know that it is business as usual for lots of people on the Big Island and that both the State and the island are open for visitors. We just got the data in for the month of May, and we had again increased tourism statewide. Everyone should come to visit.

With that being said, this is an extraordinarily difficult situation for the communities that are being affected,

and even though people are used to living with volcanos, this is extraordinarily tough. Right here, we have fissure 8. This is about a 300-foot lava fountain that has not ceased for several weeks. As recently as 2015, lava approached the town of Pahoa in the Puna district, but we really haven't seen anything like this since the 1974 flow.

For the past few months, we have had 300-foot lava fountains. We have had ash explosions that have reached tens of thousands of feet. We have also had more than 30 billion gallons of lava that have destroyed 600 homes. An estimated 2,500 people have been displaced, one way or another, by the volcanic eruption. In certain areas, there is no power, no water, and no cell phone reception. So even if your home has not been destroyed, your access now may be limited or nonexistent.

Here is the really good news: There has been no loss of human life due to the volcano. Despite all that has happened, the people of Puna and the people of Hawaii Island remain extraordinarily resilient. The bad news is that no one is sure when the volcanic activity will end. Even the experts at the United States Geological Survey don't know. We have several difficult challenges in moving forward—from air quality to the need for economic relief and, especially, for housing and transportation. Hundreds of people are currently living in shelters. Hundreds of animals from homes and ranches are, in a sense, volcano refugees. So we have to secure temporary housing for people who lost their homes or who have been evacuated and then get these people permanent housing and deal with private property damage. We have to make decisions about where to rebuild and start the process of fixing roads, power lines, and other infrastructure in the Puna district.

The Big Island's mayor, Harry Kim, and the entire county emergency operations center team, including first responders, have been working from day one and day and night to keep people safe and deal with these challenges. Several weeks ago, I visited the emergency operations center and saw firsthand that it is really all hands on deck. Something that distinguishes our EOCs from other EOCs and impresses our Federal counterparts is the extent to which we all work together regardless of jurisdiction. You can scarcely tell who works for State, Federal, or county government. You can scarcely tell who is a business leader or a not-for-profit leader or a university professor or a mayor. Everybody is really working together.

There is a long list of people who deserve our thanks. Local media have gone above and beyond to keep people informed by assigning crews to stay in place for weeks at a time. By the way, that is somewhat unusual for a disaster, especially one that has been going on as long as this one.

Nonprofits, such as the Red Cross, the World Central Kitchen, and the

Salvation Army, are operating shelters and serving meals. Companies are pitching in by waiving freight charges for relief supplies or working to keep cell towers powered.

I can name every single elected official on Hawaii Island, and each one of them is personally doing significant work in the recovery. Because this is an island State and because it is a small community, this isn't just a matter of their trying to secure resources from State, Federal, or county government, and this isn't just a matter of lawmaking; they are on the ground, they are listening, and they are helping with their hands.

This is part of the general sense that people have of wanting to help during this extraordinary time. Several weeks ago, a resident of Puna named Ikaika Marzo took it upon himself to set up Pu'u honua o Puna, which means "a place of refuge" in Puna. People can donate things or pick up what they need, whether it is information, supplies, or a hot meal. We have seen people drive 100 miles to show up and help. Ranchers are helping out other ranchers—normally they are competitors—by housing displaced cattle. On other islands, people are filling shipping containers with donations. Across the State, we are helping each other out so that people are being fed, finding shelter, and getting the things they need.

Lots of good things are happening, but it is still a very tough situation, an ongoing situation, which is why we have been grateful for the Federal response. Two weeks ago, the White House approved the State of Hawaii's request for individual assistance from FEMA for residents whose homes have been lost or damaged. FEMA has also partnered with the State to open a disaster relief center. From the start, it was clear that they sent their A team. I want to thank FEMA and the White House for their quick action, which is welcome news during this challenging time for the Big Island of Hawaii.

FEMA and the EPA are also working with the State and county partners to monitor air quality, which the EPA is now publishing online so that the public can make informed decisions. This may sound like a small thing, but this is everything when it comes to determining whether Norwegian Cruise Line can come to Hilo, and all that economic opportunity will either be lost or not, or whether schools in the Ka'u and Puna districts can open. What EPA is doing in partnership with the State and county government is really extraordinary.

The Hawaii National Guard was able to command Department of Defense resources under a dual command agreement. General Logan, General Hara, and the National Guard have all been crucial. They are literally doing everything from collecting gas samples to providing security on the ground to providing temporary shelters.

We are grateful for all the help, but we also know it is a long road to recovery because we don't know how long

this is going to go on. In a normal disaster, you have sort of three phases: disaster preparation and planning, disaster response, and then disaster recovery. Because this is an ongoing situation and because we don't know when this is going to end, we have our county, State, and Federal folks, as well as the rest of the community, in disaster prep, disaster response, and disaster recovery—all simultaneously underway. This is an extraordinary situation. There are lots of terrible natural disasters all across the country every year, but this is unique in that particular way.

This is also unique in the sense that most of the time—not all of the time but almost every time—people can go back to their properties. Although they still, under the law, will own their properties, when Kapoho Bay was flattened, when we went from 87 homes, roughly, gone to about 600 homes gone in a very short period of time, it is difficult to imagine that these people are going to be able to remake their lives in the path of this current flow.

We have to do all three things at the same time. So we are going to continue to work and to look for Federal partners for help and for flexibility. I will state that our Federal partners have recognized the unique nature of this disaster, and we really appreciate it. I have talked to Majority Leader McCONNELL, Minority Leader SCHUMER, Vice Chairman LEAHY, Chairman SHELBY, and key appropriators about how unique this disaster is, and I look forward to working with the leadership in the Appropriations Committee so the communities affected by the volcano can get the help they need.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 836.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Mark Jeremy Bennett, of Hawaii, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Mark Jeremy Bennett, of Hawaii, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Deb Fischer, Mike Rounds, John Barrasso, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, Shelley Moore Capito, Steve Daines, John Boozman, Orrin G. Hatch, Thom Tillis, David Perdue, Mike Crapo, Richard Burr, Pat Roberts, Johnny Isakson.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 639.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Brian Allen Benczkowski, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Brian Allen Benczkowski, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Mitch McConnell, Steve Daines, Chuck Grassley, Tom Cotton, John Kennedy, Marco Rubio, Thom Tillis, Mike Crapo, Orrin G. Hatch, John Barrasso, John Boozman, David Perdue, James Lankford, John Cornyn, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, John Hoeven.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 686.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Paul C. Ney, Jr., of Tennessee, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Paul C. Ney, Jr., of Tennessee, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

Mitch McConnell, Mike Crapo, Tom Cotton, Johnny Isakson, John Kennedy, John Thune, John Boozman, Tim Scott, Richard Burr, Thom Tillis, Roy Blunt, Cory Gardner, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, Jerry Moran.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 923, 925, 927, 928, 929, 930, 932, and all nominations on the Secretary's desk in the Foreign Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The assistant bill clerk read the nominations of Robin S. Bernstein, of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Dominican Republic; Joseph N. Mondello, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago; Gordon D. Sondland, of Washington, to be Representative of the United States of America to the European Union, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary; Harry B. Harris, Jr., of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of

America to the Republic of Korea; Ronald Gidwitz, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Belgium; Brian A. Nichols, of Rhode Island, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Zimbabwe; Tibor Peter Nagy, Jr., of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (African Affairs); and PN1952 FOREIGN SERVICE nominations (80) beginning George Eugene Adair, and ending Brian J. McKenna, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 10, 2018.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Bernstein, Mondello, Sondland, Harris, Gidwitz, Nichols, and Nagy nominations and all nominations on the Secretary's desk in the Foreign Service en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 902.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Tara Sweeney, of Alaska, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Sweeney nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

MARRAKESH TREATY TO FACILITATE ACCESS TO PUBLISHED WORKS FOR PERSONS WHO ARE BLIND, VISUALLY IMPAIRED, OR OTHERWISE PRINT DISABLED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following treaty on today's Executive Calendar: No. 6; I further ask unanimous consent that the treaty be considered as having passed through its various parliamentary stages up to and including the presentation of the resolution of ratification; that any committee conditions, declarations, or reservations be agreed to as applicable; that any statements be printed in the RECORD; further, that when the resolution of ratification is voted upon, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and the President be notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The treaty will be stated.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Treaty document No. 114-6, Marrakesh Treaty to Facilitate Access to Published Works for Persons Who are Blind, Visually Impaired, or Otherwise Print Disabled.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask for a division vote on the resolution of ratification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division vote has been requested.

Senators in favor of the resolution of ratification will rise and stand until counted.

Those opposed will rise and stand until counted.

On a division vote, two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

The resolution of ratification is as follows:

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein),

SECTION 1. SENATE ADVICE AND CONSENT SUBJECT TO A DECLARATION.

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Marrakesh Treaty to Facilitate Access to Published Works for Persons Who Are Blind, Visually Impaired, or Otherwise Print Disabled, Done at Marrakesh on June 27, 2013 (Treaty Doc. 114-6), subject to the declaration of section 2.

SEC. 2. DECLARATION.

The Senate's advice and consent under section 1 is subject to the following declaration: The Treaty is not self-executing.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 951 through 973 and 975 through 993 and all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy; that the nominations be confirmed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nominations

be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. Paul A. Friedrichs

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Michael T. Moran

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Mark H. Berry

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Mark J. Mouriski

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Eileen H. Laubacher

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Ann H. Duff

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (1h) John W. Korka

The following named officers for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Nancy S. Lacore

Capt. Theodore P. Leclair

Capt. Eric C. Ruttenberg

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (1h) Mary C. Riggs

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (1h) Alan D. Beal

Rear Adm. (1h) Brian S. Hurley

Rear Adm. (1h) Andrew C. Lennon

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Robert T. Clark

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Marine Corps Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Michael F. Fahey, III
Brig. Gen. Helen G. Pratt

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Scott A. Howell

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Austin S. Miller

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Eric M. Smith

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Richard M. Clark

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Darryl A. Williams

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment as Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant of the Marine Corps and for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated under title 10 U.S.C., section 5046:

To be major general

Col. Daniel J. Lecce

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Charles Q. Brown, Jr.

IN THE ARMY

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Col. Narciso Cruz
Col. Mark K. Miera

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Joseph F. Jarrard
Brig. Gen. Tracy R. Norris

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Laurel J. Hummel

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Tommy H. Baker
Brig. Gen. Gregory S. Bowen
Brig. Gen. Scott A. Campbell
Brig. Gen. James D. Craig
Brig. Gen. Gordon L. Ellis
Brig. Gen. John M. Epperly
Brig. Gen. Timothy E. Gowen
Brig. Gen. Paul F. Griffin
Brig. Gen. Kenneth S. Hara
Brig. Gen. Christopher F. Lawson
Brig. Gen. James E. Porter, Jr.
Brig. Gen. Rafael A. Ribas
Brig. Gen. Timothy J. Sheriff
Brig. Gen. Thomas F. Spencer
Brig. Gen. Michael D. Turello
Brig. Gen. Suzanne P. Vares-Lum
Brig. Gen. William J. Walker
Brig. Gen. Ronald A. Westfall

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Col. Miguel Aguilar
Col. Eugene S. Alkire
Col. Mark J. Berglund
Col. Ronald W. Burkett, II
Col. Robert F. Charlesworth
Col. Nick Ducich
Col. Robert D. Ferguson
Col. Adam R. Flasch
Col. Kevin W. Gallagher
Col. John T. Gentry, Jr.
Col. Bryan J. Grenon
Col. John D. Haas
Col. Edward H. Hallenbeck
Col. Joe D. Hargett
Col. Robert F. Hepner, Jr.
Col. Charles G. Kemper, IV
Col. Steven T. King
Col. Michael J. Leeney
Col. Roy J. Macaraeg
Col. Joanne E. MacGregor
Col. Marie M. Mahoney
Col. Shawn P. Manke
Col. James G. McCormack
Col. Miguel A. Mendez
Col. Neal S. Mitsuyoshi
Col. Sharon D. Moore
Col. Michael J. Oster
Col. Gregory C. Parker
Col. Scott T. Petrik
Col. Jerry F. Prochaska
Col. Javier A. Reina
Col. Yesenia R. Roque
Col. Leo A. Ryan
Col. Michael J. Schlorholtz
Col. Scott M. Sherman
Col. Tyler B. Smith
Col. Walter B. Sturek, Jr.
Col. John F. Taylor, Jr.
Col. Thomas E. Vern, Jr.
Col. Damian K. Waddell
Col. Robert F. Weir
Col. Katherine E. White
Col. James C. Wilkins
Col. Timothy J. Winslow

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 156:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Christopher C. French

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Carl E. Mundy, III

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Loretta E. Reynolds

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Giovanni K. Tuck

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Joseph T. Guastella, Jr.

IN THE ARMY

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Col. Robert G. Carruthers, III
Col. Quvator R. Gore
Col. Adam L. Robinson
Col. Kevin L. Vines

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Stephen M. Rutner

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Marcus A. Hitchcock

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. John K. Love

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. John C. Thomson, III

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Col. Joseph R. Baldwin

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. William P. Pennington

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Thomas W. Bergeson

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. James C. Slife

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment as the Judge Advocate General of the Navy and for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while serving as the Judge Advocate General under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 5148:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. John G. Hannink

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. James J. Malloy

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Andrew L. Lewis

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. John M. Jansen

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN2001 AIR FORCE nomination of Kourtnei L. Starkey, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 17, 2018.

PN2002 AIR FORCE nomination of Hermann F. Hinze, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 17, 2018.

PN2033 AIR FORCE nomination of Joseph B. Ryan, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 24, 2018.

PN2034 AIR FORCE nominations (93) beginning MICHAEL FRANCIS ADAMITIS, and ending LESLIE ANN ZYDAMARTIN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 24, 2018.

PN2035 AIR FORCE nominations (45) beginning BARBARA B. ACEVEDO, and ending CHRISTY L. ZAHN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 24, 2018.

PN2077 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning WILLIAM P. MORSE, and ending NICHOLAS M. STRELCHUK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2018.

PN2151 AIR FORCE nominations (20) beginning WADE B. ADAIR, and ending JAY W. VEEDER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 18, 2018.

PN2153 AIR FORCE nominations (41) beginning JAMES D. ATHNOS, and ending SARAH MONROE WHITSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 18, 2018.

PN2157 AIR FORCE nominations (75) beginning JULIE LALEH ADAMS, and ending CHRISTOPHER THOMAS ZONA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 18, 2018.

IN THE ARMY

PN1689 ARMY nominations (10) beginning ERIC T. ASHLEY, and ending MICHAEL J. RYHN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 6, 2018.

PN1690 ARMY nominations (89) beginning GILBERT AIDINIAN, and ending D011955, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 6, 2018.

PN2003 ARMY nominations (8) beginning DIANE M. ARMBRUSTER, and ending LELAND T. SHEPHERD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 17, 2018.

PN2004 ARMY nominations (5) beginning DONALD C. BREWER, III, and ending CHARLES F. WALLACE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 17, 2018.

PN2005 ARMY nomination of James D. Spencer, II, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 17, 2018.

PN2006 ARMY nominations (4) beginning CHRISTOPHER A. BASSETT, and ending SCOTT E. BOYD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 17, 2018.

PN2007 ARMY nomination of Julie A. Craig, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 17, 2018.

PN2008 ARMY nomination of Charles G. Blake, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 17, 2018.

PN2009 ARMY nomination of Thomas A. Urquhart, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 17, 2018.

PN2037 ARMY nomination of Patricia Young, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 24, 2018.

PN2038 ARMY nominations (5) beginning DIEGO L. BECERRA, III, and ending MICHAEL E. ZELLOUS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 24, 2018.

PN2039 ARMY nominations (57) beginning PATRICK M. ABELL, and ending ALBERT F. YONKOVITZ, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 24, 2018.

PN2040 ARMY nominations (218) beginning GEORGE R. K. ACREE, and ending ARTHUR E. ZEGERS, IV, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 24, 2018.

PN2041 ARMY nominations (123) beginning MELISSA K. G. ADAMSKI, and ending JAMES YI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 24, 2018.

PN2059 ARMY nominations (13) beginning DENNIS R. BELL, and ending BRETT J. TAYLOR, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 4, 2018.

PN2060 ARMY nominations (12) beginning THEODORE W. CROY, III, and ending BILL A. SOLIZ, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 4, 2018.

PN2061 ARMY nominations (43) beginning EDGAR G. ARROYO, and ending G010491, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 4, 2018.

PN2062 ARMY nominations (24) beginning JEFFREY M. ALLERDING, and ending VANESSA WORSHAM, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 4, 2018.

PN2063 ARMY nomination of Brian F. Saylor, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 4, 2018.

PN2064 ARMY nominations (3) beginning WILLIAM B. MURPHY, and ending DAVID M. SOLORZANO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 4, 2018.

PN2065 ARMY nominations (3) beginning ERIC N. HATCH, and ending YANNICK N. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 4, 2018.

PN2066 ARMY nominations (4) beginning ANTHONY HALL, and ending CHRISTINA M. WRIGHT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 4, 2018.

PN2067 ARMY nomination of Michael G. Mouritsen, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 4, 2018.

PN2068 ARMY nomination of David E. Roberts, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 4, 2018.

PN2078 ARMY nomination of Peter R. Purrington, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2018.

PN2080 ARMY nomination of Chad K. Brinton, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2018.

PN2081 ARMY nomination of Christopher K. James, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2018.

PN2128 ARMY nomination of Tony J. Woodruff, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 11, 2018.

PN2129 ARMY nominations (3) beginning JONATHAN M. FAUST, and ending CARLOS M. POVENTUDESTRADE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 11, 2018.

PN2159 ARMY nominations (23) beginning BRENDAN E. BELL, and ending JAYLON L. WAITE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 18, 2018.

PN2160 ARMY nominations (165) beginning DOUGLAS R. ADAMS, and ending LAURI M. ZIKE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 18, 2018.

PN2161 ARMY nomination of Leslie M. Latimorelorfils, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 18, 2018.

PN2162 ARMY nomination of Angel M. Sanchez, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 18, 2018.

PN2163 ARMY nomination of Fredricco McCurry, which was received by the Senate

and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 18, 2018.

PN2164 ARMY nomination of Jimmie A. Hilton, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 18, 2018.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN2069 MARINE CORPS nomination of Brett M. McCormick, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 4, 2018.

PN2103 MARINE CORPS nomination of Jonathan M. Pickup, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2018.

IN THE NAVY

PN1924 NAVY nominations (12) beginning JOHN R. BUSH, and ending HOLLY B. SHOGER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2018.

PN1925 NAVY nominations (18) beginning ERIK E. ANDERSON, and ending MATTHEW L. TARDY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2018.

PN1926 NAVY nominations (3) beginning BRADFORD W. BAKER, and ending MICHAEL P. OHARA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2018.

PN1927 NAVY nominations (8) beginning DERRICK E. BLACKSTON, and ending MICHAEL G. WHEELER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2018.

PN1928 NAVY nominations (230) beginning DAVID J. ADAMS, and ending DAVID M. ZIELINSKI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2018.

PN1929 NAVY nominations (7) beginning MARK R. ALEXANDER, and ending ANDREW T. NEWSOME, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2018.

PN1930 NAVY nominations (5) beginning JILLENE M. BUSHNELL, and ending MICAH A. WELTMER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2018.

PN1931 NAVY nominations (10) beginning ENID S. BRACKETT, and ending JOSHUA P. TAYLOR, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2018.

PN1932 NAVY nominations (4) beginning JOHN E. GAY, and ending WILLIAM H. SPEAKS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2018.

PN1933 NAVY nominations (4) beginning FRANKLIN W. BENNETT, and ending MATTHEW T. WILCOX, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2018.

PN1934 NAVY nominations (12) beginning CARVIN A. BROWN, and ending MARK W. YATES, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2018.

PN1935 NAVY nominations (20) beginning CHRISTOPHER R. ANDERSON, and ending DAVID P. WOLYNSKI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2018.

PN1936 NAVY nominations (8) beginning MARC A. ARAGON, and ending ROBERT A. YEE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2018.

PN1975 NAVY nominations (18) beginning DOUGLAS A. BECK, and ending STEVEN W. TOPPEL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2018.

PN1976 NAVY nomination of Robert A. Vita, which was received by the Senate and

appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2018.

PN1977 NAVY nominations (2) beginning DARIN E. MARVIN, and ending ERIC E. PERCIVAL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2018.

PN1978 NAVY nominations (3) beginning JOHN J. DOHERTY, and ending WILLIAM ORTIZ, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2018.

PN1979 NAVY nomination of David A. Ford, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2018.

PN1980 NAVY nominations (5) beginning RICHARD S. ARDOLINO, and ending ANDREW C. SMITH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2018.

PN1981 NAVY nominations (2) beginning CHERYL D. DANDREA, and ending JOHN C. HAZLETT, II, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2018.

PN1982 NAVY nominations (5) beginning RICHARD E. BOUCHER, and ending CINDY L. RHODES, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2018.

PN1983 NAVY nominations (20) beginning JEFFREY W. ADAMS, and ending RICHARD B. WILDERMAN, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2018.

PN1984 NAVY nominations (72) beginning CLIFFORD J. ALLEN, and ending ABRAHAM N. YOUNCE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2018.

PN1985 NAVY nominations (11) beginning MARK S. COLLINS, and ending THOMAS W. TREFNY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2018.

PN1986 NAVY nominations (3) beginning JONAS B. E. GIL, and ending CHRISTIE M. RUSHING, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2018.

PN1987 NAVY nominations (6) beginning JONATHAN E. BUSH, and ending JAMES C. WILTRAUT, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2018.

PN1988 NAVY nomination of Melissa M. Ford, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2018.

PN1989 NAVY nomination of Matthew H. Robinson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2018.

PN2010 NAVY nominations (20) beginning ROBERT L. ANDERSON, II, and ending DANIELLE M. WOOTEN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 17, 2018.

PN2011 NAVY nomination of Harold C. Barnes, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 17, 2018.

PN2012 NAVY nominations (28) beginning PAUL R. ALLEN, and ending KIM T. ZABLAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 17, 2018.

PN2013 NAVY nominations (15) beginning JASON W. ADAMS, and ending LAGENA K. G. YARBROUGH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 17, 2018.

PN2014 NAVY nominations (11) beginning PAUL C. CHAN, and ending NATHANIEL R. STRAUB, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 17, 2018.

PN2015 NAVY nominations (19) beginning PHILIP B. BAGROW, and ending DAVID S. YANG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 17, 2018.

PN2016 NAVY nominations (9) beginning HUGH BURKE, and ending CHRISTOPHER M. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 17, 2018.

PN2017 NAVY nominations (63) beginning ZACHARY M. ALEXANDER, and ending MARK L. WOODBRIDGE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 17, 2018.

PN2018 NAVY nominations (27) beginning RENE J. ALOVA, and ending STEPHEN S. YUNE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 17, 2018.

PN2042 NAVY nomination of Adrain D. Felder, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 24, 2018.

PN2043 NAVY nomination of Ashley D. Gibbs, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 24, 2018.

PN2044 NAVY nomination of Reynaldo A. Jornacion, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 24, 2018.

PN2082 NAVY nominations (4) beginning JAY D. LUTZ, and ending MARC F. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2018.

PN2083 NAVY nominations (3) beginning JEROME R. CAYANGYANG, and ending TIMOTHY J. LONEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2018.

PN2084 NAVY nomination of Donna M. Johnson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2018.

PN2085 NAVY nominations (5) beginning KEVIN M. CORCORAN, and ending SUNG H. YI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2018.

PN2086 NAVY nominations (7) beginning DEBRA A. BRENDLEY, and ending CYNTHIA M. SCHWARTZ, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2018.

PN2087 NAVY nominations (7) beginning CHRISTOPHER C. BURRIS, and ending JASON L. WEISSMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2018.

PN2088 NAVY nominations (7) beginning MICHAEL R. BASSO, and ending DONALD H. YAGER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2018.

PN2089 NAVY nominations (2) beginning STEVEN A. BLAUSTEIN, and ending SONJA A. CARL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2018.

PN2090 NAVY nominations (15) beginning JAMES G. COX, and ending DARYL S. WONG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2018.

PN2091 NAVY nominations (10) beginning RICHFIELD F. AGULLANA, and ending JERICHO B. TIMOG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2018.

PN2092 NAVY nominations (16) beginning SARAH E. ABBOTT, and ending JUSTIN R. WIESEN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2018.

PN2093 NAVY nominations (34) beginning MATTHEW R. ARGENZIANO, and ending

MICHAEL A. WOODS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2018.

PN2094 NAVY nominations (13) beginning JEANINE F. BENJAMIN, and ending SAVANNA S. STEFFEN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2018.

PN2095 NAVY nominations (527) beginning CHARLES B. ABBOTT, and ending STEVEN ZIELECHOWSKI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2018.

PN2096 NAVY nominations (16) beginning HASAN ABDULMUTAKALLIM, and ending STANLEY C. WARE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2018.

PN2097 NAVY nominations (27) beginning BRADLEY H. ABRAMOWITZ, and ending CORNELL A. WOODS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2018.

PN2098 NAVY nominations (12) beginning FRANCIS J. CARMODY, III, and ending MATTHEW N. WATTS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2018.

PN2099 NAVY nominations (22) beginning LUCAS G. BARLOW, and ending CHRISTINA J. WONG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2018.

PN2100 NAVY nominations (5) beginning KATHARINE M. CERREZO, and ending JOE M. VASQUEZ, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2018.

PN2101 NAVY nominations (49) beginning KEVIN J. ALTEMARA, and ending JACOB E. WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2018.

PN2102 NAVY nominations (43) beginning PATRICK A. BATISTE, and ending ROBERT J. WRENN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2018.

PN2130 NAVY nomination of Douglass R. Weiss, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 11, 2018.

PN2165 NAVY nomination of Lerome S. Snaer, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 18, 2018.

PN2166 NAVY nomination of Daniel J. Rizzo, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 18, 2018.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FARM BILL

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to commend Agriculture Committee Chairman ROBERTS and Ranking Member STABENOW for their leadership in crafting a bipartisan farm bill that will help support our Nation's farmers and

growers, provide funding for critical agriculture research programs, and make important investments in nutrition and food security programs.

It is an exciting time for agriculture in Maine. In fact, according to a recent study, Maine ranks first in the Nation for farming outlook, which considers factors such as farmer age, percentage of beginning farmers, and number of farms per 100 residents. According to the most recent Census data, the share of Maine farms owned and operated by farmers under the age of 45 is steadily growing. These factors show that Maine farms are poised for continued growth and long-term success.

The bill we have just passed includes a number of provisions from the Next Generation in Agriculture Act, which I introduced with Senator HEITKAMP, including a reauthorization of the Beginning Farmer and Rancher Development Grant Program at a higher funding level. Since this program was established nearly a decade ago, it has supported more than 60,000 beginning farmers across every region of the country. In Maine, these grants have helped to build the capacity and skills of beginning farmers, as well as implement a dairy farmer apprenticeship program.

Maine's agricultural resurgence has also been bolstered by a rapidly expanding organic sector. According to the Maine Organic Farmers and Gardeners Association, Maine's organic agriculture sector has grown 76 percent over the past 5 years alone. In 2017, the association certified 535 farmers and producers representing more than 90,000 acres of farmland. The strong support for organic agriculture in this bill will help ensure that this sector continues its growth.

Federal investment in organic agriculture research, however, has not kept pace with the growth of organic producers. This bill incorporates legislation I introduced with Senator CASEY that will increase funding for the Organic Agriculture Research and Extension Initiative, OREI. These additional resources will help ensure our farmers and producers benefit from the rising demand for organic products.

In addition to experiencing a resurgence in agriculture, Maine is also in the midst of reorienting its forest products industry following the downturn of traditional pulp and paper production in our State. I am encouraged to see that the bill supports innovative wood products research and development at institutions of higher learning. Based on provisions of the Timber Innovation Act, which I have cosponsored, the bill would authorize grants to advance the use of innovative wood products. Priority would be given to proposals that include the use or retrofitting of existing sawmill facilities with higher-than-average unemployment rates, which could be helpful to States such as Maine that are still recovering from the job losses from the closure of traditional mills.

An amendment that I sponsored with Senator CANTWELL to direct the Forest Service to continue using remote sensing technologies when conducting forest inventory and analysis activities has also been incorporated. This technology is faster and less expensive than physically surveying plots of land and would enable the Forest Service to provide more accurate data to inform forest management decisions.

The bill also includes a number of provisions from the Local FARMS Act, legislation that I led with Senator BROWN. One key provision provides mandatory funding for the Organic Certification Cost-Share Program, which helps to cover a portion of the costs associated with obtaining or renewing organic certifications.

Another component from our Local FARMS Act is the Local Agriculture Market Program, which will provide grants to support the development and expansion of direct producer-to-consumer marketing, as well as value-added agricultural products.

The bill also includes important provisions that help combat hunger, including the Local FARMS Act's establishment of a Harvesting Health pilot program through which fresh fruits and vegetables are provided to low-income individuals and households, as well as the reauthorization of the Seniors Farmers' Market Nutrition Program. The latter program is critically important for combating hunger among seniors and is complemented by the Farm Bill's reauthorization of the Commodity Supplemental Food Program, also known as the Senior Food Box Program. In an effort to help more seniors access and remain enrolled in the Senior Food Box Program, I am pleased that the bill includes a provision from legislation I authored with Senator CASEY, the Nourishing Our Golden Years Act, which would allow States to establish a 3-year certification period for participants 60 years or older, effectively simplifying the process to provide this much-needed support.

The Specialty Crop Block Grant program that has been so vital for farmers and producers in my State is reauthorized for another 5 years. These grants support research and extension activities that address key challenges facing specialty crops, including Maine's iconic potatoes and lowbush blueberries, aiming to improve production efficiency, address threats from pests and diseases, more accurately prevent and monitor potential food safety hazards, and enhance crop characteristics.

The bill also makes important investments to support the export of U.S. agricultural products by reauthorizing both the Market Access Program, MAP, and the Foreign Market Development Program, which are critical to the success of Maine farmers and fishermen as they work to remain competitive in the global marketplace. According to the Maine International Trade Center, MAP has allowed Maine companies to expand their markets and

create more local jobs by facilitating the promotion and sale of Maine products like wild blueberries in the Middle East, maple syrup in Central Africa, and shellfish in the Far East.

As we continue to promote products such as maple syrup abroad, we must also ensure that we are not hindering their success here at home. Pure maple sugar producers in my state have expressed serious concerns with the “added sugar” requirements in the FDA’s updated nutrition facts label rule. The rule would require the label to state that all sugar in the product is “added sugar.” While the FDA intended for the rule to help consumers make better-informed dietary choices, it is clear that the Agency’s proposal instead creates confusion. Producers believe that the term “added sugar,” when used with a single-ingredient sweetener such as pure maple syrup or honey, implies the addition of another sugar like corn syrup.

I have raised this issue directly with FDA Commissioner Gottlieb, who is open to considering other approaches proposed by the industry, and have addressed it through language in the agriculture funding bill that directs FDA to evaluate alternate labeling proposals. Although I am encouraged to see that the FDA recently announced it would “swiftly formulate a revised approach that makes key information available to consumers in a workable way,” I have joined Senator KING in offering an amendment to help ensure that this problem is rectified.

Another reasonable reform I am pleased to see included is sponsored by Senator GRASSLEY. It closes a loophole allowing an unlimited number of passive “managers” to be designated by farm entities for the purpose of collecting farm subsidies. These subsidies are intended to support workers who are truly “actively engaged.” This provision will save an estimated \$211 million, \$100 million of which will be reallocated to The Emergency Food Assistance Program, TEFAP, which supports food pantries around the country.

It is a testament to the leadership of Chairman ROBERTS and Ranking Member STABENOW that they have produced a strongly bipartisan farm bill, and I am pleased to have supported it.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for vote No. 140 on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2, the Agriculture and Nutrition Act of 2018. On vote No. 140, had I been present, I would have voted yea.

Mr. President, I was also necessarily absent for votes related to consideration of H.R. 5895, the Energy and Water, Legislative Branch, and Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, 2019. Had I been present for vote Nos. 138 and 139, I would have voted yea on the motion to table Mr. LEE’s amendment No. 3021, as

modified, and I would have voted yea on passage of H.R. 5895.

As an original cosponsor of Mr. TESTER’s amendment No. 2971 to prevent the denial of access to records and documents by various inspectors general, and as an original cosponsor of Mr. BENNET’s amendment No. 2983 to increase employment for members of the Armed Forces in emerging industries, had I been present for vote Nos. 136 and 137, I would have voted yea on both amendments. In addition, on vote No. 135, had I been present, I would have voted yea on Mr. YOUNG’s amendment No. 2926 to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a study on the effectiveness of the Veterans Crisis Line.

HONORING GEORGE C. WILLIAMS AND THE CREW OF THE FLYING FORTRESS

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I wish to honor George C. Williams and the crew of the 42-299-28 B-17 Flying Fortress that was shot down over Normandy, France, during WWII 75 years ago on July 4, 1943.

George C. Williams, bombardier from Warren, Trumbull County, OH, was killed in action. While assisting the nose gunner, his chute accidentally opened inside the aircraft. Pilot Olof Ballinger offered up his own parachute, but George refused. It is believed that he attempted to fly the plane after all the crew had evacuated.

Pilot Olof Maximilian Ballinger, of Newton Falls, Trumbull County, OH, evaded capture and walked alone, with no compass, over the Pyrenees Mountains. He reached safety in Spain in November 1943 and returned to the U.S. He eventually moved to California.

Harry W. Basucher, Jr., of Cincinnati, OH, was killed in action inside the plane by enemy cannon fire.

Copilot John Marshall Carrah, from Chico, CA, evaded capture and escaped to Switzerland and then to Spain and returned to the U.S. in March 1944 and continued to assist in the war effort. He was a career U.S. Air Force officer retiring as a lieutenant colonel.

Byron J. Gronstall, from Van Nuys, CA, who evacuated the plane, was captured by a German patrol. He was a prisoner of war at Stalag 7A.

William C. Howell, from Goldsboro, NC, who evaded capture, was seriously wounded.

Francis E. Owens, of Pittsburgh, PA, evaded capture but died of exposure in the Pyrenees Mountains while trying to assist other crewmen through the dangerous passage. He was awarded the Soldier’s Medal for bravely dragging wounded men out of harm’s way.

John K. Lane, a radio operator from Deland, FL, was captured and was a prisoner of war at Stalag 7A and 17B. Francis E. Owens found John K. Lane unconscious and dragged him the length of the plane before attaching a parachute and pulling the ripcord while assisting him out of the aircraft.

Paul McConnell, the navigator from Montgomery, AL, evaded capture.

Albert Wackerman, from Salinas, CA, was killed in action by enemy fire aboard the B-17.

A documentary was created about these 10 brave American aviators and will be featured at an event in Warren, OH, on July 2, 2018, at the Samuel E. Lanza Veterans Resource Center.

The son of copilot John M. Carrah, who has done extensive research, heard first-person accounts from his father, and assisted in filming the documentary, will speak after the documentary viewing. This event is sponsored by the Tribune Chronicle with assistance from Warren city councilman John Brown.

The bravery of the crew of the 42-299-28 B-17 Flying Fortress was indicative of so many of their generation who risked life and limb to liberate Europe from an evil unlike anything our country and allies had ever faced.

We can never repay them for their service and sacrifice, but this United States Congress and our Nation are forever grateful for their actions and the actions of so many others like them.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO TOM LABRIE

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of recognizing Tom Labrie of Phillips County for his 18 years of serving his community as the head chef at the Great Northern Restaurant.

Tom was born and raised in Malta. After graduating from Malta High School, Tom began working at the Great Northern Restaurant where he is a self-taught chef. He has since worked at the Great Northern Restaurant for 18 years, working his way up the line to head chef. He and his wife Anna have two kids and are active members of the Malta community.

Tom’s time at the restaurant stands out for two reasons: his hard work and his skills in the kitchen. Although he is the head chef, he does more than cook the food. Other employees and customers find him filling in wherever help is needed, including cashing out customers. While he is a self-taught chef, the food he creates makes the Great Northern Restaurant and Hotel stand out in Malta and the greater Phillips community.

Tom is the secret ingredient to the success of the Great Northern Restaurant. The employees are grateful for his leadership and hard work as it keeps the restaurant running smoothly.

Congratulations, Tom, on your successful career and impact on Malta’s community. I look forward to my next stop at the Great Northern Restaurant to try your famous chicken fried steak.●

TRIBUTE TO PASTOR ARTHUR ARNETT

• Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Pastor Arthur Arnett as he retires from Aurora Avenue Bible Church after decades of faithful service to his congregation and community.

Pastor Arnett spent many of the early years of his life in Des Moines, IA, where his father served as the pastor of Bethel Bible Church, later to be renamed Aurora Avenue Bible Church. Even at a young age, Pastor Arnett demonstrated his passion for service by volunteering for any needed tasks around the church. After graduating from high school, Pastor Arnett studied at the Prairie Bible Institute and worked in a variety of jobs, including truckdriving, mechanical contracting, and cooking. While holding these positions, Pastor Arnett's love of ministry shone through as he discussed and shared his knowledge of the Bible with many. In 1968, Pastor Arnett was called to military service and trained in aviation. Shortly before leaving for a year of service in Vietnam, Pastor Arnett married his wife, Connie Ray, in Tip-ton, IA. After returning from Vietnam, Pastor Arnett once again devoted his life to ministry and served congregations in Colorado and Kansas. In 1976, Pastor Arnett joined the Seaman's International Christian Association, where he was able to minister to thousands of seamen from all over the world over the course of 12 years.

Pastor Arnett was then called back to his home church in Des Moines, IA, where he began ministering on July 8, 1988. And on July 8, 2018—exactly 30 years later—Pastor Arnett will retire from the pastorate at Aurora Avenue Bible Church. After three decades as a pastor and many more years as a volunteer, Pastor Arnett has been able to deliver thousands of messages and touch countless lives through his faithful service to his community and congregation.

I ask my colleagues to join me as I proudly recognize Pastor Arthur Arnett, an Iowan whose lifelong devotion to service epitomizes the great American ideals of hard work, duty, and dedication.●

REMEMBERING CHARLES MARTIN "C.M." NEWTON

• Mr. JONES. Mr. President, today with deep sadness, but also with reverence, I wish to remember Charles Martin "C.M." Newton, who died on Monday, June 4, 2018. C.M. Newton was one of the most influential coaches in college sports, whose skills I was fortunate to witness firsthand during my time as an undergraduate student at the University of Alabama. Coach Newton integrated the Alabama Crimson Tide men's basketball team in 1969 and led them to three Southeastern Conference, SEC, titles from 1974–1976. He also led the Vanderbilt University Commodores to the Sweet Sixteen in

the 1988 NCAA Tournament before leaving to lead the athletic department at the University of Kentucky, his alma mater. At Kentucky, he not only continued the Wildcat tradition of winning NCAA men's basketball championships, he once again broke down barriers by hiring the first Black women's and men's coaches in UK history.

C.M. Newton was born in Rockwood, TN, on February 2, 1930. As a student at the University of Kentucky, he played on the baseball team, as well as the 1951 championship-winning men's basketball team. He began his coaching career at Transylvania University before moving to Alabama and, later, Vanderbilt. In addition to coaching, he served as an assistant SEC commissioner. After leading Alabama to three conference titles and six postseason visits, he headed to Vanderbilt in 1981, before returning to Kentucky in 1989. His success as a basketball coach and as an athletic director led him to oversee the 1992 and 1996 Olympic men's basketball team rosters, which included the famous 1992 "Dream Team" led by Michael Jordan, Larry Bird, Magic Johnson, as well as Charles Barkley, an Alabama native.

On a personal note, I have looked up to Coach Newton since before I ever set foot on campus at the University of Alabama. In May 1972, he spoke at a Birmingham Kiwanis Club luncheon where I received the Youth of the Year Award during my senior year of high school. He spoke of leadership, of integrity, and of the need to fulfill the promise of America. He challenged all of the students in attendance that day to be the best we could be for ourselves, our families, and our communities.

Forty-six years later, I can remember his advice just as clearly as the day he gave it. I hope, in some way, we have each lived up to his challenge.

Years later, Coach Newton went on to receive the John Bunn Lifetime Achievement Award in 1997, an annual award given to an individual who has contributed significantly to the sport of basketball, and was inducted to the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame in 2000.

My wife, Louise, and I extend our sincerest condolences to Coach Newton's wife, Nancy, his three children, and the entire extended community of athletes and fans on whom he made a positive impact. His legacy lives on in each of us.●

TRIBUTE TO TEX WILLIAMS

• Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor a Mountain State coaching legend from Raleigh County, Tex Williams. He is as legendary and as influential in West Virginia as two of his best friends, Jerry West and Logan High School Coaching legend Willie Akers.

Good coaches are able to show you what it takes to succeed in the game. Special coaches are able to put that

human touch to it and go a step beyond to have a positive impact on your life. Tex was able to capture both. He was the longtime coach at St. Albans and also served as coach at Vinson High School, Nitro High School, the University of Charleston, Alderson-Broadus, and the Charleston Gunners of the CBA. He was a star athlete in all sports, and has coached on every level—high school, college, and pro basketball—and won more than 500 games in his career.

In 2014, I had the privilege of congratulating Tex upon the opening of the Tex Williams Museum in Artie, WV. There, the Marshall Athletic Hall of Fame member for both baseball and basketball and acclaimed coach's legacy is on display, housing 40,000 photos he collected throughout his long career. Making it even more special, the Tex Williams Museum is housed in the old post office building his father helped build and where his mother worked for 43 years.

Tex learned early on that sports can make you into so much more than a successful athlete if you have the right attitude. There is no greater achievement than to be in a position to give back to the community that helped shape who you are, and that is what we are celebrating today by honoring Tex. He started the Hoops Classic high school basketball tournament, which is played every year at the Charleston Civic Center. So many student-athletes have been inspired by Tex and have gone forward to build successful careers for themselves in our home State. Tex started the West Virginia Legends Sports Banquet 9 years ago, which reunites former players and coaches who once starred in West Virginia high school and college athletics. Tex has not only influenced and inspired student athletes for decades, but he has passed his knowledge and tradition of coaching excellence to his son, Adam, who also holds a strong legacy as a player and coach.

Tex is a perfect example of what makes West Virginia so very unique and special. Our people have this can-do spirit, a neighborly love that is unrelenting, and we are all grounded by the same core principle: to help others be the best they can be and to never forget where you came from. As I always say, if you can count your blessings, you can share your blessings, and Tex has embodied that sentiment beautifully.

Again, it is an honor to recognize the outstanding achievements of Tex Williams and all he has done for countless student athletes across our home State.●

TRIBUTE TO JOHN HITT

• Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I would like to take a few moments to recognize my friend and esteemed president of the University of Central Florida, John Hitt. On June 30, John will step down as president after 26 years.

John was the first in his family to graduate from college, and ever since then, he has continued to work in academia through his leadership at the University of Maine, Bradley University, Texas Christian University, Tulane University, and most recently, the University of Central Florida.

Since he assumed his role in 1992, UCF has seen its enrollment more than triple to over 66,000 students. It has also tripled the number of minority students at UCF, who currently make up 46 percent of the UCF student body.

As the current longest serving president in Florida's State University System, John has been involved in UCF receiving \$2.23 billion in research funding, creating 71 new degree programs, and launching more than \$1 billion in new construction, including more than 100 new buildings. Among them is the UCF College of Medicine that anchors the Medical City at Lake Nona.

His many awards and honors include being recognized as one of America's 10 most innovative college presidents by Washington Monthly magazine and twice being ranked No. 1 on Orlando Magazine's list of Orlando's 50 Most Powerful People.

Most impressively, John, a first-generation college student, has awarded more than 270,000 degrees, which translates to about 83 percent of all degrees conferred in UCF history. John awarded more degrees within the State University System of Florida than any other university president in Sunshine State history.

In his inaugural presidential address in 1992, John said, "UCF is an institution founded on partnership in a city that dares to dream. We are a university founded on the principles of access to high quality education at affordable cost, of research directed to public need, and of service to the people of our state, region and nation. I fervently believe that UCF will become America's leading metropolitan university."

His dedication to his students, university, and community will be remembered by the large UCF Knight family and the people of central Florida.

I am proud to call John a friend, and we will all miss his leadership at UCF. I wish him well on his retirement.●

90TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KAPPA ALPHA PSI TAMPA ALUMNI CHAPTER

● Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I would like to recognize and celebrate the 90th anniversary of the Tampa alumni chapter of Kappa Alpha Psi fraternity. For 90 years, the members of the Tampa alumni chapter of Kappa Alpha Psi have provided leadership, dedication, and service to Tampa. Through their community initiatives and fundraisers, they have helped thousands in their community. The Tampa alumni chapter of Kappa Alpha Psi was founded in 1928 on the belief of service to one another and the community, during a time when African Americans faced

legal and institutional discrimination both on and off college campuses. The current members of the alumni chapter have dedicated their time to providing leadership and service in their community, most recently organizing a Martin Luther King, Jr., day of service focused on disaster preparedness.

The past and present members of the Tampa Alumni Chapter of Kappa Alpha Psi fraternity should inspire everyone to make their own communities better. One quality members of Kappa Alpha Psi strive for is excellence in everything they do, and over the past 90 years, the members of the Tampa alumni chapter have provided excellent leadership and service to their community in Tampa. The celebration and reflection of 90 years of service shows how far we have come in the United States and how much work is still left to do.●

350TH ANNIVERSARY OF SALT SALETTE MARIE, MICHIGAN

● Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 350th anniversary of the city of Sault Sainte Marie, MI. As one of the oldest cities in the State of Michigan, as well as the United States, Sault Ste. Marie is endowed with a rich history, dynamic present, and bright future.

As early as 800 A.D., the Chippewa Indians, originally referred to as Ojibway, inhabited the area now known as Sault Ste. Marie. The Chippewa Indians called the region "Bahweting," or "the Gathering Place," due to the wealth of fish and fur found along the St. Marys River, the only water connection between Lake Superior and the other Great Lakes.

In the early 1600s, British, French, and Jesuit missionaries ventured to the territory, including Fr. Jaques Marquette. In 1668, Fr. Jaques Marquette renamed the settlement Sault Ste. Marie in honor of the Virgin Mary, establishing the first permanent settlement in the Great Lakes region. Due to the abundant natural resources and strategic location of the St. Marys River, the French and British repeatedly fought over the area, as well as the right to trade with the Chippewa and Ottawa Tribes. Although Fr. Jaques Marquette built the first permanent structure, John Johnson is considered to be the first permanent settler in Sault Ste. Marie. In the late 1790s, Johnson and his family moved to the region to open a fur trade operation along the St. Marys River. In 1797, the Northwest Fur Company constructed a navigation lock approximately 38-feet long on the Canadian side of the St. Marys River. Unfortunately, the lock was destroyed in the War of 1812.

In 1820, the Chippewa Indians signed the Treaty of the Sault that turned control of Sault Ste. Marie to the United States. In 1852, almost three decades later, the State of Michigan contracted Fairbanks Scale Company

to build a lock designed to permit waterborne commerce between Lake Superior and the other Great Lakes. The Fairbanks Scale Company constructed a system of two locks, each 350 feet long, called the State Lock. The State of Michigan operated and maintained the locks for more than a decade, but as the shipping traffic and vessel sizes increased, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers assumed ownership of the facility and constructed a larger lock, more than 515 feet long, named the Weitzel Lock. Since then, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers oversaw the construction and replacement of five locks, later known as the Soo Locks, in order to meet the growing demand for larger vessels: First Poe Lock, Davis Lock, Sabin Lock, MacArthur Lock, and Second Poe Lock. Over the past 350 years, Sault Ste. Marie transformed from a base for fisherman and fur traders to an international gateway for community development and economic growth.

Today, Sault Ste. Marie is home to more than 13,000 residents who enjoy the beautiful parks, historic downtown, and safe neighborhoods. Situated in Chippewa County, the city provides a number of recreational activities designed to enhance the quality of life for residents, ranging from the Sault Seal Recreation Area and Voyageur Island, to the River of History Museum and Sherman Park. Sault Ste. Marie is also active in the preservation and promotion of historic landmarks, including the Historic Locks Park Walkway, the John Johnston House, and the Kemp Coal Dock Office. Recognized as "the place where Michigan was born," Sault Ste. Marie captivates the attention of residents and visitors from around the globe.

I am honored to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the rich history, significant contributions, and outstanding achievements of the city of Sault Sainte Marie. I wish the city continued growth and prosperity in the years ahead.●

TRIBUTE TO LOGAN AUKES

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Logan Aukes, an intern in my Sioux Falls, SD, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Logan is a graduate of Sioux Falls Christian High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, he is attending Dordt College, where he is majoring in business administration. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Logan for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO JOSH BROWN

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Josh Brown, an intern in my

Sioux Falls, SD, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Josh is a graduate of Dell Rapids St. Mary High School in Dell Rapids, SD. Currently, he is attending Morningside College, where he is majoring in political science. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Josh for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Cuccia, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:54 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5345. An act to designate the Marshall Space Flight Center of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to provide leadership for the U.S. rocket propulsion industrial base, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5346. An act to amend title 51, United States Code, to provide for licenses and experimental permits for space support vehicles, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5905. An act to authorize basic research programs in the Department of Energy Office of Science for fiscal years 2018 and 2019.

H.R. 5906. An act to amend the America COMPETES Act to establish Department of Energy policy for Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5907. An act to provide directors of the National Laboratories signature authority for certain agreements, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 770) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of American innovation and significant innovation and pioneering efforts of individuals or groups from each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the United States territories, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2061) to reau-

thorize the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004, and for other purposes.

At 11:27 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5895) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, and asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Frelinghuysen, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Carter of Texas, Mr. Calvert, Mr. Fortenberry, Mr. Fleischmann, Ms. Herrera Beutler, Mr. Taylor, Mrs. Lowey, Ms. Kaptur, Mr. Visclosky, Mr. Ryan of Ohio, and Ms. Wasserman Schultz, be the managers of the conference on the part of the House.

At 3:46 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, without amendment:

S.J. Res 60. Joint resolution providing for the reappointment of Barbara M. Barrett as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 6157. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6160. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the sources of the authority to issue regulations regarding certifications and other criteria applicable to legislative branch employees under Wounded Warriors Federal Leave Act.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 299. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5345. An act to designate the Marshall Space Flight Center of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to provide leadership for the U.S. rocket propulsion industrial base, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 5346. An act to amend title 51, United States Code, to provide for licenses and experimental permits for space support vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 5906. An act to amend the America COMPETES Act to establish Department of Energy policy for Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 5907. An act to provide directors of the National Laboratories signature authority

for certain agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 6160. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the sources of the authority to issue regulations regarding certifications and other criteria applicable to legislative branch employees under Wounded Warriors Federal Leave Act; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 5905. An act to authorize basic research programs in the Department of Energy Office of Science for fiscal years 2018 and 2019.

H.R. 6157. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-5778. A communication from the Chief Management Officer, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department's establishment of Cross Functional Teams (CFTs); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5779. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the mobilizations of selected reserve units, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5780. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the mobilizations of selected reserve units, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2018; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5781. A communication from the Director of Defense Pricing and Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Repeal of DFARS Clause 'Pricing Adjustments'" ((RIN0750-AJ93) (DFARS Case 2018-D032)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5782. A communication from the Director of Defense Pricing and Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Repeal of DFARS Clause 'Requirements'" ((RIN0750-AJ91) (DFARS Case 2018-D030)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5783. A communication from the Director of Defense Pricing and Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Undefined Contract Action Definition" ((RIN0750-AI99) (DFARS Case 2015-D024)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June

26, 2018; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5784. A communication from the Director of Defense Pricing and Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Offset Costs" ((RIN0750-A159) (DFARS Case 2018-D028)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5785. A communication from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendments to the Commission's Freedom of Information Act Regulations" (RIN3235-AM25) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 27, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5786. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility (Little Silver, Borough of, Monmouth County, NJ, et al.)" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2018-0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 27, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5787. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Base Year Emissions Inventories for the Lebanon and Delaware County Non-attainment Areas for the 2012 Annual Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standard" (FRL No. 9980-30-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 27, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5788. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Michigan; Revisions to Volatile Organic Compound Rules" (FRL No. 9980-08-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 27, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5789. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; California; Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District; Negative Declarations" (FRL No. 9980-17-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 27, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5790. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Arkansas; Revisions to Minor New Source Review Program" (FRL No. 9979-15-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 27, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5791. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Annual Report to Congress on the Open Payments Program"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5792. A communication from the Chairman, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to the Congress: Medicare

and the Health Care Delivery System"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5793. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the manufacture of significant military equipment abroad and the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to the Republic of Korea to support the manufacture of the F414-GE-400 engine (Transmittal No. DDTTC 17-098); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-5794. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to Italy to manufacture and/or assemble Millimeter Wave Front End Assemblies of the Guidance Section and Control Sections of AGM-88E Advanced Anti-Radiation Guided Missile for the Italian Ministry of Defense in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTTC 18-008); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-5795. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of firearm parts and components abroad controlled under Category I of the U.S. Munitions List of various caliber rifled barrel blanks to Canada for commercial resale in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTTC 18-036); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-5796. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removing Outmoded Regulations Regarding the Ricky Ray Hemophilia Relief Fund Program" (RIN0906-AB13) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5797. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removing Outmoded Regulations Regarding the National Health Service Corps Program" (RIN0906-AB15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5798. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removing Outmoded Regulations Regarding the Rural Physician Training Grant Program, Definition of 'Underserved Rural Community'" (RIN0906-AB17) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5799. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "A State's Guide to the U.S. Department of Education's Assessment Peer Review Process" received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 27, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5800. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United

States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report to Congress concerning intercepted wire, oral, or electronic communications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-5801. A communication from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Hazardous Materials: Miscellaneous Amendments; Response to Appeals; Corrections" (RIN2137-AF27) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5802. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Standard for High Chairs" (Docket No. CPSC-2015-0031) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 27, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-252. A joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee memorializing its support for the President of the United States' proposal to construct a secure border wall, and urging the United States Congress to immediately take action to fund the construction; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 741

Whereas, through the 2016 election of President Donald J. Trump, the American people delivered a clear mandate to ensure American prosperity; and

Whereas, the security of our nation's borders and the safety of our citizens are paramount to protecting the American way of life; and

Whereas, it is essential to the welfare of our nation that illegal immigration cease; and

Whereas, President Trump has pledged to secure our borders through the construction of a secure border wall; and

Whereas, the members of this General Assembly have consistently taken steps to address illegal immigration within the borders of our great State and now wish to urge the United States Congress to address illegal immigration by supporting President Trump's border wall proposal; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Tenth General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, the Senate Concurring, That we strongly support President Donald J. Trump's proposal to construct a secure border wall across our nation's southern border, and we strongly urge the United States Congress to immediately take action to fund the construction of said border wall without delay; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the U.S. Secretary of Homeland Security, the Governor of the State of Tennessee, the Speaker and the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the President and the Secretary of the United States Senate, and each member of the Tennessee Congressional delegation.

POM-253. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

designating May 2018 as “Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Awareness Month” in Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 371

Whereas, Amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS) is better known as Lou Gehrig’s disease; and

Whereas, ALS is a fatal neurodegenerative disease characterized by degeneration of cell bodies of the upper and lower motor neurons in the gray matter of the anterior horn of the spinal cord; and

Whereas, The initial symptom of ALS is weakness of the skeletal muscles, especially those of the extremities; and

Whereas, As ALS progresses, the patient experiences difficulty in swallowing, talking and breathing; and

Whereas, ALS causes muscles to atrophy and the patient becomes a functional quadriplegic; and

Whereas, Patients with ALS typically remain alert and are aware of their loss of motor functions and the inevitable outcome of continued deterioration and death; and

Whereas, ALS affects military veterans at twice the rate of the general population; and

Whereas, ALS occurs in adulthood, most commonly between 40 and 70 years of age, peaking at approximately 55 years of age, and affects both men and women without bias; and

Whereas, Annually, more than 5,000 new ALS patients are diagnoses throughout the nation; and

Whereas, In Pennsylvania, there are currently more than 1,000 individuals who have been formally diagnosed with ALS; and

Whereas, The \$500,000 in State funding appropriated by the General Assembly for ALS support services for 2017–2018 provided services to nearly 1,000 constituents and a substantial savings to the State budget and taxpayers; and

Whereas, The ALS Association reports that on average, patients diagnosed with ALS only survive two to five years from the time of diagnosis; and

Whereas, ALS has no known cause, prevention or cure; and

Whereas, “Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Awareness Month” increases the public’s awareness of ALS patients’ circumstances and acknowledges the negative impact this disease has on ALS patients and their families and recognizes the research being done to eradicate ALS; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate designate the Month of May 2018 as “Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Awareness Month” in Pennsylvania; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of each house of Congress and to each member of Congress from Pennsylvania.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SHELBY, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Special Report entitled “Further Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals for Fiscal Year 2019” (Rept. No. 115–288).

By Mr. BLUNT, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

S. 3158. An original bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115–289).

By Mr. SHELBY, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

S. 3159. An original bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115–290).

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2779. A bill to amend the Zimbabwe Democracy and Economic Recovery Act of 2001.

By Mr. BURR, from the Select Committee on Intelligence, without amendment:

S. 3153. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2018 and 2019 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 3776. A bill to support United States international cyber diplomacy, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WICKER for Mr. MCCAIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

Air Force nomination of Col. Paul A. Friedrichs, to be Brigadier General.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Michael T. Moran, to be Vice Admiral.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Mark H. Berry, to be Major General.

Navy nomination of Capt. Mark J. Mouriski, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Eileen H. Laubacher, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Ann H. Duff, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (1h) John W. Korka, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. Nancy S. Lacore and ending with Capt. Eric C. Ruttenberg, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 12, 2018.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (1h) Mary C. Riggs, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (1h) Alan D. Beal and ending with Rear Adm. (1h) Andrew C. Lennon, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 9, 2018.

Navy nomination of Capt. Robert T. Clark, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Michael F. Fahey III and ending with Brig. Gen. Helen G. Pratt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 26, 2018.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Scott A. Howell, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Austin S. Miller, to be General.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. Eric M. Smith, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Richard M. Clark, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Darryl A. Williams, to be Lieutenant General.

Marine Corps nomination of Col. Daniel J. Lecce, to be Major General.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Charles Q. Brown, Jr., to be General.

Army nominations beginning with Col. Narciso Cruz and ending with Col. Mark K. Miera, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 17, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Joseph F. Jarrard and ending with Brig. Gen. Tracy R. Norris, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 17, 2018.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Laurel J. Hummel, to be Major General.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Tommy H. Baker and ending with Brig. Gen. Ronald A. Westfall, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 17, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Col. Miguel Aguilar and ending with Col. Timothy J. Winslow, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 17, 2018.

Navy nomination of Capt. Christopher C. French, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. Carl E. Mundy III, to be Lieutenant General.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. Loretta E. Reynolds, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Giovanni K. Tuck, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Joseph T. Guastella, Jr., to be Lieutenant General.

Army nominations beginning with Col. Robert G. Carruthers III and ending with Col. Kevin L. Vines, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2018.

Army nomination of Col. Stephen M. Rutner, to be Brigadier General.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (1h) Marcus A. Hitchcock, to be Rear Admiral.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. John K. Love, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. John C. Thomson III, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Col. Joseph R. Baldwin, to be Brigadier General.

Navy nomination of Capt. William P. Pennington, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Thomas W. Bergeson, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. James C. Slife, to be Lieutenant General.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. John G. Hannink, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. James J. Malloy, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Andrew L. Lewis, to be Vice Admiral.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. John M. Jansen, to be Lieutenant General.

Mr. WICKER for Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary’s desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Air Force nomination of Kourtnei L. Starkey, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Hermann F. Hinze, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Joseph B. Ryan, to be Major.

Air Force nominations beginning with Michael Francis Adamitis and ending with Leslie Ann Zyzdamartin, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 24, 2018.

Air Force nominations beginning with Barbara B. Acevedo and ending with Christy L. Zahn, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 24, 2018.

Air Force nominations beginning with William P. Morse and ending with Nicholas M.

Strelchuk, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 7, 2018.

Air Force nominations beginning with Wade B. Adair and ending with Jay W. Veeder, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 18, 2018.

Air Force nominations beginning with James D. Athnos and ending with Sarah Monroe Whitson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 18, 2018.

Air Force nominations beginning with Julie Laleh Adams and ending with Christopher Thomas Zona, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 18, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Eric T. Ashley and ending with Michael J. Ryhn, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 6, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Gilbert Aidinian and ending with D011955, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 6, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Diane M. Armbruster and ending with Leland T. Shepherd, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 17, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Donald C. Brewer III and ending with Charles F. Wallace, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 17, 2018.

Army nomination of James D. Spencer II, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Christopher A. Bassett and ending with Scott E. Boyd, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 17, 2018.

Army nomination of Julie A. Craig, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Charles G. Blake, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Thomas A. Urquhart, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Patricia Young, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Diego L. Becerra III and ending with Michael E. Zellous, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 24, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Patrick M. Abell and ending with Albert F. Yonkovitz, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 24, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with George R. K. Acree and ending with Arthur E. Zegers IV, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 24, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Melissa K. G. Adamski and ending with James Yi, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 24, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Dennis R. Bell and ending with Brett J. Taylor, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Theodore W. Croy III and ending with Bill A. Soliz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Edgar G. Arroyo and ending with G010491, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Jeffrey M. Allerding and ending with Vanessa Worsham, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2018.

Army nomination of Brian F. Saylor, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with William B. Murphy and ending with David M. Solorzano, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Eric N. Hatch and ending with Yannick N. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Anthony Hall and ending with Christina M. Wright, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2018.

Army nomination of Michael G. Mouritsen, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of David E. Roberts, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Peter R. Purrington, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Chad K. Brinton, to be Major.

Army nomination of Christopher K. James, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Tony J. Woodruff, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Jonathan M. Faust and ending with Carlos M. Poventudestrada, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 11, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Brendan E. Bell and ending with Jaylon L. Waite, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 18, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Douglas R. Adams and ending with Lauri M. Zike, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 18, 2018.

Army nomination of Leslie M. Latimorelorfils, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Angel M. Sanchez, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Fredricco McCurry, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Jimmie A. Hilton, Jr., to be Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Brett M. McCormick, to be Major.

Marine Corps nomination of Jonathan M. Pickup, to be Major.

Navy nominations beginning with John R. Bush and ending with Holly B. Shoger, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Erik E. Anderson and ending with Matthew L. Tardy, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Bradford W. Baker and ending with Michael P. Ohara, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Derrick E. Blackston and ending with Michael G. Wheeler, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with David J. Adams and ending with David M. Zielinski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Mark R. Alexander and ending with Andrew T.

Newsome, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Jillene M. Bushnell and ending with Micah A. Weltmer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Enid S. Brackett and ending with Joshua P. Taylor, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with John E. Gay and ending with William H. Speaks, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Franklin W. Bennett and ending with Matthew T. Wilcox, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Carvin A. Brown and ending with Mark W. Yates, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Christopher R. Anderson and ending with David P. Wolynski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Marc A. Aragon and ending with Robert A. Yee, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Douglas A. Beck and ending with Steven W. Toppel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 15, 2018.

Navy nomination of Robert A. Vita, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Darin E. Marvin and ending with Eric E. Percival, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 15, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with John J. Doherty and ending with William Ortiz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 15, 2018.

Navy nomination of David A. Ford, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Richard S. Ardolino and ending with Andrew C. Smith, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 15, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Cheryl D. Dandrea and ending with John C. Hazlett II, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 15, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Richard E. Boucher and ending with Cindy L. Rhodes, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 15, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Jeffrey W. Adams and ending with Richard B. Wilderman, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 15, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Clifford J. Allen and ending with Abraham N. Younce, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 15, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Mark S. Collins and ending with Thomas W. Trefny, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 15, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Jonas B. E. Gil and ending with Christie M. Rushing,

which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 15, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Jonathan E. Bush and ending with James C. Wiltraut, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 15, 2018.

Navy nomination of Melissa M. Ford, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Matthew H. Robinson, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Robert L. Anderson II and ending with Danielle M. Wooten, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 17, 2018.

Navy nomination of Harold C. Barnes, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Paul R. Allen and ending with Kim T. Zablan, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 17, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Jason W. Adams and ending with Lagenia K. G. Yarbrough, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 17, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Paul C. Chan and ending with Nathaniel R. Straub, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 17, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Philip B. Bagrow and ending with David S. Yang, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 17, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Hugh Burke and ending with Christopher M. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 17, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Zachary M. Alexander and ending with Mark L. Woodbridge, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 17, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Rene J. Alovera and ending with Stephen S. Yune, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 17, 2018.

Navy nomination of Adrain D. Felder, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Ashley D. Gibbs, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Reynaldo A. Jornacion, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Jay D. Lutz and ending with Marc F. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 7, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Jerome R. Cayangyang and ending with Timothy J. Loney, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 7, 2018.

Navy nomination of Donna M. Johnson, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Kevin M. Corcoran and ending with Sung H. Yi, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 7, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Debra A. Brendley and ending with Cynthia M. Schwartz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 7, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Christopher C. Burris and ending with Jason L. Weissman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 7, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Michael R. Basso and ending with Donald H. Yager,

which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 7, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Steven A. Blaustein and ending with Sonja A. Carl, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 7, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with James G. Cox and ending with Daryl S. Wong, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 7, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Richfield F. Agullana and ending with Jericho B. Timog, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 7, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Sarah E. Abbott and ending with Justin R. Wiesen, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 7, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Matthew R. Argenziano and ending with Michael A. Woods, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 7, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Jeanine F. Benjamin and ending with Savanna S. Steffen, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 7, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Charles B. Abbott and ending with Steven Zielechowski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 7, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Hasan Abdulmutakallim and ending with Stanley C. Ware, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 7, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Bradley H. Abramowitz and ending with Cornell A. Woods, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 7, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Francis J. Carmody III and ending with Matthew N. Watts, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 7, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Lucas G. Barlow and ending with Christina J. Wong, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 7, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Katharine M. Cerezo and ending with Joe M. Vasquez, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 7, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Kevin J. Altemara and ending with Jacob E. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 7, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Patrick A. Batiste and ending with Robert J. Wrenn, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 7, 2018.

Navy nomination of Douglass R. Weiss, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Lerome S. Snaer, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Daniel J. Rizzo, to be Lieutenant Commander.

By Mr. HATCH for the Committee on Finance.

*Lynn A. Johnson, of Colorado, to be Assistant Secretary for Family Support, Department of Health and Human Services.

*Elizabeth Ann Copeland, of Texas, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

*Patrick J. Urda, of Indiana, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

*Jeffrey Kessler, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Holly A. Brady, of Indiana, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana.

Andrew Lynn Brasher, of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Alabama.

James Patrick Hanlon, of Indiana, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Indiana.

David Steven Morales, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.

Lance E. Walker, of Maine, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maine.

John D. Jordan, of Missouri, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Missouri for the term of four years.

Mark F. Sloke, of Alabama, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Alabama for the term of four years.

Nick Willard, of New Hampshire, to be United States Marshal for the District of New Hampshire for the term of four years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BURR:

S. 3153. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2018 and 2019 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; from the Select Committee on Intelligence; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 3154. A bill to ensure Members of Congress have access to Federal facilities in order to exercise their Constitutional oversight responsibilities; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 3155. A bill to ban the use of orthophthalate chemicals as food contact substances; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. SMITH:

S. 3156. A bill to protect airline consumers in the case of cancelled flights; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 3157. A bill to streamline siting processes for small cell deployment; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BLUNT:

S. 3158. An original bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; from

the Committee on Appropriations; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. SHELBY:

S. 3159. An original bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Appropriations; placed on the calendar.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. KING, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 3160. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to, and utilization of, bone mass measurement benefits under part B of the Medicare program by establishing a minimum payment amount under such part for bone mass measurement; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 3161. A bill to establish the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Emergency Response Fund to provide assistance with respect to a public health emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 3162. A bill to provide oversight of the border zone in which Federal agents may conduct vehicle checkpoints and stops and enter private land without a warrant, and to make technical corrections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 3163. A bill to amend the Intercountry Adoption Act of 2000 to require the Secretary of State to report on intercountry adoptions from countries which have significantly reduced adoption rates involving immigration to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. JONES (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 3164. A bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to update the exception for certain annual notices provided by financial institutions; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 3165. A bill to reauthorize the Interagency Committee on Women's Business Enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mrs. ERNST (for herself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 3166. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Army Rangers Veterans of World War II in recognition of their extraordinary service during World War II; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 3167. A bill to provide competitive grants for the operation, security, and maintenance of certain memorials to victims of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. UDALL:

S. 3168. A bill to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to make Reclamation Water Settlements Fund permanent; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. REED):

S. 3169. A bill to establish as United States policy that, pending confirmation of the Russian Federation's continued compliance with New START, the United States should extend New START through 2026; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 3170. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make certain changes to the reporting requirement of certain service providers regarding child sexual exploitation visual depictions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. COTTON, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 3171. A bill to require an unclassified interagency report on the political influence operations of the Government of China and the Communist Party of China with respect to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. KING):

S. 3172. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish, fund, and provide for the use of amounts in a National Park Service Legacy Restoration Fund to address the maintenance backlog of the National Park Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 3173. A bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to include an act of unregulated custody transfer in the definition of child abuse and neglect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BENNET, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 3174. A bill to decriminalize marijuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL (for herself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 3175. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide health care, vocational training and rehabilitation, and monetary allowance to children suffering from spina bifida whose parents are veterans who served in Thailand and were exposed to herbicide agents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. 3176. A bill to establish the Mill Springs Battlefield National Monument in the State of Kentucky as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. JONES):

S. 3177. A bill to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to include the State insurance commissioner as a voting member of the Financial Stability Oversight Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING, Mr. REED, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 3178. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to specify lynching as a deprivation of civil rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 3179. A bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to carry out a study on how virtual currencies and online marketplaces are used to buy, sell, or facili-

tate the financing of goods or services associated with sex trafficking or drug trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 3180. A bill to regulate certain State impositions on interstate commerce; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 3181. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to include in periodic health assessments, separation history and physical examinations, and other assessments an evaluation of whether a member of the Armed Forces has been exposed to open burn pits or toxic airborne chemicals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SASSE:

S. 3182. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for the responsibility of the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center to maintain capabilities to identify threats to industrial control systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. ERNST, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. Res. 558. A resolution designating July 30, 2018, as "National Whistleblower Appreciation Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CARPER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. JONES, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. COONS):

S. Res. 559. A resolution recognizing the contributions of African Americans to the musical heritage of the United States and the need for greater access to music education for African-American students, and expressing support for the designation of June as African-American Music Appreciation Month; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. Res. 560. A resolution designating the month of June 2018 as "Immigrant Heritage Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. STABENOW:

S. Res. 561. A resolution designating July 15, 2018, as "National Leiomyosarcoma Awareness Day" and the month of July 2018 as "National Sarcoma Awareness Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BROWN):

S. Res. 562. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) continues to make an invaluable contribution to United States and international security, 50 years after it opened for signature on July 1, 1968; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr.

LEAHY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CASEY, Mr. Kaine, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COONS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CARPER, Mr. REED, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. NELSON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BENNET, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KING, Mr. JONES, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. DONNELLY):

S. Res. 563. A resolution recognizing June 2018 as "LGBTQ Pride Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. Res. 564. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that President Donald Trump should hold the Government of the Russian Federation accountable for its interference in the 2016 United States election and ensure that the United States is prepared to counter future attempts at election interference; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. PERDUE:

S. Res. 565. A resolution honoring the 40th anniversary of Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay in Kings Bay, Georgia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CASEY, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. CARPER):

S. Res. 566. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the President of the United States must immediately establish an interagency Office for Locating and Reuniting Children with Parents in order to protect separated children from suffering additional trauma resulting from the "Zero Tolerance" policy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. BENNET):

S. Res. 567. A resolution celebrating the 40th anniversary of the American Homebrewers Association; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. RISCH, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. HEINRICH, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. Res. 568. A resolution designating June 2018 as "Great Outdoors Month"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 266

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 266, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Anwar Sadat in recognition of his heroic achievements and courageous contributions to peace in the Middle East.

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 266, *supra*.

S. 486

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 486, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the non-application of Medicare com-

petitive acquisition rates to complex rehabilitative wheelchairs and accessories.

S. 563

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 563, a bill to amend the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 to require that certain buildings and personal property be covered by flood insurance, and for other purposes.

S. 1050

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1050, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Chinese-American Veterans of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

S. 1112

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1112, a bill to support States in their work to save and sustain the health of mothers during pregnancy, childbirth, and in the postpartum period, to eliminate disparities in maternal health outcomes for pregnancy-related and pregnancy-associated deaths, to identify solutions to improve health care quality and health outcomes for mothers, and for other purposes.

S. 1121

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1121, a bill to establish a postsecondary student data system.

S. 1212

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1212, a bill to provide family members of an individual who they fear is a danger to himself, herself, or others, and law enforcement, with new tools to prevent gun violence.

S. 1589

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1589, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 1682

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 1682, a bill to facilitate a national pipeline of spectrum for commercial use, and for other purposes.

S. 2009

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were

added as cosponsors of S. 2009, a bill to require a background check for every firearm sale.

S. 2060

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2060, a bill to promote democracy and human rights in Burma, and for other purposes.

S. 2076

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2076, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the expansion of activities related to Alzheimer's disease, cognitive decline, and brain health under the Alzheimer's Disease and Healthy Aging Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2095

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2095, a bill to regulate assault weapons, to ensure that the right to keep and bear arms is not unlimited, and for other purposes.

S. 2131

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2131, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish medically necessary transportation for newborn children of certain women veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 2141

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2141, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to reform procedures for determinations on disposition of charges and the convening of court-martial for certain offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and for other purposes.

S. 2171

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2171, a bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to set the rate of pay for employees of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection in accordance with the General Schedule.

S. 2358

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2358, a bill to require a study on women and lung cancer, and for other purposes.

S. 2497

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2497, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the

Arms Export Control Act to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriations of funds to Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 2521

At the request of Mrs. McCASKILL, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2521, a bill to authorize the issuance of extreme risk protection orders.

S. 2687

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2687, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the individual tax provisions of the tax reform law, and for other purposes.

S. 2823

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2823, a bill to modernize copyright law, and for other purposes.

S. 2830

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2830, a bill to reauthorize the rural emergency medical services training and equipment assistance program under section 330J of the Public Health Service Act.

S. 3029

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3029, a bill to revise and extend the Prematurity Research Expansion and Education for Mothers who deliver Infants Early Act (PREEMIE Act).

S. 3031

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3031, a bill to amend chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code, to improve the management of Federal personal property.

S. 3040

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3040, a bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to clarify Federal law with respect to reporting certain positive consumer credit information to consumer reporting agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 3093

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 3093, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to address the protective custody of alien children accompanied by parents, and for other purposes.

S. 3151

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3151, a bill to secure the rights of

public employees to organize, act concertedly, and bargain collectively, which safeguard the public interest and promote the free and unobstructed flow of commerce, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 61

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 61, a resolution calling on the Department of Defense, other elements of the Federal Government, and foreign governments to intensify efforts to investigate, recover, and identify all missing and unaccounted-for personnel of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 3071

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3071 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3081

At the request of Mr. JONES, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3081 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3102

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3102 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3119

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3119 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3139

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3139 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3182

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3182 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3183

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3183 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3190

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3190 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3198

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3198 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3225

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3225 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3226

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3226 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3286

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3286 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3298

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3298 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3324

At the request of Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3324 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3329

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3329 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3338

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3338 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3340

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3340 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3341

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3341 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 3155. A bill to ban the use of ortho-phthalate chemicals as food contact substances; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Protect Our Food From Phthalate Contamination Act. This bill would ban chemicals called ortho-phthalates from materials that come in contact with our food, because these phthalates have been found to actually leach into what we eat.

Phthalates have been known to interfere with the body's hormones, leading to a range of health concerns including reproductive harm. These chemicals have also been linked to learning and behavior problems in children and insulin resistance in adolescents and adults.

According to a recent study, individuals who regularly eat out had 30 percent higher phthalate levels. The findings for teenagers are particularly troubling, where testing showed phthalate levels 55 percent higher than people who ate at home. Enjoying a meal out or using packaged food to prepare meals on a busy schedule shouldn't come with the cost of chemical exposure that can cause harm.

We've already banned certain phthalates from children's toys due to serious health concerns, and now we need to remove the exposure through the food we eat. Phthalates can be found throughout the food supply chain, from the plastic gloves worn to handle food to the containers and wrappings used for packaging.

This legislation would specifically ban the type of phthalates, ortho-phthalates, currently being used in some food production and packaging, and require that any substance used as a replacement is also safe. The bill would implement the ban over the course of two years, so that companies have time to phase out these harmful chemicals.

This bill is supported by several health and consumer organizations, including the American Academy of Pediatrics, Breast Cancer Prevention Partners, Earthjustice, Environmental Defense Fund, Environmental Health Strategy Center, Environmental Working Group, and Safer Chemicals, Healthy Families.

I appreciate the support of my colleague, Senator BLUMENTHAL, who is an original cosponsor of the bill. I look forward to working with my colleagues on this important issue. Thank you Mr. President and I yield the floor.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. KING, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 3160. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to, and utilization of, bone mass measurement benefits under part B of the Medicare program by establishing a minimum payment amount under such part for bone mass measurement; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation with my colleague from Maryland, Senator BEN CARDIN, which would increase access to preventive bone density screenings and improve osteoporosis diagnosis and treatment in the process. We are pleased to have Senators WICKER, KING, and STABENOW as cosponsors.

The public health risk of osteoporosis cannot be understated. Today, approximately 54 million Americans either have osteoporosis or low bone mass,

which places them at increased risk for osteoporosis. Women are disproportionately affected, accounting for 71 percent of osteoporotic fractures and 75 percent of costs. Osteoporosis is often called "the silent disease" because bone loss usually occurs gradually over the years without symptoms.

As the NIH Osteoporosis and Related Bone Disease National Resource Center observes, falls are especially dangerous for people who are unaware that they have low bone density. If the patient and the doctor fail to connect the broken bone to osteoporosis, the chance to make a diagnosis with a bone density test and begin a prevention or treatment program is lost.

Early diagnosis and treatment of osteoporosis are proven to dramatically reduce fracture rates, and appropriate reimbursement for tests that measure bone mass and predict fracture risk are necessary to maintain patient access to care, particularly in rural or underserved areas. Our legislation, the Increasing Access to Osteoporosis Testing for Medicare Beneficiaries Act of 2018, tackles a proven barrier to proper screening by creating a floor reimbursement rate under Medicare for the dual energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) test, the "gold standard" for osteoporosis diagnosis.

Congress has twice recognized the importance of reversing Medicare cuts to DXA reimbursement in order to maintain patient access, yet the Medicare reimbursement rate for DXA tests administered in a doctor's office has declined from \$140 in 2006 to only \$42 in 2018—a dramatic 70 percent decline. The National Osteoporosis Foundation has found that declining reimbursement rates have created a 26 percent decline in physicians performing DXA tests since 2008, resulting in a corresponding 22 percent decline in diagnoses since 2009.

Regrettably, as a result of reduced screenings due to declining reimbursements, it is estimated that more than 40,000 additional hip fractures occur each year, resulting in nearly 10,000 additional hip fracture-related deaths. As osteoporosis is already under-diagnosed in the Medicare population, it is clear that we must change this trajectory.

This legislation is endorsed by the American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists, the National Osteoporosis Foundation, and more than forty additional national medical societies and patient advocate organizations. I thank Senator CARDIN for joining me in this effort to increase patient access to osteoporosis screening and diagnosis, while lowering costs and consequences resulting from a lack of diagnosis. I encourage my colleagues to support its adoption.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 3162. A bill to provide oversight of the border zone in which Federal agents may conduct vehicle checkpoints and stops and enter private land

without a warrant, and to make technical corrections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, I am joining with Senator MURRAY in introducing the Border Zone Reasonableness Restoration Act of 2018. This legislation, if enacted, will establish critical privacy protections for Americans by limiting the unjustifiably wide “border zone” within which Department of Homeland Security officers may—without a warrant—stop vehicles and search private land for the purpose of patrolling the border.

The current 100 mile “border zone” was established through regulatory fiat. While the Fourth Amendment allows limited exceptions to the warrant requirement at or close to the border, this 100 mile zone is neither limited nor reasonable. It includes marine borders. At present, it encompasses almost two-thirds of the population of the United States. This includes major cities such as New York, Seattle, Chicago, New Orleans, and Los Angeles, even the “border town” of Richmond, Virginia, as well as entire states such as Maine, Delaware, and Florida.

The need for this legislation has never been clearer. The Trump administration’s aggressive yet wasteful use of immigration enforcement resources has subjected law-abiding citizens to needless and intrusive searches at Customs and Border Protection (CBP) checkpoints far from the border. Not only do these searches produce minimal value to border enforcement, they violate the constitutionally protected privacy of citizens and residents of border regions, including in my home State of Vermont. Recently, CBP agents in Vermont have boarded Greyhound buses in Burlington without a warrant and inquired about the citizenship of passengers. They have targeted international college students for questioning about their legal status. In the nearby States of Maine and New Hampshire, they have shut down interstate highways with immigration checkpoints. In Montana, a CBP agent even stopped an American citizen simply for speaking Spanish.

This should not be a partisan issue. This is about ensuring that every person in this Nation receives the constitutional protections to which they are entitled. Both the American Civil Liberties Union and the Cato Institute have sharply criticized these practices as problematic under the Fourth Amendment. Vermonters have rightly been concerned about these expanded border zone searches. They believe, as I do, that once inside our country the phrase ‘show me your papers’ does not belong inside the United States of America.

The Border Zone Reasonableness Restoration Act is based on an amendment that Senator MURRAY and I successfully attached to immigration reform legislation in 2013 during the Obama Administration. The 100 mile “border zone”—and the similar 25 mile zone

where many types of warrantless property searches are permitted—predates this current administration, but the actions of this administration have shown just how much we need legislation like this today.

The Fourth Amendment does not stop 100 miles from our land and sea borders. Its protections extend whether in the heart of Kansas or in the middle of Vermont. Ensuring that the protections of the Fourth Amendment are available to everyone within the United States should be important to all of us, regardless of party or ideology. I hope all Senators will support this commonsense measure to ensure the Fourth Amendment is upheld.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 3170. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make certain changes to the reporting requirement of certain service providers regarding child sexual exploitation visual depictions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3170

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “CyberTipline Modernization Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. ALTERATIONS TO REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR ELECTRONIC SERVICE PROVIDERS AND REMOTE COMPUTING SERVICE PROVIDERS.

Section 2258A of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “**electronic communication service providers and remote computing service providers**” and inserting “**providers**”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) DUTY.—In order to reduce the proliferation of online child sexual exploitation and to prevent the online sexual exploitation of children, a provider—

“(i) shall, as soon as reasonably possible after obtaining actual knowledge of any facts or circumstances described in paragraph (2)(A), take the actions described in subparagraph (B); and

“(ii) may, after obtaining actual knowledge of any facts or circumstances described in paragraph (2)(B), take the actions described in subparagraph (B).

“(B) ACTIONS DESCRIBED.—The actions described in this subparagraph are—

“(i) providing to the CyberTipline of NCMEC, or any successor to the CyberTipline operated by NCMEC, the mailing address, telephone number, facsimile number, electronic mailing address of, and individual point of contact for, such provider; and

“(ii) making a report of such facts or circumstances to the CyberTipline, or any successor to the CyberTipline operated by NCMEC.”; and

(B) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(2) FACTS OR CIRCUMSTANCES.—

“(A) APPARENT VIOLATIONS.—The facts or circumstances described in this subparagraph are any facts or circumstances from which there is an apparent violation of section 2251, 2251A, 2252, 2252A, 2252B, or 2260 that involves child pornography.

“(B) IMMINENT VIOLATIONS.—The facts or circumstances described in this subparagraph are any facts or circumstances which indicate a violation of any of the sections described in subparagraph (A) involving child pornography may be planned or imminent.”;

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “To the extent” and inserting “In an effort to prevent the future sexual victimization of children, and to the extent”;

(ii) by striking “an electronic communication service provider or a remote computing service provider” and inserting “a provider”; and

(iii) by striking “may include” and inserting “may, at the sole discretion of the provider, include”;

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting “or plans to violate” after “who appears to have violated”; and

(ii) by inserting “payment information (excluding personally identifiable information),” after “uniform resource locator,”;

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “an electronic communication service provider or a remote computing service provider” and inserting “a provider”;

(ii) by striking “apparent child pornography” each place it appears and inserting “content relating to the report”; and

(iii) by striking “the electronic communication service provider or a remote computing service provider” and inserting “the provider”;

(D) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION INFORMATION.—Information relating to the geographic location of the involved individual or website, which may include the Internet Protocol address or verified address, or, if not reasonably available, at least one form of geographic identifying information, including area code or zip code, provided by the customer or subscriber, or stored or obtained by the provider.”;

(E) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in the heading by striking “IMAGES” and inserting “VISUAL DEPICTIONS”;

(ii) by striking “image” and inserting “visual depiction”; and

(iii) by inserting “or other content” after “apparent child pornography”; and

(F) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by striking “image” and inserting “visual depiction”;

(ii) by inserting “or other content” after “apparent child pornography”; and

(iii) by striking “images” and inserting “visual depictions”;

(4) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

“(c) FORWARDING OF REPORT TO LAW ENFORCEMENT.—Pursuant to its clearinghouse role as a private, nonprofit organization, and at the conclusion of its review in furtherance of its nonprofit mission, NCMEC shall make available each report made under subsection (a)(1) to one or more of the following law enforcement agencies:

“(1) Any Federal law enforcement agency that is involved in the investigation of child sexual exploitation, kidnapping, or enticement crimes.

“(2) Any State or local law enforcement agency that is involved in the investigation of child sexual exploitation.

“(3) A foreign law enforcement agency designated by the Attorney General under subsection (d)(3) or a foreign law enforcement

agency that has an established relationship with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, or INTERPOL, and is involved in the investigation of child sexual exploitation, kidnapping, or enticement crimes.”;

(5) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “shall designate promptly the” and inserting “may designate a”;

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “shall promptly” and inserting “may”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking “designate the” and inserting “designate”;

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking “shall” and inserting “may”;

(ii) by striking “the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children” and inserting “NCMEC”;

(iii) by striking “electronic communication service providers, remote computing service providers” and inserting “providers”;

(D) by striking paragraph (5);

(E) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (5); and

(F) by amending paragraph (5), as so redesignated, to read as follows:

“(5) NOTIFICATION TO PROVIDERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—NCMEC may notify a provider of the information described in subparagraph (B), if—

“(i) a provider notifies NCMEC that the provider is making a report under this section as the result of a request by a foreign law enforcement agency; and

“(ii) NCMEC forwards the report described in clause (i) to—

“(I) the requesting foreign law enforcement agency; or

“(II) another agency in the same country designated by the Attorney General under paragraph (3) or that has an established relationship with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, or INTERPOL and is involved in the investigation of child sexual exploitation, kidnapping, or enticement crimes.

“(B) INFORMATION DESCRIBED.—The information described in this subparagraph is—

“(i) the identity of the foreign law enforcement agency to which the report was forwarded; and

“(ii) the date on which the report was forwarded.

“(C) NOTIFICATION OF INABILITY TO FORWARD REPORT.—If a provider notifies NCMEC that the provider is making a report under this section as the result of a request by a foreign law enforcement agency and NCMEC is unable to forward the report as described in subparagraph (A)(ii), NCMEC shall notify the provider that NCMEC was unable to forward the report.”;

(6) in subsection (e), by striking “An electronic communication service provider or remote computing service provider” and inserting “A provider”;

(7) in subsection (f)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “an electronic communication service provider or remote computing service provider” and inserting “a provider”;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “seek” and inserting “search, screen, or scan for”;

(8) in subsection (g)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(vi), by striking “an electronic communication service provider or remote computing service provider” and inserting “a provider”; and

(ii) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

“(B) LIMITATION.—Nothing in subparagraph (A)(vi) authorizes a law enforcement agency

to provide visual depictions of apparent child pornography to a provider.”;

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by striking “THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR MISSING AND EXPLOITED CHILDREN” and inserting “NCMEC”;

(ii) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children” and inserting “NCMEC”;

(II) by inserting after “may disclose” the following: “by mail, electronic transmission, or other reasonable means,”; and

(III) by striking “only” and inserting “only to”;

(iii) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “to any Federal law enforcement agency” and inserting “any Federal law enforcement agency”; and

(II) by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “or that is involved in the investigation of child sexual exploitation, kidnapping, or enticement crimes”;

(iv) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking “to any State” and inserting “any State”; and

(II) by striking “child pornography, child exploitation” and inserting “child sexual exploitation”;

(v) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) by striking “to any foreign law enforcement agency” and inserting “any foreign law enforcement agency”; and

(II) by striking “; and” and inserting “or that has an established relationship with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, or INTERPOL, and is involved in the investigation of child sexual exploitation, kidnapping, or enticement crimes”;

(vi) in subparagraph (D)—

(I) by striking “to an electronic communication service provider or remote computing service provider” and inserting “a provider”; and

(II) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(vii) by adding after subparagraph (D) the following:

“(E) respond to legal process, as necessary.”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) PERMITTED DISCLOSURE BY A PROVIDER.—A provider that submits a report under subsection (a)(1) may disclose by mail, electronic transmission, or other reasonable means, information, including visual depictions contained in the report, in a manner consistent with permitted disclosures under paragraphs (3) through (8) of section 2702(b) only to a law enforcement agency described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of paragraph (3), to NCMEC, or as necessary to respond to legal process.”; and

(9) in subsection (h)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “the notification to an electronic communication service provider or a remote computing service provider by the CyberTipline of receipt of a report” and inserting “a completed submission by a provider of a report to the CyberTipline”; and

(ii) by striking “, as if such request was made pursuant to section 2703(f)” and inserting “the contents provided in the report for 90 days after the submission to the CyberTipline”;

(B) by striking paragraph (2);

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (5) as paragraphs (2) through (4), respectively;

(D) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated—

(i) in the heading, by striking “IMAGES” and inserting “CONTENT”;

(ii) by striking “an electronic communication service provider or a remote computing service” and inserting “a provider”;

(iii) by striking “images” and inserting “visual depictions”; and

(iv) by striking “commingled or interspersed among the images of apparent child pornography within a particular communication or user created folder or directory” and inserting “reasonably accessible and may provide context or additional information about the reported material or person”; and

(E) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated, by striking “An electronic communication service provider or a remote computing service” and inserting “A provider”.

SEC. 3. LIMITED LIABILITY FOR PROVIDERS OR DOMAIN NAME REGISTRARS.

Section 2258B of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the heading—

(A) by striking “electronic communication service providers, remote computing service providers,” and inserting “providers”; and

(B) by striking “registrar” and inserting “registrars”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “an electronic communication service provider, remote computing service provider,” and inserting “a provider”; and

(B) by striking “such electronic communication service provider, remote computing service provider,” and inserting “such provider”;

(3) in subsection (b), by striking “electronic communication service provider, remote computing service provider,” each place it appears and inserting “provider”; and

(4) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “image” each place it appears and inserting “visual depiction”;

(B) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “An electronic communication service provider, a remote computing service provider,” and inserting “A provider”.

SEC. 4. USE TO COMBAT CHILD PORNOGRAPHY OF TECHNICAL ELEMENTS RELATING TO REPORTS MADE TO CYBERTIPLINE.

Section 2258C of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “to images reported to” and inserting “to reports made to”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children” and inserting “NCMEC”;

(ii) by striking “apparent child pornography image of an identified child” and inserting “CyberTipline report”;

(iii) by striking “an electronic communication service provider or a remote computing service provider” and inserting “a provider”;

(iv) by striking “that electronic communication service provider or remote computing service provider” and inserting “that provider”; and

(v) by striking “further transmission of images” and inserting “online sexual exploitation of children”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “specific image, Internet location of images, and other technological elements that can be used to identify and stop the transmission of child pornography” and inserting “specific visual depiction, including an Internet location and any other elements provided in a CyberTipline report that can be used to identify, prevent, curtail, or stop the transmission of child pornography and prevent the online sexual exploitation of children”; and

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking “actual images” and inserting “actual visual depictions of apparent child pornography”;

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the heading, by striking “**electronic communication service providers and remote computing service providers**” and inserting “**providers**”;

(B) by striking “electronic communication service provider or remote computing service provider” each place it appears and inserting “provider”;

(C) by striking “apparent child pornography image of an identified child from the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children” and inserting “CyberTipline report from NCMEC”;

(D) by striking “shall not relieve that” and inserting “shall not relieve the”;

(E) by striking “its reporting obligations” and inserting “reporting”;

(4) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “electronic communication service providers or remote computing service providers” and inserting “providers”;

(B) by striking “apparent child pornography image of an identified child from the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children” and inserting “CyberTipline report from NCMEC”;

(C) by striking “further transmission of the images” and inserting “online sexual exploitation of children”;

(5) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking “The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children shall” and inserting “NCMEC may”;

(B) by inserting after “local law enforcement” the following: “, and to foreign law enforcement agencies described in section 2258A(c)(3)”;

(C) by striking “investigation of child pornography” and inserting “investigation of child sexual exploitation”;

(D) by striking “image of an identified child” and inserting “visual depiction”;

(E) by striking “reported to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children” and inserting “reported to the CyberTipline”;

(6) in subsection (e)—

(A) by inserting before “Federal” the following: “foreign”;

(B) by striking “image of an identified child from the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children under section (d)” and inserting “visual depiction from NCMEC under subsection (d)”;

(C) by striking “child pornography crimes” and inserting “child sexual exploitation crimes”;

(D) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “and prevent future sexual victimization of children”.

SEC. 5. LIMITED LIABILITY FOR NCMEC.

Section 2258D of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “**the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children**” and inserting “NCMEC”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “Except as provided” and inserting “Pursuant to its clearinghouse role as a private, nonprofit organization and its mission to help find missing children, reduce online sexual exploitation of children and prevent future victimization, and except as provided”;

(B) by striking “the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children” and inserting “NCMEC”;

(C) by striking “(42 U.S.C. 5773)” and inserting “(34 U.S.C. 11293)”;

(D) by striking “such center” each place it appears and inserting “NCMEC”;

(E) by striking “from the effort” and inserting “from the efforts”;

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children” and inserting “NCMEC”;

(B) by striking “such center” and inserting “NCMEC”;

(C) by striking “(42 U.S.C. 5773)” and inserting “(34 U.S.C. 11293)”;

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children” and inserting “NCMEC”;

(B) by striking “image” each place it appears and inserting “visual depiction”.

SEC. 6. DEFINITIONS.

Section 2258E of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(3) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

“(7) the term ‘provider’ means an electronic communication service provider or remote computing service; and

“(8) the term ‘NCMEC’ means the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children.”.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. KANE, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BENNET, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 3174. A bill to decriminalize marijuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3174

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Marijuana Freedom and Opportunity Act”.

SEC. 2. DECRIMINALIZATION OF MARIJUANA.

(a) MARIJUANA REMOVED FROM SCHEDULE OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES.—Subsection (c) of schedule I of section 202(c) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 812) is amended—

(1) by striking “marihuana”;

(2) by striking “tetrahydrocannabinols”.

(b) REMOVAL OF PROHIBITION ON IMPORT AND EXPORT.—Section 1010(b) of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 960) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (F), by inserting “or” after the semicolon;

(B) by striking subparagraph (G); and

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (H) as subparagraph (G);

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (F), by inserting “or” after the semicolon;

(B) by striking subparagraph (G); and

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (H) as subparagraph (G);

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking “paragraphs (1), (2), and (4)” and inserting “paragraphs (1) and (2)”;

(4) by striking paragraph (4); and

(5) by redesignating paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (4), (5), and (6), respectively.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT.—The Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 102(44) (21 U.S.C. 802(44)), by striking “marihuana”;

(2) in section 401(b) (21 U.S.C. 841(b))—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in clause (vi), by inserting “or” after the semicolon;

(II) by striking (vii); and

(III) by redesignating clause (viii) as clause (vii);

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking clause (vii); and

(II) by redesignating clause (viii) as clause (vii);

(iii) in subparagraph (C), in the first sentence, by striking “subparagraphs (A), (B), and (D)” and inserting “subparagraphs (A) and (B)”;

(iv) by striking subparagraph (D);

(v) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (D); and

(vi) in subparagraph (D)(i), as so redesignated, by striking “subparagraphs (C) and (D)” and inserting “subparagraph (C)”;

(B) by striking paragraph (4); and

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (4), (5), and (6), respectively;

(3) in section 402(c)(2)(B) (21 U.S.C. 842(c)(2)(B)), by striking “, marihuana,”;

(4) in section 403(d)(1) (21 U.S.C. 843(d)(1)), by striking “, marihuana,”;

(5) in section 418(a) (21 U.S.C. 859(a)), by striking the last sentence;

(6) in section 419(a) (21 U.S.C. 860(a)), by striking the last sentence;

(7) in section 422(d) (21 U.S.C. 863(d))—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “marijuana,”;

(B) in paragraph (5), by striking “, such as a marihuana cigarette,”;

(8) in section 516(d) (21 U.S.C. 886(d)), by striking “section 401(b)(6)” each place the term appears and inserting “section 401(b)(5)”.

(d) OTHER CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM DRUG CONTROL ACT OF 1986.—The National Forest System Drug Control Act of 1986 (16 U.S.C. 559b et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 15002(a) (16 U.S.C. 559b(a)) by striking “marijuana and other”;

(B) in section 15003(2) (16 U.S.C. 559c(2)) by striking “marijuana and other”;

(C) in section 15004(2) (16 U.S.C. 559d(2)) by striking “marijuana and other”.

(2) INTERCEPTION OF COMMUNICATIONS.—Section 2516 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (1)(e), by striking “marihuana,”;

(B) in subsection (2) by striking “marihuana,”.

SEC. 3. LEVEL THE ECONOMIC PLAYING FIELD.

(a) ESTIMATE.—On an annual basis, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make a reasonable estimate of total tax revenue generated by the marijuana industry for the previous 12-month period.

(b) TRANSFER.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer from the general fund of the Treasury to the trust fund established under subsection (c) the greater of—

(1) an amount equal to 10 percent of the amount estimated under subsection (a); and

(2) \$10,000,000.

(c) TRUST FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the Marijuana Opportunity Trust Fund, which shall consist of amounts transferred under subsection (b).

(2) USE OF AMOUNTS.—Amounts in the trust fund established under paragraph (1) shall be made available to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to provide loans under section 7(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)) to assist—

(A) small business concerns owned and controlled by women, as defined in section 3 of

that Act (15 U.S.C. 632), that operate in the marijuana industry; and

(B) small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, as defined in section 8(d)(3)(C) of that Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)(3)(C)), that operate in the marijuana industry.

SEC. 4. HIGHWAY SAFETY RESEARCH.

(a) STUDY; DEVELOPMENT.—The Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (referred to in this section as the “Administrator”) shall—

(1) carry out a study of the impact of driving under the influence of tetrahydrocannabinol on highway safety; and

(2) develop enhanced strategies and procedures to reliably determine the impairment of a driver under the influence of tetrahydrocannabinol.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator to carry out this section \$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.

SEC. 5. PUBLIC HEALTH RESEARCH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Director of the National Institutes of Health and the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, shall conduct research on the impacts of marijuana, including—

(1) effects of tetrahydrocannabinol on the human brain;

(2) efficacy of medicinal marijuana as a treatment for specific diseases and conditions; and

(3) identification of additional medical benefits and uses of cannabis.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, \$100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, for purposes of carrying out the activities described in subsection (a).

SEC. 6. PROTECT KIDS.

The Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau of the Department of the Treasury shall promulgate regulations that—

(1) require restrictions on the advertising and promotion of products related to marijuana, if the Secretary determines that such regulation would be appropriate for the protection of the public health, taking into account—

(A) the risks and benefits to the population of individuals age 18 and under, including users and nonusers of marijuana products;

(B) the increased or decreased likelihood that existing users of marijuana products who are age 18 and under will stop using such products; and

(C) the increased or decreased likelihood that those age 18 and under who do not use marijuana products will start using such products; and

(2) impose restrictions on the advertising and promotion of products related to marijuana consistent with and to the full extent permitted by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

SEC. 7. GRANTS FOR EXPUNGEMENT OF MARIJUANA CONVICTIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General to award grants to States and units of local government for the purpose of administering, expanding, or developing expungement or sealing programs for convictions of possession of marijuana \$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023 with not less than 50 percent of those funds being directed to cover the cost of public defenders or legal aid providers.

SEC. 8. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act, or an amendment made by this Act, may be construed to modify the authority of the Federal Government

to prevent marijuana trafficking from States that have legalized marijuana to those that have not.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. 3176. A bill to establish the Mill Springs Battlefield National Monument in the State of Kentucky as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3176

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Mill Springs Battlefield National Monument Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) MAP.—The term “Map” means the map entitled “Mill Springs Battlefield National Monument, Nancy, Kentucky”, numbered 297/145513, and dated June 2018.

(2) MONUMENT.—The term “Monument” means the Mill Springs Battlefield National Monument established by section 3(a)(1).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the National Park Service.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF MILL SPRINGS BATTLEFIELD NATIONAL MONUMENT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), there is established as a unit of the National Park System, the Mill Springs Battlefield National Monument in the State of Kentucky, to preserve, protect, and interpret for the benefit of present and future generations—

(A) the nationally significant historic resources of the Mill Springs Battlefield; and

(B) the role of the Mill Springs Battlefield in the Civil War.

(2) DETERMINATION BY THE SECRETARY.—The Monument shall not be established until the date on which the Secretary determines that a sufficient quantity of land or interests in land has been acquired to constitute a manageable park unit.

(3) NOTICE.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary makes a determination under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register notice of the establishment of the Monument.

(4) BOUNDARY.—The boundary of the Monument shall be as generally depicted on the Map.

(5) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The Map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(6) ACQUISITION AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may only acquire land or an interest in land located within the boundary of the Monument by—

(A) donation;

(B) purchase with donated funds; or

(C) exchange.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the Monument in accordance with—

(A) this Act; and

(B) the laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including—

(i) section 100101(a), chapter 1003, and sections 100751(a), 100752, 100753, and 102101 of title 54, United States Code; and

(ii) chapter 3201 of title 54, United States Code.

(2) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are first made available to prepare a general management plan for the Monument, the Secretary shall prepare the general management plan in accordance with section 100502 of title 54, United States Code.

(B) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—On completion of the general management plan, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate the general management plan.

(c) PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION.—Nothing in this Act affects the land use rights of private property owners within or adjacent to the Monument.

(d) NO BUFFER ZONES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act, the establishment of the Monument, or the management of the Monument creates a buffer zone outside the Monument.

(2) ACTIVITY OR USE OUTSIDE MONUMENT.—The fact that an activity or use can be seen, heard, or detected from within the Monument shall not preclude the conduct of the activity or use outside the Monument.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 558—DESIGNATING JULY 30, 2018, AS “NATIONAL WHISTLEBLOWER APPRECIATION DAY”

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. ERNST, and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 558

Whereas, in 1777, before the passage of the Bill of Rights, 10 sailors and marines blew the whistle on fraud and misconduct that was harmful to the United States;

Whereas the Founding Fathers unanimously supported the whistleblowers in words and deeds, including by releasing government records and providing monetary assistance for the reasonable legal expenses necessary to prevent retaliation against the whistleblowers;

Whereas, on July 30, 1778, in demonstration of their full support for whistleblowers, the members of the Continental Congress unanimously enacted the first whistleblower legislation in the United States that read: “Resolved, That it is the duty of all persons in the service of the United States, as well as all other the inhabitants thereof, to give the earliest information to Congress or other proper authority of any misconduct, frauds or misdemeanors committed by any officers or persons in the service of these states, which may come to their knowledge” (legislation of July 30, 1778, reprinted in *Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774–1789*, ed. Worthington C. Ford et al. (Washington, DC, 1904–37), 11:732);

Whereas whistleblowers risk their careers, jobs, and reputations by reporting waste, fraud, and abuse to the proper authorities;

Whereas, in providing the proper authorities with lawful disclosures, whistleblowers save the taxpayers of the United States billions of dollars each year and serve the public interest by ensuring that the United States remains an ethical and safe place; and

Whereas it is the public policy of the United States to encourage, in accordance with Federal law (including the Constitution of the United States, rules, and regulations) and consistent with the protection of classified information (including sources and methods of detection of classified information), honest and good faith reporting of misconduct, fraud, misdemeanors, and other crimes to the appropriate authority at the earliest time possible: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 30, 2018, as “National Whistleblower Appreciation Day”; and

(2) ensures that the Federal Government implements the intent of the Founding Fathers, as reflected in the legislation enacted on July 30, 1778, by encouraging each executive agency to recognize National Whistleblower Appreciation Day by—

(A) informing employees, contractors working on behalf of United States taxpayers, and members of the public about the legal right of a United States citizen to “blow the whistle” to the appropriate authority by honest and good faith reporting of misconduct, fraud, misdemeanors, or other crimes; and

(B) acknowledging the contributions of whistleblowers to combating waste, fraud, abuse, and violations of laws and regulations of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 559—RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF AFRICAN AMERICANS TO THE MUSICAL HERITAGE OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE NEED FOR GREATER ACCESS TO MUSIC EDUCATION FOR AFRICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS, AND EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF JUNE AS AFRICAN-AMERICAN MUSIC APPRECIATION MONTH

Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CARPER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. JONES, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. COONS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 559

Whereas spirituals, ragtime, blues, jazz, gospel, classical composition, and countless other categories of music have been created or enhanced by African Americans, and are etched into the history and culture of the United States;

Whereas the first Africans transported to the United States came from a variety of ethnic groups with a long history of distinct and cultivated musical traditions, brought musical instruments with them, and built new musical instruments in the United States;

Whereas spirituals were a distinct response to the conditions in the United States, and expressed the longing of slaves for spiritual and bodily freedom, for safety from harm and evil, and for relief from the hardships of slavery;

Whereas jazz, arguably the most creative and complex music that the United States has produced, combines the musical traditions of African Americans in New Orleans with the creative flexibility of blues music;

Whereas masterful trumpeters Louis Armstrong and Miles Davis achieved national and international recognition with the success of “West End Blues” by Louis Armstrong in the 1920s and “So What” by Miles Davis in the late 1950s;

Whereas talented jazz pianist and vocalist Nathaniel Adams Coles recorded more than 150 singles and sold more than 50 million records;

Whereas the talent of Ella Fitzgerald, winner of 13 Grammys, is epitomized by a rendition of “Summertime”, a bluesy record accompanied by melodic vocals;

Whereas Natalie Cole, the daughter of Nathaniel Adams Coles, achieved musical success in the mid-1970s as a rhythm and blues artist with the hits “This Will Be” and “Unforgettable”;

Whereas in the 1940s bebop evolved through jam sessions, which included trumpeter Dizzy Gillespie and the alto saxophonist Charlie Parker, that were held at clubs in Harlem, New York, such as Minton’s Playhouse;

Whereas earlier classical singers such as Elizabeth Taylor Greenfield, one of the first widely known African-American vocalists, and other early African-American singing pioneers, including Nellie Mitchell Brown, Marie Selika Williams, Rachel Walker Turner, Marian Anderson, and Flora Batson Bergen paved the way for female African-American concert singers who have achieved great popularity during the last 50 years;

Whereas the term “rhythm and blues” originated in the late 1940s as a way to describe recordings marketed to African Americans and replaced the term “race music”;

Whereas lyrical themes in rhythm and blues often encapsulate the African-American experience of pain, the quest for freedom, joy, triumphs and failures, relationships, economics, and aspiration, and were popularized by artists such as Ray Charles, Ruth Brown, Etta James, and Otis Redding;

Whereas soul music originated in the African-American community in the late 1950s and early 1960s and combines elements of African-American gospel music, rhythm and blues, and jazz, and was popularized by artists such as James Brown, Ray Charles, Sam Cooke, and Jackie Wilson;

Whereas in the early 1970s the musical style of disco emerged and was popularized by programs such as Soul Train and by artists such as Donna Summer and Tower of Power;

Whereas reggae is a genre of music that originated in Jamaica in the late 1960s and incorporates some of the musical elements of rhythm and blues, jazz, mento, calypso, and African music, and was popularized by artists such as Bob Marley;

Whereas rock and roll was developed from African-American musical styles such as gospel and rhythm and blues, and was popularized by artists such as Chuck Berry, Bo Diddley, and Jimi Hendrix;

Whereas rap, arguably the most complex and influential form of hip-hop culture, combines elements of the African-American musical tradition (blues, jazz, and soul) with Caribbean calypso, dub, and dance hall reggae;

Whereas the development and popularity of old style rap combined confident beats with wordplay and storytelling, highlighting the struggle of African-American youth growing up in struggling neighborhoods;

Whereas contemporary rhythm and blues, which originated in the late 1970s and combines elements of pop, rhythm and blues, soul, funk, hip hop, gospel, and electronic dance music was popularized by artists such as Whitney Houston and Aaliyah;

Whereas Michael Jackson, one of the most popular entertainers of all time, profoundly shaped music, dance, fashion, and popular culture around the world;

Whereas Prince Rogers Nelson, who was known for electric performances and wide vocal range, pioneered music that integrated a wide variety of styles, including funk,

rock, contemporary rhythm and blues, new wave, soul, psychedelia, and pop;

Whereas a recent study by the Department of Education found that only 28 percent of African-American students receive any kind of arts education;

Whereas African-American students scored the lowest of all ethnicities in the most recent National Assessment for Educational Progress arts assessment;

Whereas students who are eligible for the school lunch program established under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) have significantly lower scores on the music portion of the National Assessment for Educational Progress arts assessment than students that are ineligible for that program, which suggests that students in low-income families are disadvantaged in the subject of music;

Whereas a recent study showed that nearly ¾ of music ensemble students were Caucasian and middle class and only 15 percent were African-American;

Whereas the same study found that only 7 percent of music teacher licensure candidates were African-American; and

Whereas minority students face many barriers to accessing musical training, especially students in large urban public schools: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes—

(1) the contributions of African Americans to the musical heritage of the United States;

(2) the wide array of talented and popular African-American musical artists, composers, songwriters, and musicians who are underrecognized for contributions to music;

(3) the achievements, talent, and hard work of African-American pioneer artists, and the obstacles that those artists overcame to gain recognition;

(4) the need for African-American students to have greater access to and participation in music education in schools across the United States; and

(5) Black History Month and African-American Music Appreciation Month as an important time—

(A) to celebrate the impact of the African-American musical heritage on the musical heritage of the United States; and

(B) to encourage greater access to music education so that the next generation may continue to greatly contribute to the musical heritage of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 560—DESIGNATING THE MONTH OF JUNE 2018 AS “IMMIGRANT HERITAGE MONTH”

Mr. HELLER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 560

Whereas the United States has a rich history because the United States has always been a country of immigrants;

Whereas the diverse heritage of the United States is one of the defining aspects of the country’s success story;

Whereas generations of immigrants from every corner of the globe have helped build the economy of the United States and created the unique character of the country;

Whereas the United States has long served as a melting pot of cultural diversity;

Whereas immigrants continue to grow businesses, innovate, strengthen the economy, and create jobs for people in the United States; and

Whereas many immigrants are entrepreneurs and business owners: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 2018 as “Immigrant Heritage Month”;

(2) recognizes the significance of Immigrant Heritage Month as an important time to celebrate the contributions of immigrants to the history of the United States; and

(3) urges the people of the United States to observe Immigrant Heritage Month with appropriate programs and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 561—DESIGNATING JULY 15, 2018, AS “NATIONAL LEIOMYOSARCOMA AWARENESS DAY” AND THE MONTH OF JULY 2018 AS “NATIONAL SARCOMA AWARENESS MONTH”

Ms. STABENOW submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 561

Whereas sarcoma is a rare type of cancer that arises in the connective tissue of the body and accounts for approximately 1 percent of all newly diagnosed cancers;

Whereas the National Institutes of Health designates sarcoma as a rare form of cancer, and sarcoma contains approximately 70 different subtypes;

Whereas sarcomas are largely resistant to current chemotherapy agents, immunotherapy agents, and radiation therapies, posing a formidable challenge for researchers and specialists;

Whereas sarcoma subtypes largely have not benefitted from immunotherapies because of the complexity of the DNA, genomes, and mutations associated with the many variations in the sarcoma subtype landscape;

Whereas leiomyosarcoma (referred to in this preamble as “LMS”) is a malignant, aggressive subtype of sarcoma derived from smooth muscle cells typically of uterine, gastrointestinal, or soft tissue origin, and can metastasize to the bone, spine, brain, and liver;

Whereas the National Institutes of Health classifies LMS as a rare disease, accounting for approximately 15 percent of all sarcomas, and LMS itself encompasses at least 4 different LMS subtypes;

Whereas LMS primarily affects adults without regard to gender, research and clinical trials remain complicated, and survival and longevity remain difficult;

Whereas multidisciplinary care coordination teams, because of their expertise and experience, are critical to the health of sarcoma and LMS patients;

Whereas sarcoma and LMS research will allow medical professionals to improve the quality of care for affected patients, lead to better clinical outcomes, and promote longer survival for patients; and

Whereas increased education and awareness about sarcoma and LMS will contribute to the well-being of the communities of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 15, 2018, as “National Leiomyosarcoma Awareness Day”;

(2) designates the month of July 2018 as “National Sarcoma Awareness Month”;

(3) recognizes the challenges faced by sarcoma and leiomyosarcoma patients; and

(4) commends the dedication of organizations, volunteers, researchers, and caregivers across the country working to improve the quality of life of sarcoma and leiomyosarcoma patients and their families.

SENATE RESOLUTION 562—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE TREATY ON THE NON-PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS (NPT) CONTINUES TO MAKE AN INVALUABLE CONTRIBUTION TO UNITED STATES AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY, 50 YEARS AFTER IT OPENED FOR SIGNATURE ON JULY 1, 1968

Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BROWN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 562

Whereas the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) opened for signature 50 years ago on July 1, 1968;

Whereas the United States and former Soviet Union averted a catastrophic nuclear exchange during the October 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, which led to a series of bilateral and multilateral agreements to lessen the chance of nuclear war, including the NPT;

Whereas President John F. Kennedy predicted in 1963 that as many as 25 countries would acquire nuclear weapons by 1970 absent a treaty to control nuclear weapons;

Whereas the United States Senate provided its advice and consent to the NPT on March 13, 1969, with a vote on ratification of 83 to 15;

Whereas the NPT has grown to include 191 State Parties, making an irreplaceable contribution to United States national and international security by preventing the spread of nuclear weapons;

Whereas Article III of the NPT obligates each non-nuclear weapon state to the NPT to conclude a Safeguards Agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to verify treaty compliance, 174 of which are Comprehensive Safeguards Agreements crafted to detect the diversion of nuclear materials from peaceful to non-peaceful uses;

Whereas the 2018 Department of Defense Nuclear Posture Review affirms, “The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) is a cornerstone of the nuclear nonproliferation regime. It plays a positive role in building consensus for non-proliferation and enhances international efforts to impose costs on those that would pursue nuclear weapons outside the Treaty.”;

Whereas the success of the NPT has and will continue to depend upon the full implementation by all States Parties of the Treaty’s three mutually reinforcing pillars: non-proliferation, access to peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and disarmament;

Whereas over the past half century, the United States has exhibited leadership in strengthening each of the NPT’s three pillars for the global good, including—

(1) reducing its nuclear weapons stockpile of more than 85 percent from its Cold War heights of 31,225 in parallel with equally massive reductions of Russia’s stockpile through bilateral coordination;

(2) cooperating with Kazakhstan, Ukraine, and Belarus—to facilitate the surrender of nuclear weapons on their soil after the fall of the Soviet Union—leading to each country’s accession to the NPT as non-nuclear weapons states;

(3) providing voluntary contributions to the IAEA Peaceful Uses Initiative exceeded more than \$320,000,000 since 2010 to help in the treatment of cancer and in other life-saving applications; and

(4) extending deterrence to United States allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), Japan, and the Republic of Korea—which is an unmistakable demonstration of the United States commitment to collective security;

Whereas heightened geopolitical tensions in recent years have made cooperation on nonproliferation and arms control issues with the Russian Federation more challenging;

Whereas a range of actions by the Government of the Russian Federation has led to a deterioration in bilateral relations with the United States, including Russia’s brazen interference in the 2016 United States presidential elections, its violation of the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (commonly known as the “INF Treaty”), signed at Washington, D.C., December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988, its illegal annexation of Crimea, its invasion of Eastern Ukraine, and its destabilizing actions in Syria; and

Whereas within a difficult environment, preserving agreements that continue to contribute to United States and global security, particularly the Treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, signed April 8, 2010, and entered into force February 5, 2011 (commonly known as the “New START Treaty”), is all the more essential, and that to that end, the Department of State confirmed in February 2018 that Russia had met New START’s Central Treaty Limits and stated that “implementation of the New START Treaty enhances the safety and security of the United States”: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) any United States negotiated agreement with the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK) on denuclearization must require it to return to the NPT as a Party in good standing;

(2) the United States must maintain support for the IAEA through its assessed and voluntary contributions and promote the universal adoption of the IAEA Additional Protocol;

(3) the United States and its allies should pursue diplomatic efforts to ensure that the Islamic Republic of Iran remains in compliance with the NPT, as the 2016 and 2017 Reports on Adherence to and Compliance with Arms Control, Nonproliferation, and Disarmament Agreements and Commitments both affirmed;

(4) the United States should enter into negotiations on the extension of the New START Treaty until 2026, which would make any current or future Russian strategic systems of a range greater than 5,500 kilometers accountable under the Treaty;

(5) the United States should work to resolve Russia’s violation of the INF Treaty;

(6) all countries who have yet to ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, done at New York September 10, 1996, including the United States, should venture to create the conditions that allow for entry-into-force of the Treaty, and should observe a moratorium on nuclear testing until that time; and

(7) the United States Government should continue to encourage opportunities for cooperation with other nuclear possessing states to reduce the salience, number, and role of nuclear weapons in global military strategies.

SENATE RESOLUTION 563—RECOGNIZING JUNE 2018 AS “LGBTQ PRIDE MONTH”

Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CASEY, Mr. Kaine, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COONS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CARPER, Mr. REED, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. NELSON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BENNET, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. HETTKAMP, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KING, Mr. JONES, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. DONNELLY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 563

Whereas individuals who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (referred to in this preamble as “LGBTQ”) include individuals from all States and the District of Columbia and all faiths, races, national origins, socioeconomic statuses, education levels, and political beliefs;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States have made, and continue to make, vital contributions to the United States and to the world in every aspect, including in the fields of education, law, health, business, science, research, economic development, architecture, fashion, sports, government, music, film, politics, technology, literature, and civil rights;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States serve as law enforcement officers, firefighters, and first responders in all States and the District of Columbia;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States serve, and have served, the United States Army, Coast Guard, Navy, Air Force, and Marines, honorably and with distinction and bravery;

Whereas an estimated number of more than 100,000 brave men and women were discharged from the Armed Forces of the United States between the beginning of World War II and 2011 because of their sexual orientation, including the discharge of more than 13,000 men and women under the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy in place between 1994 and 2011;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States serve, and have served, in positions in the Federal Government and State and local governments, including as members of Congress, Governors, mayors, and city council members;

Whereas, throughout much of the history of the United States, same-sex relationships were criminalized in many States and many LGBTQ people in the United States were forced to hide their LGBTQ identities while living in secrecy and fear;

Whereas, on June 26, 2015, the Supreme Court of the United States ruled in *Obergefell v. Hodges*, 135 S. Ct. 2584, that same-sex couples have a constitutional right to marry and acknowledged that “[n]o union is more profound than marriage, for it embodies the highest ideals of love, fidelity, devotion, sacrifice, and family.”;

Whereas Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (referred to in this preamble as “AIDS”) has disproportionately impacted LGBTQ people in the United States partly caused by a lack of funding and research de-

voted to finding effective treatment for AIDS and the Human Immunodeficiency Virus (referred to in this preamble as “HIV”) during the early stages of the HIV and AIDS epidemic;

Whereas gay and bisexual men and transgender women of color have a higher risk of contracting HIV;

Whereas the LGBTQ community has maintained its unwavering commitment to ending the HIV and AIDS epidemic;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States face disparities in employment, healthcare, education, housing, and many other areas central to the pursuit of happiness in the United States;

Whereas 30 States have no explicit ban on discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity in the workplace, housing, or public accommodations, and 35 States have no explicit ban on discrimination against LGBTQ individuals in education;

Whereas LGBTQ youth are at increased risk of suicide, homelessness, and becoming victims of bullying and violence;

Whereas the LGBTQ community has faced discrimination, inequality, and violence throughout the history of the United States;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States, in particular transgender individuals, face a disproportionately high risk of becoming victims of violent hate crimes;

Whereas members of the LGBTQ community have been targeted in acts of mass violence, including—

(1) the Pulse nightclub shooting in Orlando, Florida on June 12, 2016, where 49 people were killed; and

(2) the arson attack at the UpStairs Lounge in New Orleans, Louisiana on June 24, 1973, where 32 people died;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States face persecution, violence, and death in many parts of the world, including State-sponsored violence;

Whereas, in 2017 alone, hundreds of LGBTQ people around the world were arrested because of their actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in countries and territories such as Chechnya, Indonesia, and Bangladesh;

Whereas the LGBTQ community has gathered in some of the most dangerous places in the world to hold Pride festivals and marches, despite threats of violence or arrest;

Whereas, in 2009, President Barack Obama signed the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act (division E of Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2835) into law to protect all people in the United States from crimes motivated by the actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity of an individual;

Whereas the demonstrators who protested on June 28, 1969, following a law enforcement raid of the Stonewall Inn, an LGBTQ club in New York City, are pioneers of the LGBTQ movement for equality;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States have fought for equal treatment, dignity, and respect;

Whereas LGBTQ people in the United States have achieved significant milestones, ensuring that future generations of LGBTQ people in the United States will enjoy a more equal and just society;

Whereas, despite being marginalized throughout the history of the United States, LGBTQ people in the United States continue to celebrate their identities, love, and contributions to the United States in various expressions of Pride; and

Whereas the inclusion of LGBTQ people in the United States continues to expand every day and LGBTQ people in the United States remain determined to pursue equality, respect, and inclusion for all individuals re-

gardless of sexual orientation or gender identity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the rights, freedoms, and equal treatment of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (referred to in this resolving clause as “LGBTQ”) people in the United States and around the world;

(2) acknowledges that LGBTQ rights are human rights that are to be protected by the United States Constitution and numerous international treaties and conventions;

(3) commits to ensuring the equal treatment of all people in the United States, regardless of sexual orientation and gender identity;

(4) commits to ensuring that the United States remains a beacon of hope for the equal treatment of people around the world, including LGBTQ individuals; and

(5) encourages the celebration of June as “LGBTQ Pride Month” in order to provide a lasting opportunity for all people in the United States to learn about the discrimination and inequality that the LGBTQ community endured, and continues to endure, and to celebrate the contributions of the LGBTQ community throughout the history of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 564—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP SHOULD HOLD THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION ACCOUNTABLE FOR ITS INTERFERENCE IN THE 2016 UNITED STATES ELECTION AND ENSURE THAT THE UNITED STATES IS PREPARED TO COUNTER FUTURE ATTEMPTS AT ELECTION INTERFERENCE

Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 564

Whereas it is the unanimous opinion of the United States intelligence community under both the Administration of President Barack Obama and the Administration of President Donald Trump that the Government of the Russian Federation interfered in the 2016 United States election; and

Whereas it is the unanimous opinion of the intelligence community that the Government of the Russian Federation will interfere in the 2018 United States election and in future elections of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that President Donald Trump—

(1) should use every opportunity and every tool at his disposal, including the upcoming summit with the President of the Russian Federation Vladimir Putin, to hold the Government of the Russian Federation accountable for its attempts to undermine democracy in the United States and abroad;

(2) should ensure that the United States Government is prepared to counter future attempts to interfere in United States elections; and

(3) must clarify to President Putin that if the Government of the Russian Federation continues to interfere with democracy in the United States, it does so at its own peril.

SENATE RESOLUTION 565—HONORING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF NAVAL SUBMARINE BASE KINGS BAY IN KINGS BAY, GEORGIA

Mr. PERDUE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 565

Whereas, in 1954, the Department of the Army began to acquire land at Kings Bay, Georgia, to build a military ocean terminal to ship ammunition in case of a national emergency;

Whereas the facility at Kings Bay, Georgia, was completed in 1958, but since there was no immediate operational need for the installation, the base was placed in an inactive ready status;

Whereas, in 1975, during treaty negotiations between the United States and Spain, the countries agreed to move Submarine Squadron 16, the fleet ballistic missile submarine squadron, from its operational base at Rota, Spain;

Whereas, after evaluating more than 60 sites along the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts, the Department of the Navy selected Kings Bay, Georgia, as the new home of Submarine Squadron 16;

Whereas, from January to July 1978, the first group of sailors arrived at Kings Bay, Georgia, to transfer the base from the Department of the Army to the Department of the Navy;

Whereas the Naval Submarine Support Base Kings Bay was established in a developmental status on July 1, 1978;

Whereas construction of Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay was the largest peacetime construction program ever undertaken by the Department of the Navy;

Whereas, in May 1979, the Department of the Navy selected Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay as the preferred East Coast site for Ohio-class submarines;

Whereas, on October 23, 1980, the Secretary of the Navy announced Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay as the future home of the new Ohio-class submarine;

Whereas, on January 15, 1989, the first Trident ballistic missile submarine, the USS Tennessee (SSBN 734), arrived at Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay;

Whereas the Coast Guard commissioned the successful Maritime Force Protection Unit, the first of its kind, on July 24, 2007, at Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay to provide enhanced security for the SSBN fleet of the United States within the homeport transit area;

Whereas Camden County, Georgia, is home to 1 of 6 Coast Guard Atlantic Area Maritime Safety and Security Teams that conduct missions including counter-drug and migrant interdiction boardings and escorts for high-capacity passenger vessels;

Whereas Marine Corps Security Force Battalion Kings Bay secures strategic assets within the Strategic Weapons Facility Atlantic area of responsibility in order to prevent unauthorized access or loss of control;

Whereas Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay was named the top military installation in the Department of Defense for 2007, receiving the Commander-in-Chief's Installation Excellence Award for its ability to sustain its mission, increase productivity, and enhance quality of life;

Whereas Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay is the state-of-the-art home to the Trident II Submarines of the Atlantic Fleet in St. Marys, Georgia;

Whereas Submarine Group 10 exercises operational and administrative control of Ohio-class ballistic missile submarines and

guided missile submarines stationed at Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay;

Whereas 6 ballistic missile submarines make up Submarine Squadron 20 and are currently assigned to Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay: USS Maryland (SSBN 738), USS Rhode Island (SSBN 740), USS Tennessee (SSBN 734), USS West Virginia (SSBN 736), USS Wyoming (SSBN 742), and USS Alaska (SSBN 732);

Whereas 2 guided missile submarines make up Submarine Squadron 16 and are currently assigned to Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay: USS Florida (SSGN 728) and USS Georgia (SSGN 729);

Whereas the Department of the Navy stores the strategic assets of the United States at the Strategic Weapons Facilities at Kings Bay, Georgia, which is 1 of only 2 remaining naval nuclear weapon storage sites in the United States;

Whereas the Strategic Weapons Facility Atlantic is responsible for assembling the D-5 missile and processing missile guidance and launcher subsystem components for the ballistic missile submarine fleet;

Whereas the Naval Submarine Support Center provides critical support services to the submarines and staffs of Submarine Squadron 16, Submarine Squadron 20, and all visiting and other assigned units, which allows the team at Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay to work efficiently and effectively;

Whereas the D-5 ballistic missile is the heart of the Trident weapons system of the United States;

Whereas the D-5 Life Extension Program of the Department of the Navy will extend the life of the D-5 missiles until 2040;

Whereas the Trident Refit Facility provides timely and top-quality industrial and logistics support to Trident ballistic missile submarines of the United States;

Whereas the Trident Training Facility trains sailors in the skills necessary to operate and maintain Trident submarines and systems;

Whereas one of the largest covered dry docks of the Northern Hemisphere is located at Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay;

Whereas construction of not less than 12 Columbia-class submarines is scheduled to begin in 2021, with the first submarine slated to be fully operable by 2031;

Whereas Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay is responsible for \$1,142,000,000 in total economic output to the Camden County area; and

Whereas The Camden Partnership has supported Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay since its inception, and continues to promote the ability of the base to conduct current and future missions, and the ability of the community to provide a highly qualified workforce: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay on its 40th anniversary;

(2) commends the thousands of men and women who have worked and trained at Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay;

(3) honors the people of Camden County and the Georgia coastal communities for their continued support of Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay; and

(4) looks forward to Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay continuing its instrumental role in the strategic deterrence and national defense of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 566—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES MUST IMMEDIATELY ESTABLISH AN INTERAGENCY OFFICE FOR LOCATING AND REUNITING CHILDREN WITH PARENTS IN ORDER TO PROTECT SEPARATED CHILDREN FROM SUFFERING ADDITIONAL TRAUMA RESULTING FROM THE "ZERO TOLERANCE" POLICY

Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CASEY, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. CARPER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 566

Whereas families belong together, and innocent children must be quickly and safely reunited with their parents who are seeking asylum;

Whereas children and parents are separated between 3 different Federal agencies and remain in an indefinite logistical chaos partly due to inadequate interagency communication; and

Whereas the Department of Health and Human Services has currently identified 2,047 children in the Department's custody as a result of being taken away from their parents: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services must immediately establish an interagency Office for Locating and Reuniting Children with Parents;

(2) the Secretary of Health and Human Services must appoint a Director for the Office to ensure the successful and safe reunification of children with their parents; and

(3) the Office must move with extraordinary speed and urgency to safely reunify children with their parents.

SENATE RESOLUTION 567—CELEBRATING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN HOMEBREWERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. BENNET) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 567

Whereas on October 14, 1978, President Jimmy Carter signed into law Public Law 95-458, which legalized homebrewing under Federal law effective February 1, 1979;

Whereas on December 7, 1978, the following 2 intrepid individuals founded the American Homebrewers Association in Boulder, Colorado:

(1) Charlie Papazian, author of the seminal book on homebrewing entitled "The Complete Joy of Homebrewing"; and

(2) Charlie Matzen;

Whereas the mission of the American Homebrewers Association is to promote the community of homebrewers and empower homebrewers to make the best beer in the world;

Whereas because alcohol is predominately regulated by individual States, the American Homebrewers Association has worked diligently and successfully from the inception of the association until 2013—

(1) to ensure that homebrewing is a legal activity in each State and the District of Columbia; and

(2) to assist with drafting and advocating for State legislation relating to homebrewing across the United States;

Whereas homebrewing added \$756,000,000 to the economy of the United States in 2017, and created 6,983 full time jobs in the United States in 2017;

Whereas the American Homebrewers Association has more than 45,000 members;

Whereas the American Homebrewers Association represents a vibrant community of 1,100,000 homebrewers in the United States who brew 1,400,000 barrels of beer each year;

Whereas that community includes President Barack Obama and would have included Presidents George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and James Madison;

Whereas the American Homebrewers Association hosts—

(1) the National Homebrewers Conference, also known as “Homebrew Con”, which—

(A) has as many as 3,000 attendees annually;

(B) has been taking place for 40 years; and

(C) will be held this year in Portland, Oregon, from June 28 through June 30, and will feature 66 informational sessions, 92 speakers, and over 50 homebrew clubs;

(2) the National Homebrew Competition, the largest beer competition in the world, which has been taking place for 40 years and during which 143,240 brews have been judged;

(3) “Big Brew for National Homebrew Day”, which—

(A) is held on the first Saturday of each May to commemorate the anniversary of the designation by Congress in 1988 of May 7 as “National Homebrew Day”; and

(B) includes more than 350 events with 7,500 participants brewing more than 19,000 gallons of beer across the world;

(4) “Learn to Homebrew Day”, which is held the first Saturday of each November and was established in 1999 to encourage homebrewers to introduce friends and family to homebrewing;

(5) rallies across the United States that offer homebrewers the chance to connect with commercial craft brewers and other beer enthusiasts and homebrewers in the area;

(6) the Great American Beer Festival Program Competition, which has been taking place for 13 years and involves award-winning American Homebrewers Association homebrewers teaming up with Brewers Association member brewers; and

(7) the Hill Staff Homebrew Competition, which encourages bipartisan participation in celebrating homebrewing and the rich history of homebrewing in the United States;

Whereas the American Homebrewers Association publishes a magazine entitled “Zymurgy” 6 times a year that is circulated to 53,000 people per issue;

Whereas the American Homebrewers Association provides support to more than—

(1) 700 local homebrew supply shops in the United States; and

(2) 1,500 homebrew clubs in the United States and around the world;

Whereas the American Homebrewers Association is a predecessor to, and currently a division of, the Brewers Association, a trade group in the United States that represents and protects small and independent domestic brewers, the craft beers made by those brewers, and the community of brewing enthusiasts in the United States;

Whereas in 1982 the American Homebrewers Association presented the first Great American Beer Festival, which is currently hosted by the Brewers Association and represents the largest collection of United States beer ever served; and

Whereas the American Homebrewers Association and its members have contributed to the rise of the craft brewing industry, which—

(1) is now larger than the industry has ever been in the history of the United States; and

(2) consists of more than 6,000 small and independent breweries located across the United States that are helping to reinvigorate local economies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the American Homebrewers Association and joins its members, staff, and other beer enthusiasts in celebrating the 40th anniversary of the American Homebrewers Association;

(2) congratulates the American Homebrewers Association and its members for leading the renaissance of craft beer in the United States; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit enrolled copies of this resolution to the director of the American Homebrewers Association, the president and chief executive officer of the Brewers Association, and the founder and past president of the Brewers Association.

SENATE RESOLUTION 568—DESIGNATING JUNE 2018 AS “GREAT OUTDOORS MONTH”

Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. RISCH, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. HEINRICH, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 568

Whereas hundreds of millions of people in the United States participate in outdoor recreation annually;

Whereas Congress enacted the Outdoor Recreation Jobs and Economic Impact Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-249; 130 Stat. 999) to assess and analyze the outdoor recreation economy of the United States and the effects attributable to the outdoor recreation economy on the overall economy of the United States;

Whereas preliminary statistics released in 2018 by the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the United States Department of Commerce show that outdoor recreation contributed more than \$373,700,000,000 to the economy of the United States in 2016, comprising approximately 2 percent of the gross domestic product;

Whereas preliminary statistics released in 2018 by the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the United States Department of Commerce show that the outdoor recreation economy grew 3.8 percent in 2016, while also providing 4,280,000 jobs across the country;

Whereas regular outdoor recreation is associated with positive health outcomes and better quality of life;

Whereas outdoor recreation is part of the national heritage of the United States; and

Whereas June 2018 is an appropriate month to designate as “Great Outdoors Month” to provide an opportunity to celebrate the importance of the great outdoors: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 2018 as “Great Outdoors Month”; and

(2) encourages all people in the United States to recreate in the great outdoors in June 2018 and year-round.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I am pleased the Senate is passing a resolution I introduced along with Senators COLLINS, WYDEN, GARDNER, and BENNET to commemorate the American

Homebrewers Association’s (AHA) 40th “birthday”. Since its founding in 1978, the AHA—whose mission is to promote the community of homebrewers and empower homebrewers to make the best beer in the world—has had a tremendous impact on America, both within and well beyond the scope of beer. After then-President Jimmy Carter signed the momentous legislation (Public Law 95-458) to legalize homebrewing at the federal level, the AHA worked ceaselessly and successfully to extend that legalization to all 50 States and the District of Columbia.

Today, the AHA has over 46,000 dues-paying members and works on behalf of more than 1.1 million homebrewers in our Nation. While the AHA was established in 1978, homebrewing has been an important part of our Nation’s life from its inception. The Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock because they were running out of beer, which was safer to drink than water (each adult on board had a ration of one gallon of beer per day). Presidents George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and James Madison were all homebrewers who enjoyed crafting their own libations. In 2011, President Obama introduced a honey ale which became the first beer known to have been brewed in the White House.

Homebrewing isn’t just a wonderfully delicious hobby; however. Homebrewing has an important economic impact, creating thousands of jobs and adding hundreds of millions of dollars to the economy. There are more than 700 homebrew shops nationwide, and scores of small businesses that fabricate the brewing, fermenting, and packaging equipment homebrewers use. Homebrewers also support American agriculture, with their demand for domestic malts, hops, yeast, and other ingredients. In the aggregate, American homebrewers produce 1.4 million barrels of beer each year. That production level puts homebrewers between the Boston Beer Company and the Sierra Nevada Brewing Company, which are the second and third largest craft brewing companies in America, respectively.

Homebrewing is collaborative and social. The AHA hosts major events that bring thousands of people together, including the National Homebrewers Conference, the National Homebrew Competition, the Big Brew for National Homebrew Day, Learn to Homebrew Day, and the Hill Staff Homebrew Competition, which encourages bipartisan participation in celebrating homebrewing and its rich history in the United States. Thirty years ago, Congress designated May 7th as National Homebrew Day and the AHA celebrates that anniversary each year with the Big Brew for National Homebrew Day on the first Saturday each May. The AHA initiated Learn to Homebrew Day, which is held in November, in 1999 to encourage homebrewers to introduce their non-brewing family members and

friends to the hobby. Nearly 4,800 people from 45 States and 11 other countries participated in Learn to Homebrew Day last November.

The “big daddy” of the AHA-hosted events is the National Homebrew Conference, which attracts as many as 3,400 participants. In 2016, “Homebrew Con,” as it is affectionately known, was held in Baltimore and I enjoyed speaking to the group and sampling some of the best beer in America. This year, the 40th Homebrew Con will be held in Portland, Oregon—also known as Beervana—starting this Thursday. Homebrew Con also features the final round of the National Homebrew Competition each year, the largest beer competition in the world. Over 143,000 homebrews have been entered and judged in this competition since the first one was held in Boulder, Colorado, where the AHA is headquartered, in 1979.

Since its inception, the AHA has successfully created community, camaraderie, competition, and, of course, great beer. Today, the hobby of homebrewing unites Americans from coast to coast of all backgrounds, life experiences, and political beliefs. Just as important, the AHA and its diverse members have played a key part in the rise of the craft brewing industry, which is larger today than it has ever been in the country’s history. The United States is now home to over 6,000 small and independent craft breweries, most of which were started by homebrewers. Craft beer now accounts for \$26 billion in sales and 23 percent of the U.S. beer market. More than 80 percent of Americans age 21 and up live within 10 miles of a brewery, and these breweries are reinvigorating local economies and creating good local jobs that won’t go overseas. Collectively, they are adding \$68 billion to the economy and donating over \$70 million to charitable causes. Beer isn’t just good to drink; it’s good for the economy.

I would be seriously remiss if I were to fail to mention the one individual most responsible for the creation of the AHA, the growth of homebrewing as a hobby, and the reemergence of American craft beer: Charlie Papazian. Charlie, along with Charlie Matzen, founded the AHA in 1978 in Boulder. Charlie Papazian is rightfully known as “the godfather of homebrewing”. As for the AHA’s successes and the growth of the domestic craft beer industry, we can credit Charlie and his passion, enthusiasm, creativity, and commitment.

In 1972, Charlie graduated from the University of Virginia with a degree in Nuclear Engineering. After working as a kindergarten teacher, his passion for beer—and for the art and science of its creation—led him to swap hydrogen for hops. In 1978, he founded the AHA and published the first issue of *Zymurgy* magazine, announcing the new organization, publicizing the federal legalization of homebrewing, and calling for entries in the AHA’s first National Homebrew Competition. In 1984, he

published *The Complete Joy of Homebrewing*, which to this day remains one of the definitive guides to creating quality beer at home. Charlie’s reassuring motto—“Relax. Don’t worry. Have a homebrew.”—spawned an American movement that is now spreading abroad.

In 1983, Charlie founded the Association of Brewers, which included the AHA under its umbrella as well as the new Institute for Fermentation and Brewing Studies, which served the needs of the small, but growing, microbrewing industry. The Association of Brewers later merged with the Brewers Association of America to become today’s Brewers Association (BA). I was honored to work with the BA and its members as the lead sponsor of the Small Brewer Reinvestment & Expanding Workforce (Small BREW) Act, which intended to cut the federal excise small, independent, domestic craft brewers pay. That bill was incorporated in the Craft Beverage Modernization & Tax Reform Act, which Congress passed last year.

Charlie launched a number of popular events, including the World Beer Cup and the Great American Beer Festival, which today gathers over 60,000 attendees annually. Beyond beer, Charlie also founded National Pie Day—which takes place each year on his own birthday, January 23rd—as an annual celebration of America’s favorite dessert.

Charlie is a true trailblazer, pioneer, and entrepreneur. His irrepressible enthusiasm, sense of humor, and *joie de vivre* have endeared him to millions of people. The original wooden spoon he used to stir his mashes now resides at the Smithsonian Institution’s National Museum of American History. Charlie purchased the spoon for \$1 in a hardware store. “I was walking down an aisle in the store,” he recalls, “and that spoon spoke to me. It said, ‘Give me a try, I’m special.’ That was the start of our affair.” He used the spoon when he started teaching homebrewing in 1973 out of a series of houses he rented in Boulder. From 1973 to 1982, he taught five semesters per year, five classes per semester, with 20 people per class. According to Charlie, “Students had to get their hand on the spoon. They gave it a turn and got the ingredients going in the pot. It was an important part of the class and a lot of people touched that spoon.” As Charlie puts it, “It makes for a stirring tale, doesn’t it? The spoon has been a witness to the evolution—and the revolution—of homebrewing and craft beer. When you hold it in your hand now, it kind of vibrates a little bit. It’s got so much mojo in it.”

Come January 23, 2019, on his 70th birthday, Charlie will be exiting the AHA and its parent organization, the Brewers Association, where he served as president from 1978 to 2016. He is currently spending his time completing an array of projects, including a craft brewing history archive. This week, he

will deliver the keynote address at Homebrew Con in Portland. He is often asked, “Charlie, did you ever imagine that beer would become all of this?” His answer is always yes.

At St. Paul’s Cathedral in London, Sir Christopher Wren’s epitaph reads, *Si monumentum requiris, circumspice*—“If you seek (his) monuments, look around you.” Charlie Papazian’s monuments are all around us—from homebrewers making a chocolate stout in their kitchens or garages to the craft brewery down the street. From President Obama’s “beer summit” to the neighborhood bar, beer is the beverage that refreshes us and brings us together. We can thank Charlie Papazian for being able to choose from the best beers brewed in the history of civilization to quench our thirst and warm our hearts. I would ask all of my colleagues to join me in celebrating the 40th anniversary of the American Homebrewers Association, and thanking Charlie Papazian for his seminal and lasting contributions to homebrewing and the craft beer renaissance and wishing him all the best as he completes his final year at the AHA and begins the next chapter in a life that serves as an inspiration to all of us.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3346. Mr. ROBERTS (for Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. GARDNER)) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

SA 3347. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3348. Mr. ROBERTS (for Mr. ISAKSON) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra.

SA 3349. Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3350. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3134 proposed by Mr. THUNE to the amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3351. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3352. Mr. KING (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3353. Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended

to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3354. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3355. Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3356. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3357. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3358. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3359. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3360. Mr. PERDUE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3361. Mrs. HYDE-SMITH (for herself, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. PERDUE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3362. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. DAINES, and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3363. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3364. Mr. ROBERTS (for Mr. RUBIO) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra.

SA 3365. Mr. ROBERTS (for Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI)) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra.

SA 3366. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3367. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3368. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3369. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3370. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment in-

tended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3371. Mr. ROBERTS (for Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. BROWN)) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra.

SA 3372. Mr. TILLIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3176 submitted by Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. MCCAIN) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3373. Mr. TILLIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3176 submitted by Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. MCCAIN) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3374. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3375. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3376. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3377. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3378. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3379. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3380. Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. SCOTT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3381. Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3382. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3383. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. LEE, and Mr. INHOFE) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2, supra.

SA 3384. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3385. Mr. SASSE (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. JONES, Mr. RISCH, Mr. TESTER, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ENZI, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. ROUNDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3386. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3387. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3388. Mr. ROBERTS (for Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN)) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra.

SA 3389. Mr. ROBERTS (for Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. STABENOW)) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra.

SA 3390. Mr. ROBERTS (for Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. TOOMEY)) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, supra.

SA 3391. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 724, to amend the Federal Power Act to modernize authorizations for necessary hydropower approvals.

SA 3392. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. UDALL) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1029, to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to improve pesticide registration and other activities under the Act, to extend and modify fee authorities, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3346. Mr. ROBERTS (for Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. GARDNER)) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 1203, strike line 3 and insert the following:

“‘(16) HOP PLANT HEALTH INITIATIVE.—Research and extension grants may be made under this section for the purposes of developing and disseminating science-based tools and treatments to combat diseases of hops caused by the plant pathogens *Podosphaera macularis* and *Pseudoperonospora humuli*.’”.

SA 3347. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of of subtitle F of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 86. FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS ACT.

Public Law 88-657 (16 U.S.C. 532 et seq.) (commonly known as the “Forest Roads and

Trails Act”) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 8. FOREST SERVICE LEGACY ROADS AND TRAILS REMEDIATION PROGRAM.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM.—The term ‘National Forest System’ has the meaning given the term in section 11(a) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1609(a)).

“(2) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service.

“(b) PROGRAM.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall establish, and develop a national strategy to carry out, a program, to be known as the ‘Forest Service Legacy Roads and Trails Remediation Program’, within the National Forest System to implement for each unit of the National Forest System the minimum road system identified under subsection (c).

“(c) IDENTIFICATION OF MINIMUM ROAD SYSTEM.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this section, in accordance with section 212.5(b) of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this section), the Secretary shall identify for each unit of the National Forest System—

- “(1) the minimum road system; and
- “(2) any unneeded roads.

“(d) CONTENTS.—In carrying out subsections (b) and (c), the Secretary shall use the priorities described in section 212.5(b)(2) of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this section).

“(e) UNNEEDED ROADS.—The Secretary shall decommission any roads identified as unneeded under subsection (c) as soon as practicable after making the identification under that subsection.

“(f) REVISION.—The Secretary shall review, and may revise, an identification made under subsection (c) for a unit of the National Forest System during a revision of the land and resource management plan applicable to the unit.”.

SA 3348. Mr. ROBERTS (for Mr. ISAKSON) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 26, line 16, strike “2020” and insert “2021”.

At the end of subtitle E of title I, add the following:

SEC. 15. LOSS OF PEACH AND BLUEBERRY CROPS DUE TO EXTREME COLD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide compensation for expenses relating to losses of peach and blueberry crops that occurred—

- (1) during calendar year 2017; and
- (2) due to extreme cold, as determined by the Secretary.

(b) FUNDING.—Of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary shall use to carry out this section \$18,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Strike section 1710.

SA 3349. Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and

continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. WORK REQUIREMENTS FOR ABLE-BODIED ADULTS WITHOUT DEPENDENTS.

(a) DECLARATION OF POLICY.—Section 2 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011) is amended by adding at the end the following: “Congress further finds that it should also be the purpose of the supplemental nutrition assistance program to increase employment, to encourage healthy marriage, and to promote prosperous self-sufficiency, which means the ability of households to maintain an income above the poverty level without services and benefits from the Federal Government.”.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) FOOD.—Section 3(k) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012(k)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, except that a food, food product, meal, or other item described in this subsection shall be considered a food under this Act only if it is an essential (as determined by the Secretary)”.

(2) SUPERVISED JOB SEARCH.—Section 3 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsections (t) through (v) as subsections (u) through (w), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subsection (s) the following:

“(t) SUPERVISED JOB SEARCH.—The term ‘supervised job search’ means a job search program that has the following characteristics:

“(1) The job search occurs at an official location where the presence and activity of the recipient can be directly observed, supervised, and monitored.

“(2) The entry, time onsite, and exit of the recipient from the official job search location are recorded in a manner that prevents fraud.

“(3) The recipient is expected to remain and undertake job search activities at the job search center.

“(4) The quantity of time the recipient is observed and monitored engaging in job search at the official location is recorded for purposes of compliance with the work and work activation requirements of sections 6(o) and 30.”.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 27(a)(2) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2036(a)(2)) is amended in subparagraphs (C) and (E) by striking “3(u)(4)” each place it appears and inserting “3(v)(4)”.

(c) WORK REQUIREMENT FOR ABLE-BODIED ADULTS WITHOUT DEPENDENTS.—Section 6(o) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(o)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “not less than 3 months (consecutive or otherwise)” and inserting “more than 1 month”;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking “or” at the end;

(C) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) participate in supervised job search for at least 8 hours per week.”;

(2) in paragraph (4), by adding at the end the following:

“(C) TERMINATION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to any fiscal year that begins after the effective date of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018.”;

(3) in paragraph (6)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “15-PERCENT” and inserting “5-PERCENT”;

(B) in subparagraph (A)(ii)(IV), by striking “3 months” and inserting “1 month”; and

(C) in subparagraph (D), by striking “15 percent” and inserting “5 percent”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) PROMOTING WORK.—As a condition of receiving supplemental nutrition assistance program funds under this Act, a State agency shall provide each individual subject to the work requirement of this subsection with the opportunity to participate in an activity selected by the State from among the options described in subparagraphs (B), (C), and (E) of paragraph (2).

“(9) PENALTIES FOR INADEQUATE STATE PERFORMANCE.—If a State agency fails to fully comply with this section, including the requirement to terminate the benefits of individuals who fail to fulfill the work requirements described in paragraph (2) during a fiscal quarter, the funding allotment of the State for the supplemental nutrition assistance program shall be reduced by 10 percent for the quarter that begins 180 days after the first day of the quarter in which the non-compliance occurred.”.

SEC. WORK ACTIVATION PROGRAM FOR ADULTS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN.

The Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 30. WORK ACTIVATION PROGRAM FOR ADULTS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANT.—The term ‘eligible participant’ means an individual who, during a particular month, is—

“(A) a parent in a household with dependent children;

“(B) at least 19, and not more than 55, years of age;

“(C) not disabled;

“(D) a member of a household in which 1 or more parents or children receive supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits in the month;

“(E) a member of a household that received supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits for more than 3 months in the year; and

“(F) employed less than 100 hours in the month.

“(2) MARRIED COUPLE HOUSEHOLD.—The term ‘married couple household’ means a household that includes 2 eligible participants who are married to each other and have dependent children.

“(3) SUCCESSFUL ENGAGEMENT IN WORK ACTIVATION.—The term ‘successful engagement in work activation’ means—

“(A) in the case of an individual who is eligible and required to participate in interim work activation, performance during the month that fulfills the activity and hour requirements of subsection (c);

“(B) in the case of an individual who is required to participate in full work activation, performance during the month that fulfills the activity and hour requirements of subsection (d); and

“(C) in the case of an individual who meets the eligibility criteria described in subsection (e)(1), performance that fulfills the activity and hour requirements of that subsection.

“(4) WORK AND WORK PREPARATION ACTIVITIES.—The term ‘work and work preparation activities’ means—

“(A) unsubsidized employment;

“(B) subsidized private sector employment;

“(C) subsidized public sector employment;

“(D) work experience (including work associated with the refurbishing of publicly assisted housing) if sufficient private sector employment is not available;

“(E) on-the-job training;

“(F) job readiness assistance;

“(G) a community service program;

“(H) vocational educational training (not to exceed 1 year with respect to any individual);

“(I) job skills training directly related to employment;

“(J) education directly related to employment, in the case of a recipient who has not received a high school diploma or a certificate of high school equivalency;

“(K) satisfactory attendance at secondary school or in a course of study leading to a certificate of general equivalence, in the case of a recipient who has not completed secondary school or received such a certificate;

“(L) the provision of child care services to an individual who is participating in a community service program;

“(M) workfare under section 20; and

“(N) supervised job search.

“(b) WORK ACTIVATION PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of receiving supplemental nutrition assistance program funds under this Act, a State agency shall be required to operate a work activation program for eligible participants.

“(2) SPECIAL RULES FOR MARRIED COUPLE HOUSEHOLDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of eligible participants who are spouses in a married couple household—

“(i) the work activation requirement of this section shall apply only if the sum of the combined current employment of both spouses is less than 100 hours per month; and

“(ii) both spouses shall be considered to have achieved successful engagement in the work activation program if either spouse fulfills the work activation requirements described in subsection (c), (d), or (e)(1).

“(B) TOTAL REQUIRED HOURS.—The total combined number of hours of required work and work preparation activities for both spouses in a married couple household shall not be greater than the total number of hours required for a single head of household.

“(C) REQUIREMENT.—In carrying out this section, a State agency shall ensure that, for any month—

“(i) the proportion that—

“(I) the number of married couple households that are required to participate in work activation under this section in a month; bears to

“(II) the number of all households that are required to participate in work activation under this section in the same month; is not greater than—

“(ii) the proportion that—

“(I) the number of all married couple households with eligible participants in the month; bears to

“(II) the number of all households with eligible participants in the same month.

“(c) SHORT-TERM INTERIM WORK ACTIVATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A State agency may require eligible participants who meet the criteria in paragraph (2) to engage in—

“(A) interim work activation as described in this subsection; or

“(B) full work activation as described in subsection (d).

“(2) ELIGIBILITY.—A State agency may require an eligible participant to participate in interim work activation instead of full work activation if the eligible participant has not engaged in work activation under this section in the preceding 3 years.

“(3) REQUIRED JOB SEARCH.—A participant in interim work activation shall be required—

“(A) to participate in supervised job search for at least 6 hours per week; and

“(B) to engage in such additional activities as the State agency may require.

“(4) TIME LIMIT ON INTERIM WORK ACTIVATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible participant shall not participate in interim work activation for more than 3 months.

“(B) ADDITIONAL TIME.—After an eligible participant has participated in interim work activation for 3 months, the State agency shall require the eligible participant—

“(i) to maintain at least 100 hours of employment per month; or

“(ii) to participate in full work activation.

“(d) FULL WORK ACTIVATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of receiving supplemental nutrition assistance program funds under this Act, a State agency shall require all or part of the eligible participants in the State to engage in full work activation under this section.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—An eligible participant who is required to participate in full work activation in a month shall be required to engage in 1 or more work and work preparation activities for an average of 100 hours per month.

“(3) LIMITATION.—Of the total number of required hours described in paragraph (2), not fewer than 20 hours per week shall be attributable to an activity described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), (H), (I), (M), or (N) of subsection (a)(4).

“(4) PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY SERVICE OR WORKFARE.—At least 10 percent of the eligible participants that a State requires to participate in full work activation under this section shall be required to participate in activities described in subparagraph (D), (G), or (M) of subsection (a)(4).

“(5) WORK ACTIVATION NOT EMPLOYMENT.—Other than unsubsidized employment described in subsection (a)(4)(A), participation in work and work preparation activities under this section shall not be—

“(A) considered to be employment; or

“(B) subject to any law pertaining to wages, compensation, hours, or conditions of employment under any law administered by the Secretary of Labor.

“(6) ADDITIONAL REQUIRED ACTIVITY.—Except as provided in subsection (g), nothing in this section prevents a State from requiring more than 100 hours per month of participation in work and work preparation activities.

“(e) LIMITATIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—

“(1) SINGLE TEEN HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD OR MARRIED TEEN WHO MAINTAINS SATISFACTORY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE.—For purposes of determining monthly participation rates under this section, an eligible participant who is married or a head of household and who has not attained 20 years of age shall be considered to have completed successful engagement in work activation for a month if the eligible participant—

“(A) maintains satisfactory attendance at secondary school or the equivalent during the month; or

“(B) participates in education directly related to employment for an average of at least 20 hours per week during the month.

“(2) LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF PERSONS WHO MAY BE TREATED AS ENGAGED IN WORK ACTIVATION BY REASON OF PARTICIPATION IN EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES.—For purposes of determining monthly participation rates under this section, not more than 30 percent of the number of individuals in a State who are treated as having completed successful engagement in work activation for a month may be individuals who are determined to be

engaged in work activation for the month by reason of participation in vocational educational training.

“(f) STATE OPTION FOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENT EXEMPTIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For any fiscal year, a State agency, at the option of the State agency, may—

“(A) exempt a household that includes a child who has not attained 12 months of age from engaging in work activation; and

“(B) disregard that household in determining the monthly participation rates under this section until the child has attained 12 months of age.

“(2) EXCLUSION.—For purposes of determining monthly participation rates under this section, a household that includes a child who has not attained 6 years of age shall be considered to be successfully engaged in work activation for a month if a member of the household receiving supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits is engaged in work activation for an average of at least 20 hours per week during the month.

“(g) PENALTIES AGAINST INDIVIDUALS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), if an eligible participant in a household receiving assistance under the State program funded under this section fails to complete successful engagement in work activation in accordance with this section, the State agency shall—

“(A) in accordance with paragraph (2), reduce the amount of assistance otherwise payable to the entire household pro rata (or more, at the option of the State agency) with respect to the month immediately after any month in which the eligible participant fails to perform; or

“(B) terminate the assistance entirely.

“(2) PRO RATA REDUCTION.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(A), the amount of the pro rata reduction shall equal the product obtained by multiplying—

“(A) the normal monthly amount of assistance to the entire household that would have been received if not for the reduction under paragraph (1)(A); by

“(B) the proportion that—

“(i) the hours of required work and work preparation activities performed by the eligible participant during the month; bears to

“(ii) the number or hours of work and work preparation activities the State agency required the eligible participant to perform in accordance with this section.

“(3) EXCEPTION.—A State may not reduce or terminate assistance under the State program funded under this section or any other State program funded with qualified State expenditures (as defined in section 409(a)(7)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 609(a)(7)(B))) based on a refusal of an eligible participant to engage in work and work preparation activities required under this section if—

“(A) the eligible participant is a single custodial parent caring for a child who has not attained 6 years of age; and

“(B) the eligible participant proves that the eligible participant has a demonstrated inability (as determined by the State agency) to obtain needed child care, due to—

“(i) unavailability of appropriate child care within a reasonable distance from the home or work site of the eligible participant; or

“(ii) unavailability of all affordable child care arrangements, including formal child care and all informal child care by a relative or under other arrangements.

“(h) LIMITATION ON HOURS OF REQUIRED PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY SERVICE OR WORKFARE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The maximum number of hours during a month that an eligible participant shall be required under this section to work in a community service program or a workforce program under section 20 shall not exceed the quotient obtained by dividing—

“(A) the total dollar cost of all means-tested benefits received by the household for that month, as determined under paragraph (2); by

“(B) the Federal minimum wage.

“(2) TOTAL DOLLAR COST OF ALL MEANS-TESTED BENEFITS DEFINED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the total dollar cost of all means-tested benefits shall equal the sum of the dollar cost of all benefits received by the household from—

“(i) the supplemental nutrition assistance program;

“(ii) the State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) or any other State program funded with qualified State expenditures (as defined in section 409(a)(7)(B)(i) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 609(a)(7)(B)(i))); and

“(iii) any assistance provided to a household, landlord, or public housing agency (as defined in section 3(b)(6) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)(6))) to subsidize the rental payment for a dwelling unit, including assistance provided for public housing dwelling units under section 3 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a) and assistance provided under section 8 of that Act (42 U.S.C. 1437f).

“(B) VALUE OF BENEFITS DURING SANCTION.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), if the dollar value of 1 or more benefits received by a household in a month has been reduced under subsection (g) or another sanction requirement, the calculated dollar value of the sanctioned benefits shall equal the dollar value of the benefit that would have been received if the benefit had not been reduced by the sanction.

“(3) ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES.—Nothing in this subsection prevents a State agency from requiring an eligible participant to engage in activities not described in paragraph (1) for additional hours during the month.

“(i) WORK ACTIVATION PARTICIPATION GOALS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of receiving supplemental nutrition assistance program funds under this Act, except as provided in paragraph (2), a State agency shall achieve for each quarter of the fiscal year with respect to all eligible participants receiving assistance under the State program funded under this section for that fiscal year at least the participation rate specified in the following table:

“If the fiscal year is:	The quarterly participation rate shall be at least:
2019	20 percent
2020	35 percent
2021	50 percent
2022	65 percent
2023	80 percent.

“(2) ADJUSTMENT IF RECESSIONARY PERIOD.—If the average national unemployment rate during a quarter of a fiscal year, as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, is more than 8 percent, the participation goal for the immediately succeeding quarter shall equal the product obtained by multiplying—

“(A) the applicable quarterly participation rate under paragraph (1); by

“(B) 0.8.

“(j) CALCULATION OF WORK ACTIVATION PARTICIPATION RATES.—

“(1) DEFINITION OF SANCTIONED RECIPIENT.—In this subsection, the term ‘sanctioned recipient’ means any eligible participant who—

“(A) was required to participate in work activation in a month;

“(B) failed to perform the assigned work and work preparation activities so as to meet the relevant hourly requirements in subsection (c), (d), or (e)(2); and

“(C) was sanctioned by a reduced benefit payment in the subsequent month under subsection (g).

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The work activation participation rate for a State for any quarter of a fiscal year shall equal the average of the monthly participation rates for the State during the 3 months of that quarter.

“(3) MONTHLY PARTICIPATION RATE.—For purposes of paragraph (2), the monthly participation rate shall equal the ratio of all countable participants to all eligible participants in the month, as determined under paragraph (4).

“(4) RATIO OF ALL COUNTABLE PARTICIPANTS TO ALL ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS.—Subject to paragraph (5), the ratio of all countable participants to all eligible participants in a month equals the proportion that—

“(A) the sum obtained by adding—

“(i) all eligible participants who—

“(I) were required by the State to engage in interim work activation, full work activation, or education under subsection (e)(1) during the month; and

“(II) fulfilled the criteria for successful engagement in work activation for that activity during the month; and

“(ii) all sanctioned recipients for that month; bears to

“(B) the average number of eligible participants in the State in that month.

“(5) MULTIPLE ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS.—A married couple household consisting of more than 1 eligible participant shall be counted as a single eligible participant for purposes of calculating the participation rate under this subsection.

“(k) PENALTIES FOR INADEQUATE STATE PERFORMANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning in the first quarter of fiscal year 2020 and for each subsequent quarter of fiscal year 2020 and of each subsequent fiscal year, each State shall count the monthly average number of countable participants under this section.

“(2) REDUCTION IN FUNDING.—If the monthly average number of countable participants in a State of a fiscal year is not sufficient to fulfill the relevant work activation participation goal under subsection (i) during that quarter, the supplemental nutrition assistance program funding for the State under this Act shall be reduced for the fiscal quarter that begins 180 days after the first day of the quarter in which the inadequate performance occurred in accordance with paragraph (3).

“(3) FUNDING IN PENALIZED QUARTER.—The total amount of funding a State shall receive for all households with eligible participants for a quarter for which funding is reduced under paragraph (2) shall equal the product obtained by multiplying—

“(A) the total amount of funding that the State would have received in the preceding quarter for all households with eligible participants if no reduction had been in place; by

“(B) the ratio of all countable participants to all eligible participants (as determined under subsection (j)(4)) for the quarter that began 180 days before the first day of the quarter for which funding is reduced.

“(l) FUNDING TO ADMINISTER WORK ACTIVATION.—

“(1) TANF FUNDING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 2019 and each subsequent fiscal year, a State that receives supplemental nutrition assistance program funds under this Act may use during that fiscal year to carry out the work activation program of the State under this section—

“(i) any of the Federal funds available to the State through the State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) in that fiscal year; and

“(ii) any of the funds from State sources allocated to the operation of the program described in clause (i).

“(B) EFFECT.—Any State that uses State funds allocated to the State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) to administer the work activation program of that State under this section may treat those funds as qualified State expenditures (as defined in section 409(a)(7)(B)(i) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 609(a)(7)(B)(i))) for purposes of meeting the requirements of section 409(a)(7) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 609(a)(7)) in that fiscal year.

“(2) WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT FUNDING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 2019 and each subsequent fiscal year, a State that receives Federal funds under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.) may use up to 50 percent of those funds during that fiscal year to carry out the work activation program of the State under this section.

“(3) SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 2019 and each subsequent fiscal year, a State that receives Federal funds under this Act for an employment and training program under section 6(d) may use those funds during that fiscal year to carry out the work activation program of the State under this section.”

SA 3350. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3134 proposed by Mr. THUNE to the amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 9, strike line 14 and insert the following:

“that land.”.

SEC. 2104. EXTENSION AND AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AT 1890 LAND-GRANT COLLEGES, INCLUDING TUSKEGEE UNIVERSITY.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 1444 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3221) (as amended by section 7114(1)) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

“(4) FISCAL YEAR 2019, 2020, 2021, OR 2022.—In addition to other amounts authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated for 1 of fiscal year 2019, 2020, 2021, or 2022 such sums as are necessary to ensure that an eligible institution receiving a distribution of funds under this section for that fiscal year receives not less than the amount of funds received by that eligible institution under this section for the preceding fiscal year.”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the undesignated matter following paragraph (2)(B)—

(i) by striking “paragraph (2) of this subsection” and inserting “this paragraph”; and
(ii) by striking “In computing” and inserting the following:

“(C) In computing”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking “Of the remainder” and inserting “Except as provided in paragraph (4), of the remainder”; and

(ii) by striking “(2) any funds” and inserting the following:

“(3) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT.—Any funds”;

(C) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “are allocated” and inserting “were allocated”; and

(ii) by striking “; and” and inserting “, as so designated as of that date.”;

(D) by striking “(b) Beginning” in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and all that follows through “any funds” in paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(b) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Funds made available under this section shall be distributed among eligible institutions in accordance with this subsection.

“(2) BASE AMOUNT.—Any funds”;

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) SPECIAL AMOUNT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019, 2020, 2021, OR 2022.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), for 1 of fiscal year 2019, 2020, 2021, or 2022, if the calculation under paragraph (3)(B) would result in a distribution of less than \$3,000,000 to an eligible institution that first received funds under this section after the date of enactment of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-79; 128 Stat. 649) for a fiscal year, that institution shall receive a distribution of \$3,000,000 for that fiscal year.

“(B) LIMITATION.—Subparagraph (A) shall apply only if amounts are appropriated under subsection (a)(4) to ensure that an eligible institution receiving a distribution of funds under this section for fiscal year 2019, 2020, 2021, or 2022, as applicable, receives not less than the amount of funds received by that eligible institution under this section for the preceding fiscal year.”

(b) RESEARCH.—Section 1445 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3222) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

“(6) FISCAL YEAR 2019, 2020, 2021, OR 2022.—In addition to other amounts authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated for 1 of fiscal year 2019, 2020, 2021, or 2022 such sums as are necessary to ensure that an eligible institution receiving a distribution of funds under this section for that fiscal year receives not less than the amount of funds received by that eligible institution under this section for the preceding fiscal year.”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) SPECIAL AMOUNT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019, 2020, 2021, OR 2022.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), for 1 of fiscal year 2019, 2020, 2021, or 2022, if the calculation under subparagraph (C) would result in a distribution of less than \$3,000,000 to an eligible institution that first received funds under this section after the date of enactment of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-79; 128 Stat. 649), that institution shall receive a distribution of \$3,000,000 for that fiscal year.

“(ii) LIMITATION.—Clause (i) shall apply only if amounts are appropriated under subsection (a)(6) to ensure that an eligible institution receiving a distribution of funds under this section for fiscal year 2019, 2020, 2021, or 2022, as applicable, receives not less

than the amount of funds received by that eligible institution under this section for the preceding fiscal year.”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “(B) Of funds” and inserting the following:

“(C) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT.—Except as provided in subparagraph (D), of funds”;

(iii) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “are allocated” and inserting “were allocated”;

(II) by inserting “, as so designated as of that date” before the period at the end; and

(III) by striking “(A) Funds” and inserting the following:

“(B) BASE AMOUNT.—Funds”; and

(iv) in the matter preceding subparagraph (B) (as so designated), by striking “(2) The” and all that follows through “follows.” and inserting the following:

“(3) DISTRIBUTIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—After allocating amounts under paragraph (2), the remainder shall be allotted among the eligible institutions in accordance with this paragraph.”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “(1) Three per centum” and inserting the following:

“(2) ADMINISTRATION.—3 percent”; and

(C) in the matter preceding paragraph (2) (as so designated), by striking “(b) Beginning” and all that follows through “follows.” and inserting the following:

“(b) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Funds made available under this section shall be distributed among eligible institutions in accordance with this subsection.”.

SA 3351. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 233, line 7, strike “based” the second place it appears and insert “best”.

SA 3352. Mr. KING (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 126 . LABELING OF CERTAIN SINGLE INGREDIENT FOODS.

The food labeling requirements under section 403(q) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 343(q)) shall not require that the nutrition facts label of any single ingredient sugar, honey, agave, and syrup that is packaged and offered for sale as a single ingredient food includes a declaration of added sugars.

SA 3353. Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for

the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle F of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 86 . STREAMLINING THE FOREST SERVICE PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY LOCATION APPLICATIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY.—The term “communications facility” includes—

(A) any infrastructure, including any transmitting device, tower, or support structure, and any equipment, switches, wiring, cabling, power sources, shelters, or cabinets, associated with the licensed or permitted unlicensed wireless or wireline transmission of writings, signs, signals, data, images, pictures, and sounds of all kinds; and

(B) any antenna or apparatus that is—

(i) designed for the purpose of emitting radio frequency;

(ii) (I) designed to be operated, or is operating, from a fixed location pursuant to authorization by the Federal Communications Commission; or

(II) using duly authorized devices that do not require individual licenses; and

(iii) is added to a tower, building, or other structure.

(2) COMMUNICATIONS SITE.—The term “communications site” means an area of covered land designated for communications uses.

(3) COMMUNICATIONS USE.—The term “communications use” means the placement and operation of communications facility.

(4) COMMUNICATIONS USE AUTHORIZATION.—The term “communications use authorization” means an easement, right-of-way, lease, license, or other authorization to locate or modify a communications facility on covered land by the Forest Service for the primary purpose of authorizing the occupancy and use of the covered land for communications use.

(5) COVERED LAND.—The term “covered land” means National Forest System land.

(6) ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT.—The term “organizational unit”, with respect to the Forest Service, means—

(A) a regional office;

(B) the headquarters;

(C) a management unit; or

(D) a ranger district office.

(7) SPECIAL ACCOUNT.—The term “special account” means the special account established for the Forest Service under subsection (f)(1).

(b) REGULATIONS.—Notwithstanding section 6409 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1455) or section 606 of the Repack Airwaves Yielding Better Access for Users of Modern Services Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-141), not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations—

(1) to streamline the process for considering applications to locate or modify communications facilities on covered land;

(2) to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that the process is uniform and standardized across the organizational units of the Forest Service; and

(3) to require that the applications described in paragraph (1) be considered and granted on a competitively neutral, technology neutral, and nondiscriminatory basis.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—The regulations promulgated under subsection (b) shall—

(1) include procedures for the tracking of applications described in subsection (b)(1), including—

(A) identifying the number of applications—

- (i) received;
- (ii) approved; and
- (iii) denied;

(B) in the case of an application that is denied, describing the reasons for the denial; and

(C) describing the period of time between the receipt of an application and the issuance of a final decision on an application;

(2) provide for minimum lease terms of not less than 15 years for leases with respect to the location of communications facilities on covered land;

(3) include a structure of fees for—

(A) submitting an application described in subsection (b)(1), based on the cost to the Forest Service of considering such an application; and

(B) issuing communications use authorizations, based on the cost to the Forest Service of any maintenance or other activities required to be performed by the Forest Service as a result of the location or modification of the communications facility; and

(4) provide for prioritization or streamlining of the consideration of applications to locate or modify communications facilities on covered land in a previously disturbed right-of-way.

(d) **ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS.**—In promulgating regulations under subsection (b), the Secretary shall consider—

(1) how discrete reviews in considering an application described in paragraph (1) of that subsection can be conducted simultaneously, rather than sequentially, by any organizational units of the Forest Service that must approve the location or modification; and

(2) how to eliminate overlapping requirements among the organizational units of the Forest Service with respect to the location or modification of a communications facility on covered land administered by those organizational units.

(e) **COMMUNICATION OF STREAMLINED PROCESS TO ORGANIZATIONAL UNITS.**—With respect to the regulations promulgated under subsection (b), the Secretary shall—

(1) communicate the regulations to the organizational units of the Forest Service; and

(2) ensure that the organizational units of the Forest Service follow the regulations.

(f) **DEPOSIT AND AVAILABILITY OF FEES.**—

(1) **SPECIAL ACCOUNT.**—The Secretary of the Treasury shall establish a special account in the Treasury for the Forest Service for the deposit of fees collected by the Forest Service under subsection (c)(3) for communications use authorizations on covered land granted, issued, or executed by the Forest Service.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS FOR FEES COLLECTED.**—Fees collected by the Forest Service under paragraph (3) of subsection (c) shall be—

(A) based on the costs described in that paragraph; and

(B) competitively neutral, technology neutral, and nondiscriminatory with respect to other users of the communications site.

(3) **DEPOSIT OF FEES.**—Fees collected by the Forest Service under subsection (c)(3) shall be deposited in the special account.

(4) **AVAILABILITY OF FEES.**—Amounts deposited in the special account shall be available, to the extent and in such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriation Acts, to the Secretary to cover costs incurred by the Forest Service described in subsection (c)(3), including—

(A) preparing needs assessments or other programmatic analyses necessary to designate communications sites and issue communications use authorizations;

(B) developing management plans for communications sites;

(C) training for management of communications sites; and

(D) obtaining or improving access to communications sites.

(5) **NO ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED.**—Except as provided in paragraph (4), no other amounts are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section.

(g) **SAVINGS PROVISIONS.**—

(1) **REAL PROPERTY AUTHORITIES.**—Nothing in this section provides any executive agency with any new leasing or other real property authorities not in existence before the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) **EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Nothing in this section, including any action taken pursuant to this section, impacts a decision or determination by any executive agency to sell, dispose of, declare excess or surplus, lease, reuse, or redevelop any Federal real property pursuant to title 40, United States Code, the Federal Assets Sale and Transfer Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-287; 40 U.S.C. 1303 note), or any other law governing real property activities of the Federal Government.

(B) **AGREEMENTS.**—No agreement entered into pursuant to this section obligates the Federal Government to hold, control, or otherwise retain or use real property that may otherwise be deemed as excess, surplus, or that could otherwise be sold, leased, or redeveloped.

SA 3354. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 141, strike line 3 and all that follows through page 142, line 5, and insert the following:

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall carry out a pilot project that provides financial incentives, as determined by the Secretary, to producers to adopt practices designed to improve soil health, including by increasing carbon levels in soil (or ‘soil carbon levels’) or growing new top soil.

“(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—In establishing the pilot project under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

“(1) identify geographic regions of the United States in which to establish the pilot project, including—

“(A) not less than 1 drought prone region, based on factors such as soil type, cropping history, and water availability; and

“(B) not less than 1 region with a high percentage of spodosols, as identified by the Secretary;

“(2) establish payments to provide an incentive for the use of practices, such as cover crops, no-till farming, nutrient management, resource-conserving crop rotations, and other similar practices approved under the program that—

“(A) improve soil health;

“(B) increase carbon levels in the soil; or

“(C) meet the goals described in subparagraphs (A) and (B); and

“(3) establish protocols for measuring carbon levels in soil to measure gains in soil health as a result of the practices used in the pilot project.

“(c) **STUDY; REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—

“(1) **STUDY.**—Not later than September 30, 2022, the Secretary shall conduct a study regarding the baseline of soil carbon levels and nutrients, changes in soil health, reduction

in nutrient runoff and top soil erosion, and, if feasible, economic outcomes, as a result of the practices used in the pilot project established under subsection (a).

SA 3355. Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. PARTICIPATION OF PUERTO RICO, AMERICAN SAMOA, AND THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS IN SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—Section 3 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012) is amended—

(A) in subsection (r), by inserting “the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,” after “Guam,”; and

(B) in subsection (u)(3), by inserting “the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,” after “Guam,”.

(2) **ELIGIBLE HOUSEHOLDS.**—Section 5 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b), in the first sentence, by inserting “the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,” after “Guam,”;

(B) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “and Guam,” and inserting “Guam, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,”; and

(C) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (1)(A), by inserting “the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,” after “Hawaii,” each place it appears; and

(ii) in paragraph (6)(B), by inserting “the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,” after “Guam,”.

(3) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The amendments made by this subsection shall be effective with respect to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, as applicable, on the date described in subparagraph (B) if the Secretary submits to Congress a certification under subsection (f)(3) of section 19 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2028).

(B) **DATE DESCRIBED.**—The date referred to in subparagraph (A) is, with respect to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the date established by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, respectively, in the applicable plan of operation submitted to the Secretary under subsection (f)(1)(A) of section 19 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2028).

(b) **TRANSITION OF PUERTO RICO, AMERICAN SAMOA, AND THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS TO SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE**

PROGRAM.—Section 19 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2028) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) TRANSITION OF PUERTO RICO, AMERICAN SAMOA, AND THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS TO SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—

“(1) SUBMISSION OF PLAN BY PUERTO RICO, AMERICAN SAMOA, AND THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS.—

“(A) SUBMISSION AND REVIEW OF PLAN OF OPERATION.—If a State agency is designated by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (referred to in this subsection as a ‘governmental entity’) and submits to the Secretary a request to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program and a plan of operation under section 11 (including a date on which the governmental entity will begin to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program), the Secretary shall determine whether that governmental entity and State agency satisfy the requirements that would apply under this Act for approval of that plan if the governmental entity were 1 of the several States.

“(B) DETERMINATION BY SECRETARY.—

“(i) APPROVAL.—The Secretary shall approve a plan of operation under subparagraph (A) if the governmental entity and State agency satisfy the requirements described in that subparagraph.

“(ii) DISAPPROVAL.—If the Secretary does not approve a plan of operation under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall provide to the governmental entity a statement that describes each requirement that is not satisfied by the plan.

“(2) APPROVAL OF RETAIL FOOD STORES.—If the Secretary approves a plan of operation under paragraph (1)(B)(i), the Secretary shall accept from retail food stores located in the applicable governmental entity applications under section 9 for approval to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program.

“(3) SUBMISSION OF CERTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress a certification that a governmental entity qualifies to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program as if the governmental entity were a State if the Secretary—

“(A) approves the plan of operation under paragraph (1)(B)(i); and

“(B) approves the applications under paragraph (2) of a number of retail food stores located in the governmental entity requesting to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program that would be sufficient to satisfy the requirements of this Act if the governmental entity were 1 of the several States.

“(4) CASH BENEFITS PROVIDED IN PUERTO RICO.—As part of a plan of operation submitted under paragraph (1)(A), the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico may submit to the Secretary a request to provide benefits under the supplemental nutrition assistance program in the form of cash.

“(5) FAMILY MARKET PROGRAM IN PUERTO RICO.—As part of a plan of operation submitted under paragraph (1)(A), notwithstanding subsection (g), the Secretary shall allow the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to continue to carry out, under the supplemental nutrition assistance program, the Family Market Program established under this section.

“(g) TERMINATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsections (a) through (e) shall cease to be effective with respect to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, as applicable, on the date described in paragraph (2) if the

Secretary submits to Congress a certification under subsection (f)(3).

“(2) DATE DESCRIBED.—The date referred to in paragraph (1) is, with respect to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the date established by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, respectively, in the applicable plan of operation submitted to the Secretary under subsection (f)(1)(A).”.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section and the amendments made by this section such sums as are necessary for each fiscal year, to remain available until expended.

SA 3356. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 335, strike line 10 and insert the following:

“(C) THIRD-PARTY APPLICATIONS.—Prior to the promulgation of regulations or issuance of guidance by the Secretary under subparagraph (B), State agencies and benefit issuers of State agencies may allow third-party applications to access the electronic benefit transfer system, with the consent of a participating household member, to provide electronic benefit transfer account information to the participating household, if the third-party applications adequately protect the privacy of data relating to participating households and retail food stores, consistent with sections 9(c) and 11(e).

“(D) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years

SA 3357. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41 . . DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM FOR LOW-COST FOOD PLAN.

Section 17 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026) (as amended by section 4108) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(n) DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM FOR LOW-COST FOOD PLAN.—

“(1) DEFINITION OF LOW-COST FOOD PLAN.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In this subsection, the term ‘low-cost food plan’ means the diet required to feed a family of 4 persons, consisting of a man and a woman age 19 through 50 years old, a child age 6 through 8 years old, and a child age 9 through 11 years old, at a cost that is in the second quartile of food expenditures for those families in the United States, as determined by the Secretary.

“(B) ADJUSTMENTS.—In determining the diet under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall—

“(i) make household-size adjustments (based on the unrounded cost of the diet), taking into account economies of scale;

“(ii) make cost adjustments in the diet for the State of Hawaii and the urban and rural

parts of the State of Alaska to reflect the cost of food in the State of Hawaii and urban and rural parts of the State of Alaska;

“(iii) make cost adjustments in the separate low-cost food plans for Guam and the United States Virgin Islands to reflect the cost of food in those States, which shall not exceed the cost of food in the 50 States and the District of Columbia; and

“(iv) on October 1, 2018, and each October 1 thereafter—

“(I) adjust the cost of the diet to reflect the cost of the diet in the preceding June; and

“(II) round the cost determined under subclause (I) to the nearest lower dollar increment.

“(2) ESTABLISHMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out a demonstration program under which the value of the allotment issued to eligible households under the supplemental nutrition assistance program shall be equal to the cost to those households of the low-cost food plan, reduced by an amount equal to 30 percent of the income of the household, as determined in accordance with subsections (d) and (e) of section 5, rounded to the nearest lower whole dollar.

“(B) MINIMUM ALLOTMENT.—In the case of a household of 1 or 2 persons, the minimum allotment shall be 8 percent of the cost of the low-cost food plan for a household containing 1 member, as determined by the Secretary under section 3, rounded to the nearest whole dollar increment.

“(3) SELECTION.—In consultation with State agencies, the Secretary shall select not fewer than 4 areas to participate in the demonstration program under this subsection.

“(4) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall conduct an independent evaluation, using rigorous evaluation standards (including random assignment and control groups), to evaluate the impact on health and nutrition of using the low-cost food plan in lieu of the thrifty food plan.

“(5) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that describes—

“(A) the results of the demonstration program under this subsection;

“(B) any additional costs or savings to the supplemental assistance nutrition program as a result of the demonstration program under this subsection; and

“(C) any additional costs or savings to State and Federal health care programs as a result of the demonstration program under this subsection.”.

SA 3358. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 4114, strike the section designation and heading and all that follows through “Section 28(c)” in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and insert the following:

SEC. 4114. NUTRITION EDUCATION AND OBESITY PREVENTION.

(a) OFFICE OF NUTRITION EDUCATION AND OBESITY PREVENTION TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 28 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2036a) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “GRANT PROGRAM”; and

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

“(e) OFFICE OF NUTRITION EDUCATION AND OBESITY PREVENTION TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish within the Food and Nutrition Service an office, to be known as the ‘Office of Nutrition Education and Obesity Prevention Training and Technical Assistance’ (referred to in this subsection as the ‘Office’), to provide services described in paragraph (2) to—

“(A) State agencies receiving grants under this section; and

“(B) other State and local departments and agencies and community organizations applying for, or receiving, subgrants under this section.

“(2) SERVICES.—The services provided by the Office pursuant to paragraph (1) shall include providing technical assistance to grantees and applicants relating to—

“(A) administering education under the supplemental nutrition assistance program to ensure improvement in diet quality for benefit recipients;

“(B) assessing the nutritional, physical activity, and obesity prevention needs of target populations, and the barriers encountered by those populations to accessing healthy foods and physical activity;

“(C) identifying appropriate, evidence-based strategies and interventions to address problems identified under subparagraph (B), including through the program known as the ‘SNAP-Ed Toolkit’;

“(D) evaluating the effectiveness of applicable education plans, including through the use of the framework known as the ‘SNAP-Ed Evaluation Framework’;

“(E) maintaining and updating the toolkit and framework described in subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively, the document known as the ‘SNAP-Ed Interpretive Guide’, and other such other programs as the Secretary determines to be necessary;

“(F) disseminating information, sharing best practices, and facilitating communication among the entities described in paragraph (1);

“(G)(i) identifying common challenges faced by the entities described in paragraph (1); and

“(ii) coordinating efforts to achieve solutions to those challenges; and

“(H) such other services as may be identified by the Secretary, consistent with the purposes of the grants provided under this section.

“(3) FUNDING.—The Secretary shall use to carry out this subsection not less than 0.5 percent, and not more than 2 percent, of the amounts made available to carry out this section.”

(b) NUTRITION EDUCATION STATE PLANS.—Section 28(c)

SA 3359. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 41. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND EDUCATION.

The Secretary, in conjunction with the Secretary of Labor and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, shall provide technical assistance and education to workers and small businesses with respect to—

(1) the eligibility of workers for benefits under the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.); and

(2) other benefits associated with employment-based income.

SA 3360. Mr. PERDUE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 62. MIDDLE MILE BROADBAND INFRASTRUCTURE.

Section 601 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 950bb) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “middle mile infrastructure” before “in rural areas”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

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

“(3) MIDDLE MILE INFRASTRUCTURE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘middle mile infrastructure’ means any broadband infrastructure that does not connect directly to an end user location (including an anchor institution).

“(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ‘middle mile infrastructure’ may include interoffice transport, backhaul, internet connectivity, data centers, or special access transport to rural areas.”;

(3) in subsection (c) (as amended by section 6206(2))—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “and to construct, improve, or acquire middle mile infrastructure” after “broadband service”;

(B) in paragraph (2)(A)(i) (as amended by section 6206(2)(C)) by inserting “or, in the case of middle mile infrastructure, offer the future ability to link” after “provide broadband service”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) LIMITATION ON MIDDLE MILE INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall limit grants, loans, or loan guarantees for middle mile infrastructure projects to not more than 20 percent of the amounts made available to carry out this section.”;

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(i) in clause (i), by inserting “or extend middle mile infrastructure” before “to all”; and

(ii) in clause (iii) (as amended by section 6206(3)(A)(i)(III)), by inserting “or middle mile infrastructure” before “described”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “or install middle mile infrastructure” before “in the proposed”;

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) EXCEPTION FOR MIDDLE MILE INFRASTRUCTURE.—Portions of a middle mile infrastructure project that uses funds provided under this section that otherwise meet the rural service requirements of this section may traverse an area that is not a rural area when necessary.”;

(C) in paragraph (4), by inserting “, or to construct, improve, or acquire middle mile infrastructure in,” before “a rural area”;

(D) in paragraph (5)(A)(v), by inserting “or, in the case of middle mile infrastructure, connect” after “to service”;

(E) in paragraph (8)(A)(ii)—

(i) in subclause (I), by inserting “or may” before “receive”;

(ii) in subclause (II), by inserting “or capability of middle mile infrastructure” after “service”;

(iii) in subclause (III), by striking “area” and inserting “area, if applicable”;

(5) in subsection (1)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by inserting “OR MIDDLE MILE INFRASTRUCTURE” after “SERVICE”;

(B) by inserting “or middle mile infrastructure” before “in rural areas”;

(6) in subsection (j)(6), by inserting “or middle mile infrastructure” after “service” the first and third places it appears.

SA 3361. Mrs. HYDE-SMITH (for herself, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. PERDUE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title I, add the following:

SEC. 17. APPLICATION.

The amendments made by sections 1704 and 1705 shall not apply until the date that is 60 days after the date on which the Secretary submits to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a detailed report that affirms that the implementation of those amendments would not negatively impact farm income levels, land values, and the financial stability of farms in all regions of the United States.

SA 3362. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. DAINES, and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 8101 insert the following:

SEC. 8101. STATE AND PRIVATE FOREST LANDSCAPE-SCALE RESTORATION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 13A of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2109a) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 13A. STATE AND PRIVATE FOREST LANDSCAPE-SCALE RESTORATION PROGRAM.

“(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to encourage collaborative, science-based restoration of priority forest landscapes, as identified in—

“(1) a State-wide assessment under section 2A(a)(1); or

“(2) a long-term State-wide forest resource strategy under section 2A(a)(2).

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term ‘Indian tribe’ has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

“(2) NONINDUSTRIAL PRIVATE FOREST LAND.—The term ‘nonindustrial private forest land’ means land that—

“(A) has existing tree cover or is suitable for growing trees; and

“(B) is owned by any private individual, group, association, corporation, Indian tribe, or other private legal entity.

“(3) STATE FOREST LAND.—The term ‘State forest land’ means land that is—

“(A) under State or local governmental ownership; and

“(B) considered to be non-Federal forest land.

“(c) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary, in consultation with State foresters or appropriate State agencies, shall establish a competitive grant program to provide financial and technical assistance to encourage collaborative, science-based restoration of priority landscapes.

“(d) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, a State forester or another appropriate entity, on approval of the State forester, shall submit to the Secretary a State and private forest landscape-scale restoration proposal based on a restoration strategy that—

“(1) is complete or substantially complete;

“(2) is for a multiyear period;

“(3) enhances public benefits from trees and forests on nonindustrial private forest land or State forest land, as identified in—

“(A) a State-wide assessment under section 2A(a)(1); or

“(B) a long-term State-wide forest resource strategy under section 2A(a)(2);

“(4) is accessible by wood-processing infrastructure; and

“(5) is based on the best available science.

“(e) PLAN CRITERIA.—A State and private forest landscape-scale restoration proposal submitted under this section shall include plans—

“(1) to reduce the risk of uncharacteristic wildfires;

“(2) to improve fish and wildlife habitats, including the habitats of threatened and endangered species;

“(3) to maintain or improve water quality and watershed function;

“(4) to mitigate invasive species, insect infestation, and disease;

“(5) to improve important forest ecosystems;

“(6) to measure ecological and economic benefits, including air quality and soil quality and productivity; or

“(7) to take other relevant actions, as determined by the Secretary.

“(f) PRIORITIES.—In making grants under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to plans that—

“(1) further a statewide forest assessment and resource strategy;

“(2) promote cross boundary landscape collaboration; and

“(3) leverage public and private resources.

“(g) COLLABORATION AND CONSULTATION.—The Chief of the Forest Service, the Chief of the Natural Resources Conservation Service, and relevant stakeholders shall collaborate and consult on an ongoing basis regarding—

“(1) administration of the program established under this section; and

“(2) identification of other applicable resources for landscape-scale restoration.

“(h) MATCHING FUNDS REQUIRED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), as a condition of receiving a grant under this section, the Secretary shall require the recipient of the grant to provide funds or in-kind support from non-Federal sources in an amount that is at least equal to the amount of Federal funds.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply in any case in which the Secretary determines that—

“(A) the recipient of the grant is unable to obtain from non-Federal sources the matching funds required under that paragraph; and

“(B) regardless of that inability, the benefits of the project of the recipient justify carrying out the project.

“(i) COORDINATION AND PROXIMITY ENCOURAGED.—In making grants under this section, the Secretary may consider coordination with and proximity to other landscape-scale projects on other land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary, the Secretary of the Interior, or a Governor of a State, including under—

“(1) the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program established under section 4003 of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (16 U.S.C. 7303);

“(2) landscape areas designated for insect and disease treatments under section 602 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6591a);

“(3) good neighbor authority under section 19;

“(4) stewardship end result contracting projects authorized under section 604 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6591c);

“(5) appropriate State-level programs; and

“(6) other relevant programs, as determined by the Secretary.

“(j) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(1) ALLOCATION.—Of the amounts made available to carry out this section, the Secretary shall use—

“(A) 50 percent for allocation through a competitive grant process; and

“(B) 50 percent for allocation proportionally to States, in consultation with State foresters, to address the highest national priorities, as identified in—

“(i) a State-wide assessment under section 2A(a)(1); or

“(ii) a long-term State-wide forest resource strategy under section 2A(a)(2).

“(2) MULTIYEAR PROJECTS.—The Secretary may provide amounts under this section for multiyear projects.

“(k) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall promulgate such regulations as the Secretary determines necessary to carry out this section.

“(1) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report on—

“(1) the status of development, execution, and administration of selected projects;

“(2) the accounting of program funding expenditures; and

“(3) specific accomplishments that have resulted from landscape-scale projects.

“(m) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section \$20,000,000 for the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this section and each fiscal year thereafter through fiscal year 2023, to remain available until expended.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 13B of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2109b) is repealed.

(2) Section 19(a)(4)(C) of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2113(a)(4)(C)) is amended by striking “sections 13A and 13B” and inserting “section 13A”.

SA 3363. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title XII, add the following:

SEC. ____ HEALTH CARE FOR FARMERS AND RANCHERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Agriculture (referred to in this section as the “Secretary”) shall award grants to States and nonprofit entities to establish and support programs to mitigate the financial risk posed to farms and ranches by high health costs by—

(1) providing information and services to assist farmers and ranchers to determine their eligibility for comprehensive health coverage; and

(2) subsidizing out-of-pocket health expenditures for farmers and ranchers who are enrolled in comprehensive health coverage and have annual household incomes below 500 percent of the Federal poverty rate.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FARMERS AND RANCHERS.—The term “farmers and ranchers” means individuals who work as farmers or ranchers, and any spouse or dependant (as defined in section 152 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) of such an individual.

(2) COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH COVERAGE.—The term “comprehensive health coverage” means public or private health insurance coverage that—

(A) offers—

(i) benefits that are at least equivalent to the essential health benefits package under section 1302(a) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18022(a)); and

(ii) consumer protections that are at least equivalent to the consumer protections required under such Act and under title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg et seq.), including protections for individuals with pre-existing conditions; or

(B) meets the requirements for being minimum essential coverage under section 5000A(f)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as in effect on June 1, 2018.

(3) OUT-OF-POCKET HEALTH EXPENDITURES.—The term “out-of-pocket health expenditures” means health insurance deductibles, copayments, coinsurance, or other cost-sharing incurred by individuals and families enrolled in comprehensive health insurance benefits.

(c) NUMBER OF AWARDS.—The Secretary shall make awards under this section to eligible applicants located in not fewer than 10 States.

(d) GRANT PERIOD.—Grants under this section shall be awarded for not longer than a 5-year period and may be renewed at the Secretary’s discretion.

(e) SELECTION PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall—

(1) give priority to States and nonprofit entities located in States where, according to the most recent Census of Agriculture the primary occupation of not less than half of principal farm operators is farming; and

(2) ensure that grantees and grant funds are distributed across Census of Agriculture regions and divisions.

(f) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—Funds made available under this section shall be used to supplement, and not supplant, other Federal, State, or private funds that are made available for the purposes described in subsection (a).

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section \$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, to remain available until expended.

SA 3364. Mr. ROBERTS (for Mr. RUBIO) proposed an amendment to

amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 257, line 2, insert after the period the following: “Funds may not be used as described in the previous sentence in contravention with directives set forth under the National Security Presidential Memorandum entitled ‘Strengthening the Policy of the United States Toward Cuba’ issued by the President on June 16, 2017, during the period in which that memorandum is in effect.”

SA 3365. Mr. ROBERTS (for Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI)) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; as follows:

In section 8632(f), strike paragraph (2) and insert the following:

(2) **PROJECT WORK.**—If the Secretary approves a supplement to an approved plan under subsection (c) of section 512 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1772) or an agreement entered into under subsection (d)(1) of that section that covers a vegetation management project under the pilot program, the liability provisions of subsection (g) of that section shall apply to the vegetation management project.

SA 3366. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Section 8206(b) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (16 U.S.C. 2113a(b)) (as amended by section 8624(b)(2)(D)) is amended, in paragraph (4), by striking “monies received from” and inserting “monies or receipts received from or on account of”.

SA 3367. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 8503, strike subsection (b) and insert the following:

(b) **COMMUNITY CAPACITY AND LAND STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM.**—The National Forest Foundation Act is amended by inserting after section 406 (16 U.S.C. 583j-4) the following:

“SEC. 406A. COMMUNITY CAPACITY AND LAND STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM.

“The Foundation shall establish and administer a program, to be known as the ‘Community Capacity and Land Stewardship Program’, under which the Secretary may provide grants to collaborative groups and

community-based organizations to build the capacity of the collaborative group or community-based organization—

“(1) to implement landscape-scale restoration projects; and

“(2) to facilitate job creation and retention in the local economy of the collaborative group or community-based organization.”.

(c) **REPORT ON BEST PRACTICES.**—Section 407 of the National Forest Foundation Act (16 U.S.C. 583j-5) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) **REPORT ON BEST PRACTICES.**—

“(1) **REVIEW.**—The Foundation shall conduct a review of the organization and activities of collaboratives and groups carrying out collaborative processes to increase the quantity of projects or activities carried out on National Forest System land or public land.

“(2) **REPORT.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than September 30, 2019, subject to the availability of appropriations, the Foundation shall publish a report describing the findings of the review conducted under paragraph (1).

“(B) **CONTENT.**—At a minimum, the report under subparagraph (A) shall identify and describe the tools and best practices that are frequently used by the highest performing collaboratives and groups carrying out collaborative processes described in paragraph (1).”.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; ADDITIONAL FUNDS.**—Section 410 of the National Forest Foundation Act (16 U.S.C. 583j-8) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) **ADDITIONAL FUNDS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out sections 406A and 407(c) \$2,000,000 for fiscal year 2019 and each fiscal year thereafter.

“(2) **USE OF FUNDS.**—The Secretary shall make available to the Foundation the amounts appropriated under paragraph (1) to match, on a 1-for-1 basis, private contributions made to the Foundation to establish or administer the Community Capacity and Land Stewardship Program established under section 406A.”.

Strike section 8631 and insert the following:

SEC. 8631. COLLABORATIVE FOREST LANDSCAPE RESTORATION PROGRAM.

(a) **SELECTION OF NEW PROPOSALS.**—Section 4003(d) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (16 U.S.C. 7303(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (E), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) past performance.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) **SELECTION OF NEW PROPOSALS.**—During fiscal year 2019, the Secretary shall

“(A) cease all expenditures from the Fund for proposals selected prior to fiscal year 2019; and

“(B) subject to the availability of appropriations, select, in a manner consistent with this subsection, the best proposals that have been nominated during fiscal year 2019 under subsection (c).

“(5) **ANNUAL REEVALUATION.**—For each of fiscal years 2020 through 2030, the Secretary shall—

“(A) in accordance with subsection (g)(3), determine whether the targets included in a selected proposal for the fiscal year were achieved;

“(B) discontinue transferring amounts from the Fund to implement a selected pro-

posal that did not achieve any target during the preceding 2 fiscal years; and

“(C) subject to the availability of appropriations, select an additional proposal to replace a proposal that did not achieve any target during the preceding 2 fiscal years.”.

(b) **REMOVAL OF LIMITATIONS ON SELECTIONS.**—Section 4003(d)(3) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (16 U.S.C. 7303(d)(3)) is amended by striking “than—” and all that follows through “(C) the number” and inserting “than the number”.

(c) **NON-FEDERAL INVESTMENT IN THE PRIORITY LANDSCAPE.**—Section 4003(f)(4) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (16 U.S.C. 7303(f)(4)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) **NON-FEDERAL INVESTMENT.**—The Secretary shall not expend money from the Fund for a proposal if the investment made by the Secretary would comprise more than 50 percent of the total investment for carrying out the proposal.”.

(d) **REAUTHORIZATION.**—Section 4003(f)(6) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (16 U.S.C. 7303(f)(6)) is amended by inserting “and \$80,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2030” after “2019”.

(e) **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**—Section 4003(h) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (16 U.S.C. 7303(h)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively;

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

“(3) the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate;”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives.”.

SA 3368. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 8402 and insert the following:

SEC. 8402. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR HAZARDOUS FUEL REDUCTION ON FEDERAL LAND.

Section 108 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6518) is amended by striking “\$760,000,000” and inserting “\$1,000,000,000”.

SA 3369. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE — OUTSOURCING PREVENTION

SEC. — 01. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **COMMERCE.**—The term “commerce” means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several

States, or between the District of Columbia or any Territory of the United States and any State or other Territory, or between any foreign country and any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or within the District of Columbia or any Territory, or between points in the same State but through any other State or any Territory or the District of Columbia or any foreign country.

(2) **EMPLOYER.**—The term “employer” means any business entity with 1 or more locations in the United States that—

(A) is engaged in commerce, or in an industry affecting commerce; and

(B) employs—

(i) 50 or more employees, excluding part-time employees; or

(ii) 50 or more employees who in the aggregate work at least 2,000 hours per week (exclusive of hours of overtime).

(3) **FEDERAL AGENCY.**—The term “Federal agency” means an executive agency (as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code) and a military department (as defined in section 102 of such title).

(4) **OUTSOURCING.**—The term “outsourcing” means the closing, by an employer, of a site, facility, or operating unit in the United States and the opening of another site, facility, or operating unit by the employer in a foreign country.

(5) **PART-TIME EMPLOYEE.**—The term “part-time employee” means an employee who—

(A) is employed for an average of fewer than 20 hours per week; or

(B) has been employed for fewer than 6 of the 12 months preceding the date on which notice described in section 02(a)(1) is required.

(6) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Labor.

(7) **SITE, FACILITY, OR OPERATING UNIT.**—The term “site, facility, or operating unit” means a single site of employment or 1 or more facilities or operating units within a single site of employment.

SEC. 02. LIST OF OUTSOURCING EMPLOYERS.

(a) **NOTICE REQUIREMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—An employer that intends to engage in the outsourcing of a site, facility, or operating unit shall notify the Secretary not less than 120 days before such outsourcing.

(2) **DETERMINATION OF OUTSOURCING BY SECRETARY.**—The Secretary may investigate any instance where an employer is suspected of engaging in outsourcing described in paragraph (1) without providing the required notification. If the Secretary determines, after notice and an opportunity for a hearing, that the employer is in violation of paragraph (1), the Secretary—

(A) shall include the employer on the list of employers engaged in outsourcing, in accordance with subsection (b); and

(B) may assess a civil fine in accordance with paragraph (3).

(3) **FINE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an employer that fails to notify the Secretary under paragraph (1) by not less than 120 days before outsourcing a site, facility, or operating unit shall be subject to a civil fine in an amount not to exceed \$50,000 for each day that the required notice was not provided.

(B) **DEFENSE.**—An employer that has engaged in outsourcing a site, facility, or operating unit shall not be subject to a civil fine described in subparagraph (A) if the employer can demonstrate that—

(i) the employer created, by not later than 90 days after the date of the outsourcing of a site, facility, or operating unit, a number of new jobs in the United States that is equal to, or greater than, the number of jobs lost due to the outsourcing activity; and

(ii) on average, the new jobs offer substantially similar or improved wages and benefits, as compared to the jobs lost due to the outsourcing activity.

(b) **LIST.**—

(1) **COMPILATION.**—The Secretary shall compile, on a semiannual basis, a list of all employers that engage in outsourcing, as determined under paragraph (2).

(2) **EMPLOYER PLACEMENT ON LIST.**—In any case where the Secretary determines that an employer has engaged in outsourcing without creating an equal or greater number of substantially similar jobs before the end of the 90-day period described in subsection (a)(3)(B), the Secretary shall—

(A) include the employer on the next semiannual list compiled by the Secretary under paragraph (1); and

(B) keep the employer on subsequent semiannual lists for not less than the 5-year period beginning on the date on which the employer was first included on the list under subparagraph (A).

(3) **ADDITIONAL TERM.**—In any case where an employer included on the most recent list described in paragraph (1) engages in additional outsourcing activity without creating an equal or greater number of substantially similar jobs before the end of the 90-day period described in subsection (a)(3)(B)—

(A) the employer shall provide the notice required under subsection (a)(1) for each such additional outsourcing activity; and

(B) the 5-year period described in paragraph (2)(B) for such employer shall be calculated using the date that is 90 days after the beginning date for the most recent outsourcing activity.

(4) **DISTRIBUTION.**—The Secretary shall—

(A) post each list described in paragraph (1) on the website of the Department of Labor; and

(B) submit each such list to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 03. TREATMENT OF FEDERAL GRANTS AND GUARANTEED LOANS FOR OUTSOURCING EMPLOYERS.

(a) **INELIGIBILITY FOR FEDERAL GRANTS AND LOANS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the head of each Federal agency shall, before awarding any Federal grant, Federal loan, or Federal guaranteed loan to an employer—

(1) consult the most recent semiannual lists described in section 02(b)(1) for the 5 years preceding the date of the award determination; and

(2) if the employer appears on any such list, deem such employer to be ineligible for the Federal grant, Federal loan, or Federal guaranteed loan.

(b) **NON-OUTSOURCING CONDITION FOR ALL FEDERAL GRANTS AND LOANS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the head of each Federal agency shall ensure that any employer receiving a Federal grant, Federal loan, or Federal guaranteed loan from the Federal agency agree, as a condition of the grant or loan, that—

(A) the employer will not engage in outsourcing for the 10-year period following the receipt of the grant or loan; and

(B) if the employer is included on a semiannual list described in section 02(b)(1) during such period—

(i) in the case of a Federal grant, the employer shall repay the full amount of the grant immediately; and

(ii) in the case of a Federal loan or Federal guaranteed loan, the full amount of the loan shall become due as of the date of the employer's inclusion on the list, and the employer shall repay the loan immediately.

(2) **RETURN OF FUNDS.**—Any amounts repaid under paragraph (1) shall be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

(c) **APPLICABILITY.**—Subsections (a) and (b) shall apply with respect to all Federal grants, Federal loans, or Federal guaranteed loans awarded, entered into, or renewed on or after the effective date of this title.

SEC. 04. PROCUREMENT PREFERENCE FOR EMPLOYERS REMAINING IN THE UNITED STATES.

Any employer that appears on the most recent list compiled pursuant to section 02(b)(1)—

(1) shall be ineligible to enter into a contract with a Federal agency for the procurement of property or services; and

(2) shall be included on the List of Parties Excluded from Federal Procurement and Nonprocurement Programs maintained by the Administrator of General Services under part 9 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

SEC. 05. FEDERAL BENEFITS FOR WORKERS.

No provision of this title shall be construed to permit the withholding or denial of payments, compensation, or benefits under any other Federal law (including Federal unemployment compensation, disability payments, or worker retraining or readjustment funds) to workers employed by employers that engage in outsourcing.

SEC. 06. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title shall take effect beginning on the date that is 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 3370. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 4102(a), redesignate paragraph (3) as paragraph (4).

In section 4102(a), strike paragraph (2) and insert the following:

(2) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

“(5) **TRADITIONAL FOOD PURCHASES.**—Subject to the availability of appropriations to carry out this paragraph, the Secretary may purchase, subject to availability, bison meat, reindeer meat, wild salmon, and other traditional indigenous foods for recipients of food distributed under this subsection, including—

“(A) bison meat and reindeer meat from—

“(i) Native American bison or reindeer producers; and

“(ii) producer-owned cooperatives of bison and reindeer ranchers;

“(B) wild salmon from an eligible entity described in section 305(i)(1)(D) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1855(i)(1)(D));

“(C) blue cornmeal; and

“(D) wild rice.”;

(3) in paragraph (6), by striking subparagraph (F) and inserting the following:

“(F) **FUNDING.**—

“(i) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this paragraph \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.

“(ii) **APPROPRIATIONS IN ADVANCE.**—Only funds appropriated under clause (i) in advance specifically to carry out this paragraph shall be available to carry out this paragraph.”; and

SA 3371. Mr. ROBERTS (for Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. BROWN))

proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title I, add the following:

SEC. 11. OPTION TO CHANGE PRODUCER ELECTION.

Section 1115 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9015) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) OPTION TO CHANGE PRODUCER ELECTION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), for the 2021 crop year, all of the producers on a farm may make a 1-time, irrevocable election to change the election applicable to the producers on the farm under that subsection or subsection (c), as applicable, to price loss coverage or agriculture risk coverage, as applicable, which shall apply to the producers on the farm for each of the 2021, 2022, and 2023 crop years.”.

SA 3372. Mr. TILLIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3176 submitted by Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. MCCAIN) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 2 of the amendment, strike line 7 and insert the following:

ederal budget deficit reduction.

“(10) PROHIBITION ON PAYMENT OF PORTION OF PREMIUM BY CORPORATION FOR GRAPES USED FOR WINE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Effective beginning with the 2019 reinsurance year, notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle, the Corporation shall not pay any portion of the premium for a policy or plan of insurance for grapes used for wine under this subtitle.

“(B) DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Any savings realized as a result of subparagraph (A) shall be deposited in the Treasury and used for Federal budget deficit reduction.”.

SA 3373. Mr. TILLIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3176 submitted by Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. MCCAIN) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 1 of the amendment, strike line 2 and all that follows through page 2, line 7 and insert the following:

SEC. 11112. PROHIBITION ON PAYMENT OF PORTION OF PREMIUM BY CORPORATION FOR GRAPES USED FOR WINE.

Section 508(e) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(9) PROHIBITION ON PAYMENT OF PORTION OF PREMIUM BY CORPORATION FOR GRAPES USED FOR WINE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Effective beginning with the 2019 reinsurance year, notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle, the Corporation shall not pay any portion of the premium for a policy or plan of insurance for grapes used for wine under this subtitle.

“(B) DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Any savings realized as a result of subparagraph (A) shall be deposited in the Treasury and used for Federal budget deficit reduction.”.

SA 3374. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 61. WATER OR WASTE DISPOSAL GRANTS OR DIRECT OR GUARANTEED LOANS.

(a) ASSISTANCE FOR UNSERVED AND UNDERSERVED RURAL COMMUNITIES.—Section 306(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)) (as amended by section 6105) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(28) ASSISTANCE FOR UNSERVED AND UNDERSERVED RURAL COMMUNITIES.—

“(A) DEFINITION OF UNSERVED OR UNDERSERVED RURAL COMMUNITY.—In this paragraph, the term ‘unserved or underserved rural community’ means a rural area that, as determined by the Secretary, lacks the technical, financial, organizational, and managerial capacity to adequately operate, maintain, and effectively serve the population of the rural area.

“(B) WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL DIRECT LOANS.—The Secretary may make water and waste disposal direct loans under paragraph (1) to eligible entities described in subparagraph (C) at the interest rate applicable to areas where the median family income is below the poverty line, as determined under section 307(a)(3)(A), for projects for unserved or underserved rural communities.

“(C) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—To be eligible to receive a direct loan under subparagraph (B), an applicant shall be a contiguous or local utility outside of the unserved or underserved rural community to be served by the project funded by the direct loan that, as determined by the Secretary—

“(i) has a demonstrated experience and capacity in delivering water programs or wastewater programs under this Act;

“(ii) demonstrates the capacity to provide service to the applicable unserved or underserved rural community;

“(iii) demonstrates that—

“(I) the project funded by the direct loan is solely for the purpose of serving the applicable unserved or underserved rural community; and

“(II) the maximum financial benefit of the assistance under this paragraph will be conferred to that unserved or underserved rural community; and

“(iv) demonstrates that the applicable unserved or underserved rural community—

“(I) has willingly entered into a formal agreement with the applicant for service by the applicant; and

“(II) entered into the agreement described in subclause (I) with the understanding that the unserved or underserved rural community is eligible for water and waste disposal direct loans under paragraph (1) independently of any direct loan under this paragraph.”.

(b) DIRECT AND GUARANTEED LOANS.—Section 343(a)(13)(B) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1991(a)(13)(B)) is amended—

(1) by striking “For the purpose” and inserting the following:

“(i) GRANTS AND DIRECT LOANS.—For the purpose”;

(2) in clause (i) (as so designated)—

(A) by striking “and guaranteed”; and

(B) by striking “(24)” and inserting “(28)”;

and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) GUARANTEED LOANS.—For the purpose of water and waste disposal guaranteed loans provided under paragraphs (1) and (24) of section 306(a), the terms ‘rural’ and ‘rural area’ mean a city, town, or unincorporated area that has a population of not more than 50,000 inhabitants.”.

SA 3375. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 141, strike lines 15 through 21 and insert the following:

“(2) establish payments to provide an incentive for the use of practices, such as cover crops, no-till farming, nutrient management, resource-conserving crop rotations, and other similar practices approved under the program; and

SA 3376. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VIII, insert the following:

SEC. 8. REFORMS AND OVERSIGHT TO U.S. FOREST SERVICE CONTRACTING.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) H-2B NONIMMIGRANT.—The term “H-2B nonimmigrant” means a nonimmigrant described in section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(b)).

(2) PROSPECTIVE H-2B EMPLOYER.—The term “prospective H-2B employer” means a United States business that is considering employing 1 or more H-2B nonimmigrants.

(3) STATE WORKFORCE AGENCY.—Except as used in subsection (b), the term “State workforce agency” means the workforce agency of the State in which the prospective H-2B employer intends to employ H-2B nonimmigrants.

(b) DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.—

(1) RECRUITMENT.—As a component of the labor certification process required before H-2B nonimmigrants are offered employment through United States Forest Service timber or service contracts in the United States, the Secretary of Labor shall require all prospective H-2B employers, before submitting a petition to hire H-2B nonimmigrants, to conduct a robust effort to recruit United States workers, including—

(A) advertising at employment or job-placement events, such as job fairs;

(B) advertising with State or local workforce agencies, nonprofit organizations, or other appropriate entities, and working with such entities to identify potential employees;

(C) advertising in appropriate media, including local radio stations and commonly used, reputable Internet job-search sites;

(D) provide potential United States workers at least 30 days from the date on which a job announcement is posted (or such longer period as the State workforce considers appropriate) to apply for such employment in person, by mail, by email, or by facsimile machine;

(E) include a valid phone number that potential United States workers may call to get additional information about such employment opportunity; and

(F) such other recruitment strategies as the State workforce agency considers appropriate for the sector or positions for which H-2B nonimmigrants would be considered.

(2) SEPARATE PETITIONS.—A prospective H-2B employer shall submit a separate petition for each State in which the employer plans to employ H-2B nonimmigrants as part of a United States Forest Service timber or service contract for a period of 7 days or longer.

(c) STATE WORKFORCE AGENCIES.—The Secretary of Labor may not grant a temporary labor certification to a prospective H-2B employer seeking to employ H-2B nonimmigrants as part of a United States Forest Service timber or service contract until after the Director of the State workforce agency—

(1) has provided United States workers who may be interested in the position with application instructions;

(2) has formally consulted with the workforce agency director of each contiguous State listed on the prospective H-2B employer's application and determined that—

(A) the employer has complied with all recruitment requirements set forth in subsection (b) and there is a legitimate demand for the employment of H-2B nonimmigrants in each of those States; or

(B) the employer has amended the application by removing or making appropriate modifications with respect to the States in which the criteria set forth in subparagraph (A) have not been met;

(3) certifies that the prospective H-2B employer has complied with all recruitment requirements set forth in subsection (b) or any other applicable provision of law; and

(4) makes a formal determination and certifies to the Secretary of Labor that nationals of the United States are not qualified or available to fill the employment opportunities offered by the prospective H-2B employer.

SA 3377. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 1301(a), strike the subsection designation and all that follows through “(3) in subsection (1)” and insert the following:

(a) EXTENSION AND PROVISION FOR ENSURING ADEQUATE SUPPLIES AT REASONABLE PRICES.—Section 156 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(4), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”;

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”;

(3) in subsection (f)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by inserting “WHILE ENSURING ADEQUATE SUPPLIES AT

REASONABLE PRICES” after “FORFEITURES”; and

(B) in paragraph (1), by inserting “ensure adequate supplies of sugar at reasonable prices and” after “shall”; and

(4) in subsection (i)

In section 1301(b)(2), strike the paragraph designation and all that follows through “Section” and insert the following:

(2) ADMINISTRATION OF TARIFF-RATE QUOTAS.—Section 359k of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359kk) is repealed.

(3) EFFECTIVE PERIOD.—Section

SA 3378. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 9109 and insert the following:

SEC. 9109. FEEDSTOCK FLEXIBILITY PROGRAM FOR BIOENERGY PRODUCERS TERMINATION.

Section 9010 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8110) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) TERMINATION.—The Secretary may not carry out the feedstock flexibility program under subsection (b) for the 2019 or subsequent crops of eligible commodities.”.

SEC. 9110. SUGAR PROGRAM.

(a) LOAN RATES.—Section 156 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272) (as amended by section 1301(a)) is amended by striking subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the following:

“(a) SUGARCANE.—The Secretary shall make loans available to processors of domestically grown sugarcane at a rate equal to—

“(1) 18.75 cents per pound for raw cane sugar for the 2018 crop year; and

“(2) 18.00 cents per pound for raw cane sugar for the 2019 through 2023 crop years.

“(b) SUGAR BEETS.—The Secretary shall make loans available to processors of domestically grown sugar beets at a rate equal to 128.5 percent of the loan rate per pound of raw cane sugar for the applicable crop year under subsection (a) for each of the 2018 through 2023 crop years.”.

(b) AVOIDING FORFEITURES WHILE ENSURING ADEQUATE SUPPLIES AT REASONABLE PRICES.—Section 156(f) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272(f)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by inserting “WHILE ENSURING ADEQUATE SUPPLIES AT REASONABLE PRICES” after “FORFEITURES”; and

(2) in paragraph (1), by inserting “ensure adequate supplies of sugar at reasonable prices and” after “shall”.

SEC. 9111. ADMINISTRATION OF TARIFF-RATE QUOTAS.

Part VII of subtitle B of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359aa et seq.) (as amended by section 1301(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“PART VII—SUGAR

“SEC. 359. ADMINISTRATION OF TARIFF-RATE QUOTAS.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—At the beginning of fiscal year 2019 and each fiscal year thereafter through the end of the effective period

described in subsection (d), the Secretary shall establish the tariff-rate quotas for raw cane sugar and refined sugar to provide adequate supplies of sugar at reasonable prices, but at no less than the minimum level necessary to comply with obligations under international trade agreements that have been approved by Congress.

“(b) ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall adjust tariff-rate quotas established under subsection (a) in such a manner as to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that stocks of raw cane and refined beet sugar are adequate throughout the crop year to meet the needs of the marketplace, including the efficient utilization of cane refining capacity.

“(c) TRANSFER OF QUOTA SHARES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations that—

“(A) promote full use of the tariff-rate quotas for raw cane sugar and refined sugar and ensure adequate supplies for cane refiners in the United States; and

“(B) provide that any country that has been allocated a share of the quotas may temporarily transfer all or part of the share to any other country that has also been allocated a share of the quotas.

“(2) TRANSFERS VOLUNTARY.—Any transfer under this subsection shall be valid only pursuant to a voluntary agreement between the transferor and the transferee, consistent with procedures established by the Secretary.

“(3) LIMITATIONS ON TRANSFERS WITH RESPECT TO FISCAL YEAR.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Any transfer under this subsection shall be valid only for the duration of the fiscal year during which the transfer is made.

“(B) FOLLOWING FISCAL YEAR.—No transfer under this subsection shall affect the share of the quota allocated to the transferor or transferee for the following fiscal year.

“(d) EFFECTIVE PERIOD.—This section shall be effective for fiscal years only through the 2023 crop year for sugar.”.

SA 3379. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 8611, insert the following:

SEC. 8612. CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION FOR COLLABORATIVE RESTORATION PROJECTS.

(a) EXPANSION OF CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION TO FIRE REGIME IV.—Section 603(c) of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6591b(c)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) LOCATION.—

“(A) DEFINITION OF FIRE REGIME IV.—In this paragraph, the term ‘Fire Regime IV’ means an area in which historically there are stand replacement severity fires with a frequency of 35 to 100 years.

“(B) LOCATION.—A project under this section shall be limited to areas—

“(i) in the wildland-urban interface; or

“(ii) for projects located outside the wildland-urban interface, within condition class 2 or condition class 3 in—

“(I) fire regime I, fire regime II, or fire regime III; or

“(II) fire regime IV—

“(aa) if the Secretary determines, based on the best available scientific information,

that an authorized hazardous fuel reduction project is necessary to restore reference conditions and reduce the threat posed to the water quality of a municipal water supply, electrical transmission lines, or other infrastructure; and

“(bb) if the project does not include clearcutting regeneration, coppice, or even-aged methods (as those terms are defined in Forest Service Manual 2470 (as in effect on the date of enactment of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018)).”.

(b) ROADLESS AREA RESTRICTION.—Section 603(d) of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6591b(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) an inventoried roadless area.”.

SA 3380. Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. SCOTT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 4101, insert the following:

SEC. 410 . MULTIVITAMIN-MINERAL DIETARY SUPPLEMENTS ELIGIBLE FOR PURCHASE WITH SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012) is amended—

(1) in subsection (k)—

(A) by striking “and (9)” and inserting “(9)”; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, and (10) a multivitamin-mineral dietary supplement for home consumption”;

(2) by redesignating subsections (n) through (v) as subsections (o) through (w), respectively;

(3) by inserting after subsection (m) the following:

“(m) ‘Multivitamin-mineral dietary supplement’ means a substance that—

“(1) provides at least 50 percent of the vitamins and minerals for which the National Academy of Medicine establishes dietary reference intakes, at 50 percent or more of the daily value for the intended life stage per daily serving, as determined by the Food and Drug Administration; and

“(2) does not exceed the tolerable upper intake levels for the nutrients for which an established tolerable upper intake level is determined by the National Academy of Medicine.”; and

(4) in paragraph (2) of subsection (r) (as so redesignated), by striking “and spices” and inserting “spices, and multivitamin-mineral dietary supplements”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 27(a)(2) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2036(a)(2)) is amended in subparagraphs (C) and (E) by striking “3(u)(4)” each place it appears and inserting “3(v)(4)”.

On page 275, lines 3 and 4, strike “Section 3(v) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012(v))” and insert “Subsection (w) of section 3 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012) (as redesignated by section 41 (a)(2))”.

On page 312, strike lines 3 through 5.

On page 312, line 6, strike “(DD)” and insert “(CC)”.

On page 312, line 10, strike “(EE)” and insert “(DD)”.

On page 312, line 14, strike “(FF)” and insert “(EE)”.

Strike section 4116 and insert the following:

SEC. 4116. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) Section 3 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by striking “7(i)” and inserting “7(h)”; and

(2) in subsection (i), by striking “7(i)” and inserting “7(h)”.

(b) Section 9(c) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2018(c)) is amended in the third sentence by striking “to any used by” and inserting “to, and used by,”.

(c) Section 10 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2019) is amended in the first sentence by striking “or the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation” each place it appears.

(d) Section 18(e) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2027(e)) is amended in the first sentence by striking “7(f)” and inserting “7(e)”.

(e) Section 25(a)(1)(B)(i)(I) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2034(a)(1)(B)(i)(I)) is amended by striking “service;” and inserting “service;”.

SA 3381. Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 125 . SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO ANIMAL FIGHTING.

It is the sense of Congress that animal fighting should be prohibited in all United States territories.

SA 3382. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 4103 and insert the following:

SEC. 4103. WORK REQUIREMENTS FOR ABLE-BODIED ADULTS WITHOUT DEPENDENTS.

(a) DECLARATION OF POLICY.—Section 2 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011) is amended by adding at the end the following: “Congress further finds that it should also be the purpose of the supplemental nutrition assistance program to increase employment, to encourage healthy marriage, and to promote prosperous self-sufficiency, which means the ability of households to maintain an income above the poverty level without services and benefits from the Federal Government.”.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) FOOD.—Section 3(k) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012(k)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, except that a food, food product, meal, or other item described in this subsection shall be considered a food

under this Act only if it is an essential (as determined by the Secretary)”.

(2) SUPERVISED JOB SEARCH.—Section 3 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsections (t) through (v) as subsections (u) through (w), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subsection (s) the following:

“(t) SUPERVISED JOB SEARCH.—The term ‘supervised job search’ means a job search program that has the following characteristics:

“(1) The job search occurs at an official location where the presence and activity of the recipient can be directly observed, supervised, and monitored.

“(2) The entry, time onsite, and exit of the recipient from the official job search location are recorded in a manner that prevents fraud.

“(3) The recipient is expected to remain and undertake job search activities at the job search center.

“(4) The quantity of time the recipient is observed and monitored engaging in job search at the official location is recorded for purposes of compliance with the work and work activation requirements of sections 6(o) and 30.”.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 27(a)(2) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2036(a)(2)) is amended in subparagraphs (C) and (E) by striking “3(u)(4)” each place it appears and inserting “3(v)(4)”.

(c) WORK REQUIREMENT FOR ABLE-BODIED ADULTS WITHOUT DEPENDENTS.—Section 6(o) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(o)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “not less than 3 months (consecutive or otherwise)” and inserting “more than 1 month”; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking “or” at the end;

(C) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) participate in supervised job search for at least 8 hours per week.”;

(2) in paragraph (4), by adding at the end the following:

“(C) TERMINATION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to any fiscal year that begins after the effective date of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018.”;

(3) in paragraph (6)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “15-PERCENT” and inserting “5-PERCENT”;

(B) in subparagraph (A)(ii)(IV), by striking “3 months” and inserting “1 month”; and

(C) in subparagraph (D), by striking “15 percent” and inserting “5 percent”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) PROMOTING WORK.—As a condition of receiving supplemental nutrition assistance program funds under this Act, a State agency shall provide each individual subject to the work requirement of this subsection with the opportunity to participate in an activity selected by the State from among the options described in subparagraphs (B), (C), and (E) of paragraph (2).

“(9) PENALTIES FOR INADEQUATE STATE PERFORMANCE.—If a State agency fails to fully comply with this section, including the requirement to terminate the benefits of individuals who fail to fulfill the work requirements described in paragraph (2) during a fiscal quarter, the funding allotment of the State for the supplemental nutrition assistance program shall be reduced by 10 percent for the quarter that begins 180 days after the first day of the quarter in which the non-compliance occurred.”.

(d) WORK ACTIVATION PROGRAM FOR ADULTS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN.—The Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 30. WORK ACTIVATION PROGRAM FOR ADULTS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANT.—The term ‘eligible participant’ means an individual who, during a particular month, is—

“(A) a parent in a household with dependent children;

“(B) at least 19, and not more than 55, years of age;

“(C) not disabled;

“(D) a member of a household in which 1 or more parents or children receive supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits in the month;

“(E) a member of a household that received supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits for more than 3 months in the year; and

“(F) employed less than 100 hours in the month.

“(2) MARRIED COUPLE HOUSEHOLD.—The term ‘married couple household’ means a household that includes 2 eligible participants who are married to each other and have dependent children.

“(3) SUCCESSFUL ENGAGEMENT IN WORK ACTIVATION.—The term ‘successful engagement in work activation’ means—

“(A) in the case of an individual who is eligible and required to participate in interim work activation, performance during the month that fulfills the activity and hour requirements of subsection (c);

“(B) in the case of an individual who is required to participate in full work activation, performance during the month that fulfills the activity and hour requirements of subsection (d); and

“(C) in the case of an individual who meets the eligibility criteria described in subsection (e)(1), performance that fulfills the activity and hour requirements of that subsection.

“(4) WORK AND WORK PREPARATION ACTIVITIES.—The term ‘work and work preparation activities’ means—

“(A) unsubsidized employment;

“(B) subsidized private sector employment;

“(C) subsidized public sector employment;

“(D) work experience (including work associated with the refurbishing of publicly assisted housing) if sufficient private sector employment is not available;

“(E) on-the-job training;

“(F) job readiness assistance;

“(G) a community service program;

“(H) vocational educational training (not to exceed 1 year with respect to any individual);

“(I) job skills training directly related to employment;

“(J) education directly related to employment, in the case of a recipient who has not received a high school diploma or a certificate of high school equivalency;

“(K) satisfactory attendance at secondary school or in a course of study leading to a certificate of general equivalence, in the case of a recipient who has not completed secondary school or received such a certificate;

“(L) the provision of child care services to an individual who is participating in a community service program;

“(M) workfare under section 20; and

“(N) supervised job search.

“(b) WORK ACTIVATION PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of receiving supplemental nutrition assistance program funds under this Act, a State agency shall be required to operate a work activation program for eligible participants.

“(2) SPECIAL RULES FOR MARRIED COUPLE HOUSEHOLDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of eligible participants who are spouses in a married couple household—

“(i) the work activation requirement of this section shall apply only if the sum of the combined current employment of both spouses is less than 100 hours per month; and

“(ii) both spouses shall be considered to have achieved successful engagement in the work activation program if either spouse fulfills the work activation requirements described in subsection (c), (d), or (e)(1).

“(B) TOTAL REQUIRED HOURS.—The total combined number of hours of required work and work preparation activities for both spouses in a married couple household shall not be greater than the total number of hours required for a single head of household.

“(C) REQUIREMENT.—In carrying out this section, a State agency shall ensure that, for any month—

“(i) the proportion that—

“(I) the number of married couple households that are required to participate in work activation under this section in a month; bears to

“(II) the number of all households that are required to participate in work activation under this section in the same month; is not greater than—

“(ii) the proportion that—

“(I) the number of all married couple households with eligible participants in the month; bears to

“(II) the number of all households with eligible participants in the same month.

“(c) SHORT-TERM INTERIM WORK ACTIVATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A State agency may require eligible participants who meet the criteria in paragraph (2) to engage in—

“(A) interim work activation as described in this subsection; or

“(B) full work activation as described in subsection (d).

“(2) ELIGIBILITY.—A State agency may require an eligible participant to participate in interim work activation instead of full work activation if the eligible participant has not engaged in work activation under this section in the preceding 3 years.

“(3) REQUIRED JOB SEARCH.—A participant in interim work activation shall be required—

“(A) to participate in supervised job search for at least 6 hours per week; and

“(B) to engage in such additional activities as the State agency may require.

“(4) TIME LIMIT ON INTERIM WORK ACTIVATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible participant shall not participate in interim work activation for more than 3 months.

“(B) ADDITIONAL TIME.—After an eligible participant has participated in interim work activation for 3 months, the State agency shall require the eligible participant—

“(i) to maintain at least 100 hours of employment per month; or

“(ii) to participate in full work activation.

“(d) FULL WORK ACTIVATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of receiving supplemental nutrition assistance program funds under this Act, a State agency shall require all or part of the eligible participants in the State to engage in full work activation under this section.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—An eligible participant who is required to participate in full work activation in a month shall be required to engage in 1 or more work and work preparation activities for an average of 100 hours per month.

“(3) LIMITATION.—Of the total number of required hours described in paragraph (2),

not fewer than 20 hours per week shall be attributable to an activity described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), (H), (L), (M), or (N) of subsection (a)(4).

“(4) PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY SERVICE OR WORKFARE.—At least 10 percent of the eligible participants that a State requires to participate in full work activation under this section shall be required to participate in activities described in subparagraph (D), (G), or (M) of subsection (a)(4).

“(5) WORK ACTIVATION NOT EMPLOYMENT.—Other than unsubsidized employment described in subsection (a)(4)(A), participation in work and work preparation activities under this section shall not be—

“(A) considered to be employment; or

“(B) subject to any law pertaining to wages, compensation, hours, or conditions of employment under any law administered by the Secretary of Labor.

“(6) ADDITIONAL REQUIRED ACTIVITY.—Except as provided in subsection (g), nothing in this section prevents a State from requiring more than 100 hours per month of participation in work and work preparation activities.

“(e) LIMITATIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—

“(1) SINGLE TEEN HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD OR MARRIED TEEN WHO MAINTAINS SATISFACTORY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE.—For purposes of determining monthly participation rates under this section, an eligible participant who is married or a head of household and who has not attained 20 years of age shall be considered to have completed successful engagement in work activation for a month if the eligible participant—

“(A) maintains satisfactory attendance at secondary school or the equivalent during the month; or

“(B) participates in education directly related to employment for an average of at least 20 hours per week during the month.

“(2) LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF PERSONS WHO MAY BE TREATED AS ENGAGED IN WORK ACTIVATION BY REASON OF PARTICIPATION IN EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES.—For purposes of determining monthly participation rates under this section, not more than 30 percent of the number of individuals in a State who are treated as having completed successful engagement in work activation for a month may be individuals who are determined to be engaged in work activation for the month by reason of participation in vocational educational training.

“(f) STATE OPTION FOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENT EXEMPTIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For any fiscal year, a State agency, at the option of the State agency, may—

“(A) exempt a household that includes a child who has not attained 12 months of age from engaging in work activation; and

“(B) disregard that household in determining the monthly participation rates under this section until the child has attained 12 months of age.

“(2) EXCLUSION.—For purposes of determining monthly participation rates under this section, a household that includes a child who has not attained 6 years of age shall be considered to be successfully engaged in work activation for a month if a member of the household receiving supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits is engaged in work activation for an average of at least 20 hours per week during the month.

“(g) PENALTIES AGAINST INDIVIDUALS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), if an eligible participant in a household receiving assistance under the State program funded under this section fails to complete successful engagement in work activation in accordance with this section, the State agency shall—

“(A) in accordance with paragraph (2), reduce the amount of assistance otherwise payable to the entire household pro rata (or more, at the option of the State agency) with respect to the month immediately after any month in which the eligible participant fails to perform; or

“(B) terminate the assistance entirely.

“(2) PRO RATA REDUCTION.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(A), the amount of the pro rata reduction shall equal the product obtained by multiplying—

“(A) the normal monthly amount of assistance to the entire household that would have been received if not for the reduction under paragraph (1)(A); by

“(B) the proportion that—

“(i) the hours of required work and work preparation activities performed by the eligible participant during the month; bears to

“(ii) the number or hours of work and work preparation activities the State agency required the eligible participant to perform in accordance with this section.

“(3) EXCEPTION.—A State may not reduce or terminate assistance under the State program funded under this section or any other State program funded with qualified State expenditures (as defined in section 409(a)(7)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 609(a)(7)(B))) based on a refusal of an eligible participant to engage in work and work preparation activities required under this section if—

“(A) the eligible participant is a single custodial parent caring for a child who has not attained 6 years of age; and

“(B) the eligible participant proves that the eligible participant has a demonstrated inability (as determined by the State agency) to obtain needed child care, due to—

“(i) unavailability of appropriate child care within a reasonable distance from the home or work site of the eligible participant; or

“(ii) unavailability of all affordable child care arrangements, including formal child care and all informal child care by a relative or under other arrangements.

“(h) LIMITATION ON HOURS OF REQUIRED PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY SERVICE OR WORKFARE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The maximum number of hours during a month that an eligible participant shall be required under this section to work in a community service program or a workfare program under section 20 shall not exceed the quotient obtained by dividing—

“(A) the total dollar cost of all means-tested benefits received by the household for that month, as determined under paragraph (2); by

“(B) the Federal minimum wage.

“(2) TOTAL DOLLAR COST OF ALL MEANS-TESTED BENEFITS DEFINED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the total dollar cost of all means-tested benefits shall equal the sum of the dollar cost of all benefits received by the household from—

“(i) the supplemental nutrition assistance program;

“(ii) the State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) or any other State program funded with qualified State expenditures (as defined in section 409(a)(7)(B)(i) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 609(a)(7)(B)(i))); and

“(iii) any assistance provided to a household, landlord, or public housing agency (as defined in section 3(b)(6) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)(6))) to subsidize the rental payment for a dwelling unit, including assistance provided for public housing dwelling units under section 3 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a) and assistance provided under section 8 of that Act (42 U.S.C. 1437f).

“(B) VALUE OF BENEFITS DURING SANCTION.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), if the dollar value of 1 or more benefits received by a household in a month has been reduced under subsection (g) or another sanction requirement, the calculated dollar value of the sanctioned benefits shall equal the dollar value of the benefit that would have been received if the benefit had not been reduced by the sanction.

“(3) ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES.—Nothing in this subsection prevents a State agency from requiring an eligible participant to engage in activities not described in paragraph (1) for additional hours during the month.

“(i) WORK ACTIVATION PARTICIPATION GOALS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of receiving supplemental nutrition assistance program funds under this Act, except as provided in paragraph (2), a State agency shall achieve for each quarter of the fiscal year with respect to all eligible participants receiving assistance under the State program funded under this section for that fiscal year at least the participation rate specified in the following table:

“If the fiscal year is:	The quarterly participation rate shall be at least:
2019	20 percent
2020	35 percent
2021	50 percent
2022	65 percent
2023	80 percent.

“(2) ADJUSTMENT IF RECESSIONARY PERIOD.—If the average national unemployment rate during a quarter of a fiscal year, as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, is more than 8 percent, the participation goal for the immediately succeeding quarter shall equal the product obtained by multiplying—

“(A) the applicable quarterly participation rate under paragraph (1); by

“(B) 0.8.

“(j) CALCULATION OF WORK ACTIVATION PARTICIPATION RATES.—

“(1) DEFINITION OF SANCTIONED RECIPIENT.—In this subsection, the term ‘sanctioned recipient’ means any eligible participant who—

“(A) was required to participate in work activation in a month;

“(B) failed to perform the assigned work and work preparation activities so as to meet the relevant hourly requirements in subsection (c), (d), or (e)(2); and

“(C) was sanctioned by a reduced benefit payment in the subsequent month under subsection (g).

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The work activation participation rate for a State for any quarter of a fiscal year shall equal the average of the monthly participation rates for the State during the 3 months of that quarter.

“(3) MONTHLY PARTICIPATION RATE.—For purposes of paragraph (2), the monthly participation rate shall equal the ratio of all countable participants to all eligible participants in the month, as determined under paragraph (4).

“(4) RATIO OF ALL COUNTABLE PARTICIPANTS TO ALL ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS.—Subject to paragraph (5), the ratio of all countable participants to all eligible participants in a month equals the proportion that—

“(A) the sum obtained by adding—

“(i) all eligible participants who—

“(I) were required by the State to engage in interim work activation, full work activation, or education under subsection (e)(1) during the month; and

“(II) fulfilled the criteria for successful engagement in work activation for that activity during the month; and

“(ii) all sanctioned recipients for that month; bears to

“(B) the average number of eligible participants in the State in that month.

“(5) MULTIPLE ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS.—A married couple household consisting of more than 1 eligible participant shall be counted as a single eligible participant for purposes of calculating the participation rate under this subsection.

“(k) PENALTIES FOR INADEQUATE STATE PERFORMANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning in the first quarter of fiscal year 2020 and for each subsequent quarter of fiscal year 2020 and of each subsequent fiscal year, each State shall count the monthly average number of countable participants under this section.

“(2) REDUCTION IN FUNDING.—If the monthly average number of countable participants in a State of a fiscal year is not sufficient to fulfill the relevant work activation participation goal under subsection (i) during that quarter, the supplemental nutrition assistance program funding for the State under this Act shall be reduced for the fiscal quarter that begins 180 days after the first day of the quarter in which the inadequate performance occurred in accordance with paragraph (3).

“(3) FUNDING IN PENALIZED QUARTER.—The total amount of funding a State shall receive for all households with eligible participants for a quarter for which funding is reduced under paragraph (2) shall equal the product obtained by multiplying—

“(A) the total amount of funding that the State would have received in the preceding quarter for all households with eligible participants if no reduction had been in place; by

“(B) the ratio of all countable participants to all eligible participants (as determined under subsection (j)(4)) for the quarter that began 180 days before the first day of the quarter for which funding is reduced.

“(l) FUNDING TO ADMINISTER WORK ACTIVATION.—

“(1) TANF FUNDING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 2019 and each subsequent fiscal year, a State that receives supplemental nutrition assistance program funds under this Act may use during that fiscal year to carry out the work activation program of the State under this section—

“(i) any of the Federal funds available to the State through the State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) in that fiscal year; and

“(ii) any of the funds from State sources allocated to the operation of the program described in clause (i).

“(B) EFFECT.—Any State that uses State funds allocated to the State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) to administer the work activation program of that State under this section may treat those funds as qualified State expenditures (as defined in section 409(a)(7)(B)(i) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 609(a)(7)(B)(i))) for purposes of meeting the requirements of section 409(a)(7) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 609(a)(7)) in that fiscal year.

“(2) WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT FUNDING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 2019 and each subsequent fiscal year, a State that receives Federal funds under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.) may use up to 50 percent of those funds during that fiscal year to carry out the work activation program of the State under this section.

“(3) SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 2019 and each subsequent fiscal year, a State that receives Federal funds under this Act for an employment and training program under section 6(d) may use those funds during that fiscal year to carry out the work activation program of the State under this section.”.

(e) IDENTIFICATION FOR CARD USE.—Section 7(h)(9) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(h)(9)) is amended—

(1) in the paragraph heading, by striking “OPTIONAL PHOTOGRAPHIC IDENTIFICATION” and inserting “IDENTIFICATION FOR CARD USE”;

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(3) by inserting before clause (i) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(A) LISTED BENEFICIARIES.—A State agency shall require that an electronic benefit card lists the names of—

“(i) the head of the household;

“(ii) each adult member of the household; and

“(iii) each adult that is not a member of the household that is authorized to use that card.

“(B) PHOTOGRAPHIC IDENTIFICATION REQUIRED.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under clause (ii), any individual listed on an electronic benefit card under subparagraph (A) shall be required to show photographic identification at the point of sale when using the card.

“(ii) HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD.—A head of a household is not required to show photographic identification under clause (i) if the electronic benefit card contains a photograph of that individual under subparagraph (C)(i).

“(C) OPTIONAL PHOTOGRAPHIC IDENTIFICATION.—”;

(4) in subparagraph (C) (as so designated)—
(A) in clause (i) (as so redesignated), by striking “1 or more members of a” and inserting “the head of the”; and

(B) in clause (ii) (as so redesignated)—

(i) by striking “subparagraph (A)” and inserting “clause (i)”; and

(ii) by inserting “subject to subparagraph (B)(i)” after “the card”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) VISUAL VERIFICATION.—Any individual that is shown photographic identification or an electronic benefit card containing a photograph, as applicable, under subparagraph (B) shall visually confirm that the photograph on the identification or the electronic benefit card, as applicable, is a clear and accurate likeness of the individual using the electronic benefit card.”.

SA 3383. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. LEE, and Mr. INHOFE) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike section 4103 and insert the following:

SEC. 4103. WORK REQUIREMENTS FOR ABLE-BODIED ADULTS WITHOUT DEPENDENTS.

(a) DECLARATION OF POLICY.—Section 2 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011) is amended by adding at the end the following: “Congress further finds that it should also be the purpose of the supplemental nutrition assistance program to increase employment, to encourage healthy

marriage, and to promote prosperous self-sufficiency, which means the ability of households to maintain an income above the poverty level without services and benefits from the Federal Government.”.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) FOOD.—Section 3(k) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012(k)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, except that a food, food product, meal, or other item described in this subsection shall be considered a food under this Act only if it is an essential (as determined by the Secretary)”.

(2) SUPERVISED JOB SEARCH.—Section 3 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsections (t) through (v) as subsections (u) through (w), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subsection (s) the following:

“(t) SUPERVISED JOB SEARCH.—The term ‘supervised job search’ means a job search program that has the following characteristics:

“(1) The job search occurs at an official location where the presence and activity of the recipient can be directly observed, supervised, and monitored.

“(2) The entry, time onsite, and exit of the recipient from the official job search location are recorded in a manner that prevents fraud.

“(3) The recipient is expected to remain and undertake job search activities at the job search center.

“(4) The quantity of time the recipient is observed and monitored engaging in job search at the official location is recorded for purposes of compliance with the work and work activation requirements of sections 6(o) and 30.”.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 27(a)(2) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2036(a)(2)) is amended in subparagraphs (C) and (E) by striking “3(u)(4)” each place it appears and inserting “3(v)(4)”.

(c) WORK REQUIREMENT FOR ABLE-BODIED ADULTS WITHOUT DEPENDENTS.—Section 6(o) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(o)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “not less than 3 months (consecutive or otherwise)” and inserting “more than 1 month”;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking “or” at the end;

(C) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) participate in supervised job search for at least 8 hours per week.”;

(2) in paragraph (4), by adding at the end the following:

“(C) TERMINATION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to any fiscal year that begins after the effective date of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018.”;

(3) in paragraph (6)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “15-PERCENT” and inserting “5-PERCENT”;

(B) in subparagraph (A)(ii)(IV), by striking “3 months” and inserting “1 month”; and

(C) in subparagraph (D), by striking “15 percent” and inserting “5 percent”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) PROMOTING WORK.—As a condition of receiving supplemental nutrition assistance program funds under this Act, a State agency shall provide each individual subject to the work requirement of this subsection with the opportunity to participate in an activity selected by the State from among the options described in subparagraphs (B), (C), and (E) of paragraph (2).

“(9) PENALTIES FOR INADEQUATE STATE PERFORMANCE.—If a State agency fails to fully comply with this section, including the requirement to terminate the benefits of individuals who fail to fulfill the work requirements described in paragraph (2) during a fiscal quarter, the funding allotment of the State for the supplemental nutrition assistance program shall be reduced by 10 percent for the quarter that begins 180 days after the first day of the quarter in which the non-compliance occurred.”.

(d) WORK ACTIVATION PROGRAM FOR ADULTS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN.—The Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 30. WORK ACTIVATION PROGRAM FOR ADULTS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANT.—The term ‘eligible participant’ means an individual who, during a particular month, is—

“(A) a parent in a household with dependent children;

“(B) at least 19, and not more than 55, years of age;

“(C) not disabled;

“(D) a member of a household in which 1 or more parents or children receive supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits in the month;

“(E) a member of a household that received supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits for more than 3 months in the year; and

“(F) employed less than 100 hours in the month.

“(2) MARRIED COUPLE HOUSEHOLD.—The term ‘married couple household’ means a household that includes 2 eligible participants who are married to each other and have dependent children.

“(3) SUCCESSFUL ENGAGEMENT IN WORK ACTIVATION.—The term ‘successful engagement in work activation’ means—

“(A) in the case of an individual who is eligible and required to participate in interim work activation, performance during the month that fulfills the activity and hour requirements of subsection (c);

“(B) in the case of an individual who is required to participate in full work activation, performance during the month that fulfills the activity and hour requirements of subsection (d); and

“(C) in the case of an individual who meets the eligibility criteria described in subsection (e)(1), performance that fulfills the activity and hour requirements of that subsection.

“(4) WORK AND WORK PREPARATION ACTIVITIES.—The term ‘work and work preparation activities’ means—

“(A) unsubsidized employment;

“(B) subsidized private sector employment;

“(C) subsidized public sector employment;

“(D) work experience (including work associated with the refurbishing of publicly assisted housing) if sufficient private sector employment is not available;

“(E) on-the-job training;

“(F) job readiness assistance;

“(G) a community service program;

“(H) vocational educational training (not to exceed 1 year with respect to any individual);

“(I) job skills training directly related to employment;

“(J) education directly related to employment, in the case of a recipient who has not received a high school diploma or a certificate of high school equivalency;

“(K) satisfactory attendance at secondary school or in a course of study leading to a certificate of general equivalence, in the case of a recipient who has not completed

secondary school or received such a certificate;

“(L) the provision of child care services to an individual who is participating in a community service program;

“(M) workfare under section 20; and

“(N) supervised job search.

“(b) WORK ACTIVATION PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of receiving supplemental nutrition assistance program funds under this Act, a State agency shall be required to operate a work activation program for eligible participants.

“(2) SPECIAL RULES FOR MARRIED COUPLE HOUSEHOLDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of eligible participants who are spouses in a married couple household—

“(i) the work activation requirement of this section shall apply only if the sum of the combined current employment of both spouses is less than 100 hours per month; and

“(ii) both spouses shall be considered to have achieved successful engagement in the work activation program if either spouse fulfills the work activation requirements described in subsection (c), (d), or (e)(1).

“(B) TOTAL REQUIRED HOURS.—The total combined number of hours of required work and work preparation activities for both spouses in a married couple household shall not be greater than the total number of hours required for a single head of household.

“(C) REQUIREMENT.—In carrying out this section, a State agency shall ensure that, for any month—

“(i) the proportion that—

“(I) the number of married couple households that are required to participate in work activation under this section in a month; bears to

“(II) the number of all households that are required to participate in work activation under this section in the same month; is not greater than—

“(ii) the proportion that—

“(I) the number of all married couple households with eligible participants in the month; bears to

“(II) the number of all households with eligible participants in the same month.

“(C) SHORT-TERM INTERIM WORK ACTIVATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A State agency may require eligible participants who meet the criteria in paragraph (2) to engage in—

“(A) interim work activation as described in this subsection; or

“(B) full work activation as described in subsection (d).

“(2) ELIGIBILITY.—A State agency may require an eligible participant to participate in interim work activation instead of full work activation if the eligible participant has not engaged in work activation under this section in the preceding 3 years.

“(3) REQUIRED JOB SEARCH.—A participant in interim work activation shall be required—

“(A) to participate in supervised job search for at least 6 hours per week; and

“(B) to engage in such additional activities as the State agency may require.

“(4) TIME LIMIT ON INTERIM WORK ACTIVATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible participant shall not participate in interim work activation for more than 3 months.

“(B) ADDITIONAL TIME.—After an eligible participant has participated in interim work activation for 3 months, the State agency shall require the eligible participant—

“(i) to maintain at least 100 hours of employment per month; or

“(ii) to participate in full work activation.

“(d) FULL WORK ACTIVATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of receiving supplemental nutrition assistance program funds under this Act, a State agency shall require all or part of the eligible participants in the State to engage in full work activation under this section.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—An eligible participant who is required to participate in full work activation in a month shall be required to engage in 1 or more work and work preparation activities for an average of 100 hours per month.

“(3) LIMITATION.—Of the total number of required hours described in paragraph (2), not fewer than 20 hours per week shall be attributable to an activity described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), (H), (L), (M), or (N) of subsection (a)(4).

“(4) PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY SERVICE OR WORKFARE.—At least 10 percent of the eligible participants that a State requires to participate in full work activation under this section shall be required to participate in activities described in subparagraph (D), (G), or (M) of subsection (a)(4).

“(5) WORK ACTIVATION NOT EMPLOYMENT.—Other than unsubsidized employment described in subsection (a)(4)(A), participation in work and work preparation activities under this section shall not be—

“(A) considered to be employment; or

“(B) subject to any law pertaining to wages, compensation, hours, or conditions of employment under any law administered by the Secretary of Labor.

“(6) ADDITIONAL REQUIRED ACTIVITY.—Except as provided in subsection (g), nothing in this section prevents a State from requiring more than 100 hours per month of participation in work and work preparation activities.

“(e) LIMITATIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—

“(1) SINGLE TEEN HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD OR MARRIED TEEN WHO MAINTAINS SATISFACTORY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE.—For purposes of determining monthly participation rates under this section, an eligible participant who is married or a head of household and who has not attained 20 years of age shall be considered to have completed successful engagement in work activation for a month if the eligible participant—

“(A) maintains satisfactory attendance at secondary school or the equivalent during the month; or

“(B) participates in education directly related to employment for an average of at least 20 hours per week during the month.

“(2) LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF PERSONS WHO MAY BE TREATED AS ENGAGED IN WORK ACTIVATION BY REASON OF PARTICIPATION IN EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES.—For purposes of determining monthly participation rates under this section, not more than 30 percent of the number of individuals in a State who are treated as having completed successful engagement in work activation for a month may be individuals who are determined to be engaged in work activation for the month by reason of participation in vocational educational training.

“(f) STATE OPTION FOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENT EXEMPTIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For any fiscal year, a State agency, at the option of the State agency, may—

“(A) exempt a household that includes a child who has not attained 12 months of age from engaging in work activation; and

“(B) disregard that household in determining the monthly participation rates under this section until the child has attained 12 months of age.

“(2) EXCLUSION.—For purposes of determining monthly participation rates under this section, a household that includes a child who has not attained 6 years of age shall be considered to be successfully en-

gaged in work activation for a month if a member of the household receiving supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits is engaged in work activation for an average of at least 20 hours per week during the month.

“(g) PENALTIES AGAINST INDIVIDUALS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), if an eligible participant in a household receiving assistance under the State program funded under this section fails to complete successful engagement in work activation in accordance with this section, the State agency shall—

“(A) in accordance with paragraph (2), reduce the amount of assistance otherwise payable to the entire household pro rata (or more, at the option of the State agency) with respect to the month immediately after any month in which the eligible participant fails to perform; or

“(B) terminate the assistance entirely.

“(2) PRO RATA REDUCTION.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(A), the amount of the pro rata reduction shall equal the product obtained by multiplying—

“(A) the normal monthly amount of assistance to the entire household that would have been received if not for the reduction under paragraph (1)(A); by

“(B) the proportion that—

“(i) the hours of required work and work preparation activities performed by the eligible participant during the month; bears to

“(ii) the number or hours of work and work preparation activities the State agency required the eligible participant to perform in accordance with this section.

“(3) EXCEPTION.—A State may not reduce or terminate assistance under the State program funded under this section or any other State program funded with qualified State expenditures (as defined in section 409(a)(7)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 609(a)(7)(B))) based on a refusal of an eligible participant to engage in work and work preparation activities required under this section if—

“(A) the eligible participant is a single custodial parent caring for a child who has not attained 6 years of age; and

“(B) the eligible participant proves that the eligible participant has a demonstrated inability (as determined by the State agency) to obtain needed child care, due to—

“(i) unavailability of appropriate child care within a reasonable distance from the home or work site of the eligible participant; or

“(ii) unavailability of all affordable child care arrangements, including formal child care and all informal child care by a relative or under other arrangements.

“(h) LIMITATION ON HOURS OF REQUIRED PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY SERVICE OR WORKFARE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The maximum number of hours during a month that an eligible participant shall be required under this section to work in a community service program or a workfare program under section 20 shall not exceed the quotient obtained by dividing—

“(A) the total dollar cost of all means-tested benefits received by the household for that month, as determined under paragraph (2); by

“(B) the Federal minimum wage.

“(2) TOTAL DOLLAR COST OF ALL MEANS-TESTED BENEFITS DEFINED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the total dollar cost of all means-tested benefits shall equal the sum of the dollar cost of all benefits received by the household from—

“(i) the supplemental nutrition assistance program;

“(ii) the State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42

U.S.C. 601 et seq.) or any other State program funded with qualified State expenditures (as defined in section 409(a)(7)(B)(i) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 609(a)(7)(B)(i))); and

“(iii) any assistance provided to a household, landlord, or public housing agency (as defined in section 3(b)(6) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)(6))) to subsidize the rental payment for a dwelling unit, including assistance provided for public housing dwelling units under section 3 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a) and assistance provided under section 8 of that Act (42 U.S.C. 1437f).

“(B) VALUE OF BENEFITS DURING SANCTION.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), if the dollar value of 1 or more benefits received by a household in a month has been reduced under subsection (g) or another sanction requirement, the calculated dollar value of the sanctioned benefits shall equal the dollar value of the benefit that would have been received if the benefit had not been reduced by the sanction.

“(3) ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES.—Nothing in this subsection prevents a State agency from requiring an eligible participant to engage in activities not described in paragraph (1) for additional hours during the month.

“(i) WORK ACTIVATION PARTICIPATION GOALS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of receiving supplemental nutrition assistance program funds under this Act, except as provided in paragraph (2), a State agency shall achieve for each quarter of the fiscal year with respect to all eligible participants receiving assistance under the State program funded under this section for that fiscal year at least the participation rate specified in the following table:

“If the fiscal year is:	The quarterly participation rate shall be at least:
2019	20 percent
2020	35 percent
2021	50 percent
2022	65 percent
2023	80 percent.

“(2) ADJUSTMENT IF RECESSIONARY PERIOD.—If the average national unemployment rate during a quarter of a fiscal year, as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, is more than 8 percent, the participation goal for the immediately succeeding quarter shall equal the product obtained by multiplying—

“(A) the applicable quarterly participation rate under paragraph (1); by

“(B) 0.8.

“(j) CALCULATION OF WORK ACTIVATION PARTICIPATION RATES.—

“(1) DEFINITION OF SANCTIONED RECIPIENT.—In this subsection, the term ‘sanctioned recipient’ means any eligible participant who—

“(A) was required to participate in work activation in a month;

“(B) failed to perform the assigned work and work preparation activities so as to meet the relevant hourly requirements in subsection (c), (d), or (e)(2); and

“(C) was sanctioned by a reduced benefit payment in the subsequent month under subsection (g).

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The work activation participation rate for a State for any quarter of a fiscal year shall equal the average of the monthly participation rates for the State during the 3 months of that quarter.

“(3) MONTHLY PARTICIPATION RATE.—For purposes of paragraph (2), the monthly participation rate shall equal the ratio of all countable participants to all eligible partici-

pants in the month, as determined under paragraph (4).

“(4) RATIO OF ALL COUNTABLE PARTICIPANTS TO ALL ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS.—Subject to paragraph (5), the ratio of all countable participants to all eligible participants in a month equals the proportion that—

“(A) the sum obtained by adding—

“(i) all eligible participants who—

“(I) were required by the State to engage in interim work activation, full work activation, or education under subsection (e)(1) during the month; and

“(II) fulfilled the criteria for successful engagement in work activation for that activity during the month; and

“(ii) all sanctioned recipients for that month; bears to

“(B) the average number of eligible participants in the State in that month.

“(5) MULTIPLE ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS.—A married couple household consisting of more than 1 eligible participant shall be counted as a single eligible participant for purposes of calculating the participation rate under this subsection.

“(k) PENALTIES FOR INADEQUATE STATE PERFORMANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning in the first quarter of fiscal year 2020 and for each subsequent quarter of fiscal year 2020 and of each subsequent fiscal year, each State shall count the monthly average number of countable participants under this section.

“(2) REDUCTION IN FUNDING.—If the monthly average number of countable participants in a State of a fiscal year is not sufficient to fulfill the relevant work activation participation goal under subsection (i) during that quarter, the supplemental nutrition assistance program funding for the State under this Act shall be reduced for the fiscal quarter that begins 180 days after the first day of the quarter in which the inadequate performance occurred in accordance with paragraph (3).

“(3) FUNDING IN PENALIZED QUARTER.—The total amount of funding a State shall receive for all households with eligible participants for a quarter for which funding is reduced under paragraph (2) shall equal the product obtained by multiplying—

“(A) the total amount of funding that the State would have received in the preceding quarter for all households with eligible participants if no reduction had been in place; by

“(B) the ratio of all countable participants to all eligible participants (as determined under subsection (j)(4)) for the quarter that began 180 days before the first day of the quarter for which funding is reduced.

“(l) FUNDING TO ADMINISTER WORK ACTIVATION.—

“(1) TANF FUNDING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 2019 and each subsequent fiscal year, a State that receives supplemental nutrition assistance program funds under this Act may use during that fiscal year to carry out the work activation program of the State under this section—

“(i) any of the Federal funds available to the State through the State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) in that fiscal year; and

“(ii) any of the funds from State sources allocated to the operation of the program described in clause (i).

“(B) EFFECT.—Any State that uses State funds allocated to the State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) to administer the work activation program of that State under this section may treat those funds as qualified State expenditures (as defined in

section 409(a)(7)(B)(i) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 609(a)(7)(B)(i))) for purposes of meeting the requirements of section 409(a)(7) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 609(a)(7)) in that fiscal year.

“(2) WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT FUNDING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 2019 and each subsequent fiscal year, a State that receives Federal funds under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.) may use up to 50 percent of those funds during that fiscal year to carry out the work activation program of the State under this section.

“(3) SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 2019 and each subsequent fiscal year, a State that receives Federal funds under this Act for an employment and training program under section 6(d) may use those funds during that fiscal year to carry out the work activation program of the State under this section.”.

(e) IDENTIFICATION FOR CARD USE.—Section 7(h)(9) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(h)(9)) is amended—

(1) in the paragraph heading, by striking “OPTIONAL PHOTOGRAPHIC IDENTIFICATION” and inserting “IDENTIFICATION FOR CARD USE”;

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(3) by inserting before clause (i) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(A) LISTED BENEFICIARIES.—A State agency shall require that an electronic benefit card lists the names of—

“(i) the head of the household;

“(ii) each adult member of the household; and

“(iii) each adult that is not a member of the household that is authorized to use that card.

“(B) PHOTOGRAPHIC IDENTIFICATION REQUIRED.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under clause (ii), any individual listed on an electronic benefit card under subparagraph (A) shall be required to show photographic identification at the point of sale when using the card.

“(ii) HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD.—A head of a household is not required to show photographic identification under clause (i) if the electronic benefit card contains a photograph of that individual under subparagraph (C)(i).

“(C) OPTIONAL PHOTOGRAPHIC IDENTIFICATION.—”;

(4) in subparagraph (C) (as so designated)—

(A) in clause (i) (as so redesignated), by striking “1 or more members of a” and inserting “the head of the”; and

(B) in clause (ii) (as so redesignated)—

(i) by striking “subparagraph (A)” and inserting “clause (i)”; and

(ii) by inserting “subject to subparagraph (B)(i)” after “the card”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) VISUAL VERIFICATION.—Any individual that is shown photographic identification or an electronic benefit card containing a photograph, as applicable, under subparagraph (B) shall visually confirm that the photograph on the identification or the electronic benefit card, as applicable, is a clear and accurate likeness of the individual using the electronic benefit card.”.

SA 3384. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for

the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 141, strike lines 15 through 21 and insert the following:

“(2) establish payments to provide an incentive for the use of practices, such as cover crops, no-till farming, nutrient management, resource-conserving crop rotations, and other similar practices approved under the pilot project that—

“(A) improve soil health;
 “(B) increase carbon levels in the soil; or
 “(C) meet the goals described in subparagraphs (A) and (B); and

SA 3385. Mr. SASSE (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. JONES, Mr. RISCH, Mr. TESTER, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ENZI, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. ROUNDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 121. HOURS OF SERVICE REGULATIONS FOR TRANSPORTATION OF LIVESTOCK.

The Secretary of Transportation shall amend part 395 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, to ensure that, in the case of a driver transporting livestock (as defined in section 602 of the Emergency Livestock Feed Assistance Act of 1988 (7 U.S.C. 1471)) or insects within a 300 air-mile radius from the point at which the on-duty time of the driver begins with respect to the trip—

(1) the on-duty time of the driver shall exclude all time spent—

(A) at a plant, terminal, facility, or other property of a motor carrier or shipper or on any public property during which the driver is waiting to be dispatched;

(B) loading or unloading a commercial motor vehicle;

(C) supervising or assisting in the loading or unloading of a commercial motor vehicle;

(D) attending to a commercial motor vehicle while the vehicle is being loaded or unloaded;

(E) remaining in readiness to operate a commercial motor vehicle; and

(F) giving or receiving receipts for shipments loaded or unloaded;

(2) except as provided in paragraph (5), the driving time under section 395.3(a)(3)(i) of that title is modified to a maximum of not less than 15, and not more than 18, hours within a 24-hour period;

(3) the driver may take 1 or more rest periods during the trip, which shall not be included in the calculation of the driving time;

(4) after completion of the trip, the driver shall be required to take a rest break for a period that is 5 hours less than the maximum driving time under paragraph (2);

(5) if the driver is within 150 air-miles of the point of delivery, any additional driving to that point of delivery shall not be included in the calculation of the driving time; and

(6) the 10-hour rest period under section 395.3(a)(1) of that title shall not apply.

SA 3386. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title II, add the following:

SEC. 24. GAO STUDY ON NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE DETERMINATIONS OF PROGRAM INELIGIBILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study of the coordination between the Natural Resources Conservation Service and the Farm Service Agency to determine—

(1) the number of producers that were determined to be ineligible for Department of Agriculture benefits as a result of non-compliance with applicable requirements under conservation programs (referred to in this section as “applicable conservation requirements”);

(2) in any case in which a producer was determined not to be in compliance with an applicable conservation requirement, the penalties enforced against the producer;

(3) the total number of acres determined not to be in compliance with applicable conservation requirements;

(4) applicable procedures to ensure producers can work with the Natural Resources Conservation Service to bring the acres of the producers into compliance with applicable conservation requirements;

(5) the coordination between county and State offices with respect to evaluation of compliance with applicable conservation requirements; and

(6)(A) the means by which the Natural Resources Conservation Service determines which tracts of land to evaluate for compliance with applicable conservation requirements; and

(B) whether a random order of selection is the most efficient way to evaluate whether producers are achieving compliance with applicable conservation requirements.

(b) COMPONENTS.—The study under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an evaluation of the appeals process relating to determinations of ineligibility for Federal programs, including a review, during the 5-year period ending on the date on which the study is commenced, of those appeals brought to the National Appeals Division; and

(2) the development of recommendations, taking into consideration affected watersheds, regions, counties, and adjacent landowners, to improve efficiency in the management of Federal resources relating to producer compliance with applicable conservation requirements.

SA 3387. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 62. LOANS FOR CARBON DIOXIDE CAPTURE AND UTILIZATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 901 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 19 the following:

“SEC. 20. LOANS FOR CARBON DIOXIDE CAPTURE AND UTILIZATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including regulations), in carrying out any program under this Act under which the Secretary provides a loan or loan guarantee, the Secretary may provide such a loan or loan guarantee to facilities employing commercially demonstrated technologies for carbon dioxide capture and utilization.”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 3 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 903) is amended—

(1) by striking “There are” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b)(2), there are”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) LOANS FOR CARBON DIOXIDE CAPTURE AND UTILIZATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out section 20.

“(2) SEPARATE APPROPRIATIONS.—The sums appropriated under paragraph (1) shall be separate and distinct from the sums appropriated under subsection (a).”.

SA 3388. Mr. ROBERTS (for Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN)) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 63. COUNCIL ON RURAL COMMUNITY INNOVATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) 16 percent of the population of the United States lives in rural counties.

(2) Strong, sustainable rural communities are essential to future prosperity and ensuring United States competitiveness in the years ahead.

(3) Rural communities supply the food, fiber, and energy of the United States, safeguard the natural resources of the United States, and are essential to the development of science and innovation.

(4) Though rural communities face numerous challenges, they also present enormous economic potential.

(5) The Federal Government has an important role to play in expanding access to the capital necessary for economic growth, promoting innovation, increasing energy resiliency and reliability, improving access to health care and education, and expanding outdoor recreational activities on public land.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to enhance the efforts of the Federal Government to address the needs of rural areas in the United States by—

(1) establishing a council to better coordinate Federal programs directed to rural communities;

(2) maximizing the impact of Federal investment to promote economic prosperity

and quality of life in rural communities in the United States; and

(3) using innovation to resolve local and regional challenges faced by rural communities.

(c) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established a Council on Rural Community Innovation and Economic Development (referred to in this section as the “Council”).

(d) **MEMBERSHIP.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The membership of the Council shall be composed of the heads of the following executive branch departments, agencies, and offices:

- (A) The Department of Agriculture.
- (B) The Department of the Treasury.
- (C) The Department of Defense.
- (D) The Department of Justice.
- (E) The Department of the Interior.
- (F) The Department of Commerce.
- (G) The Department of Labor.
- (H) The Department of Health and Human Services.

(I) The Department of Housing and Urban Development.

- (J) The Department of Transportation.
- (K) The Department of Energy.
- (L) The Department of Education.
- (M) The Department of Veterans Affairs.
- (N) The Department of Homeland Security.
- (O) The Environmental Protection Agency.
- (P) The Federal Communications Commission.

(Q) The Office of Management and Budget.

(R) The Office of Science and Technology Policy.

(S) The Office of National Drug Control Policy.

- (T) The Council of Economic Advisers.
- (U) The Domestic Policy Council.
- (V) The National Economic Council.
- (W) The Small Business Administration.
- (X) The Council on Environmental Quality.
- (Y) The White House Office of Public Engagement.

(Z) The White House Office of Cabinet Affairs.

(AA) Such other executive branch departments, agencies, and offices as the President or the Secretary may, from time to time, designate.

(2) **CHAIR.**—The Secretary shall serve as the Chair of the Council.

(3) **DESIGNEES.**—A member of the Council may designate, to perform the Council functions of the member, a senior-level official who is—

- (A) part of the department, agency, or office of the member; and
- (B) a full-time officer or employee of the Federal Government.

(4) **ADMINISTRATION.**—The Council shall coordinate policy development through the rural development mission area.

(e) **FUNDING.**—The Secretary shall provide funding and administrative support for the Council to the extent permitted by law and within existing appropriations.

(f) **MISSION AND FUNCTION OF THE COUNCIL.**—The Council shall work across executive departments, agencies, and offices to coordinate development of policy recommendations—

- (1) to maximize the impact of Federal investment of rural communities;
- (2) to promote economic prosperity and quality of life in rural communities; and
- (3) to use innovation to resolve local and regional challenges faced by rural communities.

(g) **DUTIES.**—The Council shall—

(1) make recommendations to the President, acting through the Director of the Domestic Policy Council and the Director of the National Economic Council, on streamlining and leveraging Federal investments in rural areas, where appropriate, to increase the impact of Federal dollars and create eco-

omic opportunities to improve the quality of life in rural areas in the United States;

(2) coordinate and increase the effectiveness of Federal engagement with rural stakeholders, including agricultural organizations, small businesses, education and training institutions, health-care providers, telecommunications services providers, electric service providers, transportation providers, research and land grant institutions, law enforcement, State, local, and tribal governments, and nongovernmental organizations regarding the needs of rural areas in the United States;

(3) coordinate Federal efforts directed toward the growth and development of rural geographic regions that encompass both metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas;

(4) identify and facilitate rural economic opportunities associated with energy development, outdoor recreation, and other conservation related activities; and

(5) identify common economic and social challenges faced by rural communities that could be served through—

- (A) better coordination of existing Federal and non-Federal resources; and
- (B) innovative solutions utilizing governmental and nongovernmental resources.

(h) **EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The heads of executive departments and agencies shall assist and provide information to the Council, consistent with applicable law, as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Council.

(2) **EXPENSES.**—Each executive department or agency shall be responsible for paying any expenses of the executive department or agency for participating in the Council.

(i) **REPORT ON RURAL SMART COMMUNITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the establishment of the Council, the Council shall submit to Congress a report describing efforts of rural areas to integrate “smart” technology into their communities to solve challenges relating to energy, transportation, health care, law enforcement, housing, or other relevant local issues, as determined by the Secretary.

(2) **SMART RURAL COMMUNITIES.**—The report under paragraph (1) shall include a description of efforts of rural communities to apply innovative and advanced technologies and related mechanisms (such as telecommunications, energy, transportation, housing, economic development)—

- (A) to improve the health and quality of life of residents;
- (B) to increase the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of civic operations and services, including public safety and other vital public functions;
- (C) to promote economic growth;
- (D) to enhance the use of electricity in the community and reduce pollution; and
- (E) to create a more sustainable and resilient community.

(3) **OTHER INCLUSIONS.**—The report under paragraph (1) shall include—

- (A) an analysis of efforts to integrate “smart” technology into rural communities across the United States;
- (B) an analysis of barriers and challenges faced by rural areas in integrating “smart” technology into their communities;
- (C) an analysis of Federal efforts to assist rural areas with the development and integration of “smart” technology into rural communities;
- (D) recommendations, if any, on how to improve coordination and deployment of Federal efforts to assist rural areas develop and integrate “smart” technology into their communities;

(E) recommendations, if any, on how rural areas developing “smart” communities can better leverage private sector resources; and

(F) guidelines that establish best practices for rural areas that desire to use “smart” technology to overcome local challenges.

(j) **REVIEW OF PUBLIC BENEFIT TO RURAL COMMUNITIES ON THE CREATION OF RURAL SMART COMMUNITY DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—On completion of the report under subsection (i)(1), the Council shall review the benefits of the creation of a rural smart community demonstration projects program for the purposes of coordinating Department of Agriculture rural development, housing, energy, and telecommunication programs, and other Federal programs specific to rural communities, to expand innovative technologies and address local challenges specific to rural communities.

(2) **INCLUSIONS.**—In the review under paragraph (1) the Council shall determine whether a rural smart community demonstration projects program would—

(A) demonstrate smart community technologies that can be adapted and repeated by other rural communities;

(B) encourage public, private, local, or regional best practices that can be replicated by other rural communities;

(C) encourage private sector innovation and investment in rural communities;

(D) promote a skilled workforce; and

(E) promote standards that allow for the measurement and validation of the cost savings and performance improvements associated with the installation and use of smart community technologies and practices.

(k) **RURAL SMART COMMUNITY RESOURCE GUIDE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Council shall create, publish, and maintain a resource guide designed to assist States and other rural communities in developing and implementing rural smart community programs.

(2) **INCLUSIONS.**—A resource guide under paragraph (1) may include—

(A) a compilation of existing related Federal and non-Federal programs available to rural communities, including technical assistance, education, training, research and development, analysis, and funding;

(B) available examples of local rural communities engaging private sector entities to implement smart community solutions, including public-private partnership models that could be used to leverage private sector funding to solve similar local challenges;

(C) available examples of proven methods for local rural communities to facilitate integration of smart technologies with new and existing infrastructure and systems;

(D) best practices and lessons learned from demonstration projects, including return on investment and performance information to help other rural communities decide how to initiate integration of smart technologies; and

(E) such other topics as are requested by industry entities or local governments or determined to be necessary by the Council.

(3) **UTILIZATION OF EXISTING GUIDES.**—In creating, publishing, and maintaining the guide under paragraph (1), the Council shall consider Federal, State, and local guides already published relating to smart community goals, activities, and best practices—

(A) to prevent duplication of efforts by the Federal Government; and

(B) to leverage existing complementary efforts.

(4) **RESOURCE GUIDE OUTREACH.**—The Council shall conduct outreach to States, counties, communities, and other relevant entities—

(A) to provide interested stakeholders with the guide published under paragraph (1);

(B) to promote the consideration of smart community technologies and encourage States and local governments to contribute rural smart community program and activity information to the guide published under paragraph (1);

(C) to identify—

(i) barriers to rural smart community technology adoption; and

(ii) any research, development, and assistance that is needed that could be included in the guide published under paragraph (1);

(D) to respond to requests for assistance, advice, or consultation from rural communities; and

(E) for other purposes, as identified by the Council.

(5) **SUBSEQUENT RESOURCE GUIDES.**—The Council shall issue an update to the guide published under paragraph (1) every 5 years.

(1) **RURAL BROADBAND INTEGRATION WORKING GROUP.**—

(1) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(A) Access to high-speed broadband is no longer a luxury and is a important for United States families, businesses, and consumers.

(B) Affordable, reliable access to high-speed broadband is critical to United States economic growth and competitiveness.

(C) High-speed broadband enables the people of the United States to use the Internet in new ways, expands access to health services and education, increases the productivity of businesses, and drives innovation throughout the digital ecosystem.

(D) The private sector and Federal, State, and local governments have made substantial investments to expand broadband access in the United States, but more must be done to improve the availability and quality of high-speed broadband, particularly in areas lacking competitive choices.

(E) Today, more than 50,000,000 people of the United States cannot purchase a wired broadband connection at speeds for adequate broadband service, and only 29 percent of people of the United States can choose from more than 1 service provider at that speed.

(F) As a result of the statistics described in subparagraph (E), the costs, benefits, and availability of high-speed broadband Internet are not evenly distributed, with considerable variation among States and between urban and rural areas.

(G) The Federal Government has an important role to play in developing coordinated policies to promote broadband deployment and adoption, including promoting best practices, breaking down regulatory barriers, and encouraging further investment, which will help deliver higher quality, lower cost broadband to more families, businesses, and communities and allow communities to benefit fully from those investments.

(2) **POLICY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—It is the policy of the Federal Government for executive departments and agencies having statutory authorities applicable to broadband deployment (referred to in this subsection as the “agencies”) to use all available and appropriate authorities—

(i) to identify and address regulatory barriers that may unduly impede either wired broadband deployment or the infrastructure to augment wireless broadband deployment;

(ii) to encourage further investment in broadband networks and services;

(iii) to promote the adoption and meaningful use of broadband technology; and

(iv) to otherwise encourage or support broadband deployment, competition, and adoption in ways that promote the public interest.

(B) **PRIORITIES.**—In carrying out the policy under subparagraph (A), the agencies shall focus on—

(i) opportunities to promote broadband adoption and competition through incentives to new entrants in the market for broadband services;

(ii) modernizing regulations;

(iii) accurately measuring real-time broadband availability and speeds;

(iv) increasing broadband access for underserved communities, including in rural areas;

(v) exploring opportunities to reduce costs for potential low-income users; and

(vi) other possible measures, including supporting State, local, and Tribal governments interested in encouraging or investing in high-speed broadband networks.

(C) **EFFECT.**—In carrying out the policy under subparagraph (A), the agencies shall ensure that existing and planned Federal, State, local, and Tribal government missions and capabilities for delivering services to the public, including those missions and capabilities relating to national security, public safety, and emergency response, are maintained.

(D) **COORDINATION.**—The agencies shall coordinate the policy under subparagraph (A) through the Rural Broadband Integration Working Group established under paragraph (3).

(3) **ESTABLISHMENT OF RURAL BROADBAND INTEGRATION WORKING GROUP.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—There is established the Rural Broadband Integration Working Group (referred to in this subsection as the “Working Group”).

(B) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The membership of the Working Group shall be composed of the heads, or their designees, of—

(i) the Department of Agriculture;

(ii) the Department of Commerce;

(iii) the Department of Defense;

(iv) the Department of State;

(v) the Department of the Interior;

(vi) the Department of Labor;

(vii) the Department of Health and Human Services;

(viii) the Department of Homeland Security;

(ix) the Department of Housing and Urban Development;

(x) the Department of Justice;

(xi) the Department of Transportation;

(xii) the Department of the Treasury;

(xiii) the Department of Energy;

(xiv) the Department of Education;

(xv) the Department of Veterans Affairs;

(xvi) the Environmental Protection Agency;

(xvii) the General Services Administration;

(xviii) the Small Business Administration;

(xix) the Institute of Museum and Library Services;

(xx) the National Science Foundation;

(xxi) the Council on Environmental Quality;

(xxii) the Office of Science and Technology Policy;

(xxiii) the Office of Management and Budget;

(xxiv) the Council of Economic Advisers;

(xxv) the Domestic Policy Council;

(xxvi) the National Economic Council; and

(xxvii) such other Federal agencies or entities as are determined appropriate in accordance with subparagraph (E).

(C) **CO-CHAIRS.**—The Secretary and the Secretary of Commerce shall serve as the Co-Chairs of the Working Group.

(D) **CONSULTATION; COORDINATION.**—

(i) **CONSULTATION.**—The Working Group shall consult, as appropriate, with other relevant agencies, including the Federal Communications Commission.

(ii) **COORDINATION.**—The Working Group shall coordinate with existing Federal working groups and committees involved with broadband.

(E) **MEMBERSHIP CHANGES.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the National Economic Council and the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall review, on a periodic basis, the membership of the Working Group to ensure that the Working Group—

(I) includes necessary Federal Government entities; and

(II) is an effective mechanism for coordinating among agencies on the policy described in paragraph (2).

(ii) **CHANGES.**—The Director of the National Economic Council and the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy may add or remove members of the Council, as appropriate, based on the review under clause (i).

(4) **FUNCTIONS OF THE WORKING GROUP.**—

(A) **CONSULTATION.**—As permitted by law, the members of the Working Group shall consult with State, local, Tribal, and territorial governments, telecommunications companies, utilities, trade associations, philanthropic entities, policy experts, and other interested parties to identify and assess regulatory barriers described in paragraphs (1)(G) and (2)(A)(i) and opportunities described in clauses (i) and (v) of paragraph (2)(B) to determine possible actions relating to those barriers and opportunities.

(B) **POINT OF CONTACT.**—Not later than 15 days after the date of enactment of this Act, each member of the Working Group shall—

(i) designate a representative to serve as the main point of contact for matters relating to the Working Group; and

(ii) notify the Co-Chairs of the Working Group of that designee.

(C) **SURVEY.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the members of the Working Group shall submit to the Working Group a comprehensive survey of—

(I) Federal programs, including the allocated funding amounts, that currently support or could reasonably be modified to support broadband deployment and adoption; and

(II) all agency-specific policies and rules with the direct or indirect effect of facilitating or regulating investment in or deployment of wired and wireless broadband networks.

(D) **LIST OF ACTIONS.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the members of the Working Group shall submit to the Working Group an initial list of actions that each of the agencies could take to identify and address regulatory barriers, incentivize investment, promote best practices, align funding decisions, and otherwise support wired broadband deployment and adoption.

(E) **REPORT.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 150 days after the date of enactment of this Act, after not fewer than 2 meetings of the full Working Group, the Working Group shall submit to the President, acting through the Director of the National Economic Council, a coordinated, agreed-to, and prioritized list of recommendations of the Working Group on actions that agencies can take to support broadband deployment and adoption.

(ii) **INCLUSIONS.**—The recommendations under clause (i) shall include—

(I) a list of priority actions and rulemakings; and

(II) timelines to complete the priority actions and rulemakings under subclause (I).

(m) **GENERAL PROVISIONS.**—

(1) **EFFECT.**—Nothing in this section—

(A) impairs or otherwise affects—
 (i) the authority granted by law to a department or agency, or the head thereof;
 (ii) the functions of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget relating to budgetary, administrative, or legislative proposals; or

(iii) the authority of the Federal Communications Commission concerning spectrum allocation decisions;

(B) requires the disclosure of classified information, law enforcement sensitive information, or other information that shall be protected in the interests of national security; or

(C) creates any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity by any party against the United States, any Federal department, agency, or entity, any officer, employee, or agent, of the United States, or any other person.

(2) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—This section shall be implemented consistent with applicable law and subject to the availability of appropriations.

SA 3389. Mr. ROBERTS (for Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. STABENOW)) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title XII, add the following:

SEC. ____ . REAUTHORIZATION OF RURAL EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES TRAINING AND EQUIPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Supporting and Improving Rural EMS Needs Act of 2018” or the “SIREN Act of 2018”.

(b) **AMENDMENTS.**—Section 330J of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254c-15) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “in rural areas” and inserting “in rural areas or to residents of rural areas”;

(2) by striking subsections (b) through (f) and inserting the following:

“(b) **ELIGIBILITY; APPLICATION.**—To be eligible to receive grant under this section, an entity shall—

“(1) be—

“(A) an emergency medical services agency operated by a local or tribal government (including fire-based and non-fire based); or

“(B) an emergency medical services agency that is described in section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code; and

“(2) submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

“(c) **USE OF FUNDS.**—An entity—

“(1) shall use amounts received through a grant under subsection (a) to—

“(A) train emergency medical services personnel as appropriate to obtain and maintain licenses and certifications relevant to service in an emergency medical services agency described in subsection (b)(1);

“(B) conduct courses that qualify graduates to serve in an emergency medical services agency described in subsection (b)(1) in accordance with State and local requirements;

“(C) fund specific training to meet Federal or State licensing or certification requirements; and

“(D) acquire emergency medical services equipment; and

“(2) may use amounts received through a grant under subsection (a) to—

“(A) recruit and retain emergency medical services personnel, which may include volunteer personnel;

“(B) develop new ways to educate emergency health care providers through the use of technology-enhanced educational methods; or

“(C) acquire personal protective equipment for emergency medical services personnel as required by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

“(d) **GRANT AMOUNTS.**—Each grant awarded under this section shall be in an amount not to exceed \$200,000.

“(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘emergency medical services’—

“(A) means resources used by a public or private nonprofit licensed entity to deliver medical care outside of a medical facility under emergency conditions that occur as a result of the condition of the patient; and

“(B) includes services delivered (either on a compensated or volunteer basis) by an emergency medical services provider or other provider that is licensed or certified by the State involved as an emergency medical technician, a paramedic, or an equivalent professional (as determined by the State).

“(2) The term ‘rural area’ means—

“(A) a nonmetropolitan statistical area;

“(B) an area designated as a rural area by any law or regulation of a State; or

“(C) a rural census tract of a metropolitan statistical area (as determined under the most recent rural urban commuting area code as set forth by the Office of Management and Budget).

“(f) **MATCHING REQUIREMENT.**—The Secretary may not award a grant under this section to an entity unless the entity agrees that the entity will make available (directly or through contributions from other public or private entities) non-Federal contributions toward the activities to be carried out under the grant in an amount equal to 25 percent of the amount received under the grant.”; and

(3) in subsection (g)(1), by striking “2002 through 2006” and inserting “2019 through 2023”.

SA 3390. Mr. ROBERTS (for Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. TOOMEY)) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3224 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) to the bill H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 125 ____ . PROHIBITION ON SLAUGHTER OF DOGS AND CATS FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subsection (c), no person may—

(1) knowingly slaughter a dog or cat for human consumption; or

(2) knowingly ship, transport, move, deliver, receive, possess, purchase, sell, or donate—

(A) a dog or cat to be slaughtered for human consumption; or

(B) a dog or cat part for human consumption.

(b) **SCOPE.**—Subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to conduct—

(1) in interstate commerce or foreign commerce; or

(2) within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

(c) **EXCEPTION FOR INDIAN TRIBES.**—The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to an Indian (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304)) carrying out any activity described in subsection (a) for the purpose of a religious ceremony.

(d) **PENALTY.**—Any person who violates subsection (a) shall be subject to a fine in an amount not greater than \$5,000 for each violation.

(e) **EFFECT ON STATE LAW.**—Nothing in this section—

(1) limits any State or local law or regulation protecting the welfare of animals; or

(2) prevents a State or unit of local government from adopting and enforcing an animal welfare law or regulation that is more stringent than this section.

SA 3391. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 724, to amend the Federal Power Act to modernize authorizations for necessary hydropower approvals; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

(c) **OBLIGATION FOR PAYMENT OF ANNUAL CHARGES.**—Any obligation of a licensee or exemptee for the payment of annual charges under section 10(e) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 803(e)) for a project that has not commenced construction as of the date of enactment of this Act shall commence not earlier than the latest of—

(1) the date by which the licensee or exemptee is required to commence construction; or

(2) the date of any extension of the deadline under paragraph (1).

SA 3392. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. UDALL) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1029, to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to improve pesticide registration and other activities under the Act, to extend and modify fee authorities, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 1, line 6, strike “2017” and insert “2018”.

On page 2, line 12, strike “2018 through 2020” and insert “2019 through 2023”.

On page 2, line 17, strike “2018 through 2020” and insert “2019 through 2023”.

On page 2, line 21, strike “2018 through 2020” and insert “2019 through 2023”.

On page 3, line 5, strike “2018 through 2020” and insert “2019 through 2023”.

On page 3, lines 9 and 10, strike “2018 through 2020” and insert “2019 through 2023”.

On page 3, line 23, strike “2017” and insert “2018”.

On page 3, line 24, strike “2022” and insert “2025”.

On page 7, line 21, strike “2017” and insert “2018”.

On page 12, strike lines 23 and 24 and insert the following:

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “pesticide registration”; and

(ii) by striking “October 1, 2013, and ending on September 30, 2015” and inserting “October 1, 2019, and ending on September 30, 2021”;

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “pesticide registration”; and

(ii) by striking “2015” each place it appears and inserting “2021”; and

On page 13, line 1, strike “(B)” and insert “(C)”.

On page 21, line 11, strike “2021” and insert “2024”.

On page 21, line 12, strike “2021” and insert “2024”.

On page 21, line 19, strike “2022” and insert “2025”.

On page 21, line 20, strike “2022” and insert “2025”.

On page 22, line 2, strike “2022” and insert “2025”.

On page 22, line 3, strike “2022” and insert “2025”.

On page 186, strike lines 1 through 3 and insert the following:

SEC. 7. EXTENSION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or amendment made by this Act, any reference in this Act or an amendment made by this Act to “2020” shall be deemed to be a reference to “2023”.

SEC. 8. AGRICULTURAL WORKER PROTECTION STANDARD; CERTIFICATION OF PESTICIDE APPLICATORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending not earlier than October 1, 2021, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (referred to in this section as the “Administrator”)—

(1) shall carry out—

(A) the final rule of the Administrator entitled “Pesticides; Agricultural Worker Protection Standard Revisions” (80 Fed. Reg. 67496 (November 2, 2015)); and

(B) the final rule of the Administrator entitled “Pesticides; Certification of Pesticide Applicators” (82 Fed. Reg. 952 (January 4, 2017)); and

(2) shall not revise or develop revisions to the rules described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1).

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Prior to October 1, 2021, the Administrator may propose, and after a notice and public comment period of not less than 90 days, promulgate revisions to the final rule described in subsection (a)(1)(A) addressing application exclusion zones under part 170 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, consistent with the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136 et seq.).

(c) GAO REPORT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) conduct a study on the use of the designated representative, including the effect of that use on the availability of pesticide application and hazard information and worker health and safety; and

(2) not later than October 1, 2021, make publically available a report describing the study under paragraph (1), including any recommendations to prevent the misuse of pesticide application and hazard information, if that misuse is identified.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I have 5 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 28, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Legisla-

tive Proposals to Examine Corporate Governance.”

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 28, 2018, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the nomination of Charles P. Rettig, of California, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Department of the Treasury.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 28, 2018, to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Jeffrey Kessler, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Lynn A. Johnson, of Colorado, to be Assistant Secretary for Family Support, Department of Health and Human Services, and Elizabeth Ann Copeland, of Texas, and Patrick J. Urda, of Indiana, both to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 28, 2018, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Donald Lu, of California, to be Ambassador to the Kyrgyz Republic, Randy W. Berry, of Colorado, to be Ambassador to the Federal Democratic Republic of Nepal, and Alaina B. Teplitz, of Colorado, to be Ambassador to the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Maldives, all of the Department of State.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 27, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Britt Cagle Grant, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit, David James Porter, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, Holly A. Brady, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana, Andrew Lynn Brasher, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Alabama, James Patrick Hanlon, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Indiana, David Steven Morales, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, Lance E. Walker, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maine, and John D. Jordan, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Missouri, Nick Willard, to be United States Marshal for the District of New Hampshire, and Mark F. Sloke, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Alabama, all of the Department of Justice.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privileges of the floor be granted to my first ses-

sion summer interns: John Grossl, Joseph Monsef, Vince Tenebro, Sheldon Prout, William Lee, Conor Bates, Emma Ashlock, Katelynn Toth, Alison Nicholls, Yajaira Ponce-Moran, Denae Benson, Sterling Gingerich, Kaiwi Eisenhower, Michael McCambridge, Alexandra Bender, Selia Butler, and Johnathan Slife for today and tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Megan McFarlane and Lauren Odum, interns with the minority staff on the Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee, be granted floor privileges for the duration of the debate on H.R. 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PESTICIDE REGISTRATION ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 163, H.R. 1029.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1029) to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to improve pesticide registration and other activities under the Act, to extend and modify fee authorities, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, with amendments, as follows:

(The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in italic.)

H.R. 1029

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the [“Pesticide Registration Enhancement Act of 2017”.] *“Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2017”*.

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

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Extension and modification of maintenance fee authority.
- Sec. 3. Reregistration and Expedited Processing Fund.
- Sec. 4. Experimental use permits for pesticides.
- Sec. 5. Pesticide registration service fees.
- Sec. 6. Revision of tables regarding covered pesticide registration applications and other covered actions and their corresponding registration service fees.
- Sec. 7. *Effective date.*

SEC. 2. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF MAINTENANCE FEE AUTHORITY.

(a) MAINTENANCE FEE.—Section 4(i)(1) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and

Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a-1(i)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking “an aggregate amount of \$27,800,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017” and inserting “an average amount of \$31,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 [through 2023] 2018 through 2020”;

(2) in subparagraph (D)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking “\$115,500 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017” and inserting “\$129,400 for each of fiscal years [2017 through 2023] 2018 through 2020”; and

(B) in clause (ii), by striking “\$184,800 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017” and inserting “\$207,000 for each of fiscal years [2017 through 2023] 2018 through 2020”;

(3) in subparagraph (E)(i)—

(A) in subclause (I), by striking “\$70,600 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017” and inserting “\$79,100 for each of fiscal years [2017 through 2023] 2018 through 2020”; and

(B) in subclause (II), by striking “\$122,100 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017” and inserting “\$136,800 for each of fiscal years [2017 through 2023] 2018 through 2020”; and

(4) in subparagraph (I), by striking “2017” and inserting “[2023] 2020”.

(b) PROHIBITION ON OTHER FEES.—Section 4(i)(2) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a-1(i)(2)) is amended—

[(1) by striking “during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this section and ending on September 30, 2019” and inserting “until September 30, 2025”; and]

(1) by striking “the date of enactment of this section and ending on September 30, 2019” and inserting “the effective date of the Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2017 and ending on September 30, 2022”; and

(2) by inserting after “registration of a pesticide under this Act” the following: “or any other action covered under a table specified in section 33(b)(3).”.

(c) EXTENSION OF PROHIBITION ON TOLERANCE FEES.—Section 408(m)(3) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 346a(m)(3)) is amended by striking “2017” and inserting “[2023] 2020”.

SEC. 3. REREGISTRATION AND EXPEDITED PROCESSING FUND.

(a) AUTHORIZED USE OF FUND.—Section 4(k)(2)(A) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a-1(k)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “the fund” and inserting “the Reregistration and Expedited Processing Fund”;

(2) by striking “paragraph (3),” in the first sentence and all that follows through *the period at the end of the second sentence* and inserting the following: “paragraph (3), to offset the costs of registration review under section 3(g), including the costs associated with any review under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et. seq.) required as part of the registration review, to offset the costs associated with tracking and implementing registration review decisions, including registration review decisions designed to reduce risk, for the purposes specified in paragraphs (4) and (5), and to enhance the information systems capabilities to improve the tracking of pesticide registration decisions.”;

(3) in clause (i), by striking “are allocated solely” and all that follows through “(3(g));” and inserting the following: “are allocated solely for the purposes specified in the first sentence of this subparagraph.”; and

(4) in clause (ii), by striking “necessary to achieve” and all that follows through “(3(g));” and inserting the following: “necessary to achieve the purposes specified in the first sentence of this subparagraph.”.

(b) SET-ASIDE FOR REVIEW OF INERT INGREDIENTS AND EXPEDITED PROCESSING OF SIMILAR APPLICATIONS.—Section 4(k)(3)(A) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a-1(k)(3)(A)) is amended, in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “The Administrator shall use” and all that follows through “personnel and resources—” and inserting the following: “For each of fiscal years [2017 through 2023] 2018 through 2020, the Administrator shall use between $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ of the maintenance fees collected in such fiscal year to obtain sufficient personnel and resources—”.

(c) SET-ASIDE FOR EXPEDITED RULEMAKING AND GUIDANCE DEVELOPMENT FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—Paragraph (4) of section 4(k) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a-1(k)) is amended to read as follows:

“(4) EXPEDITED RULEMAKING AND GUIDANCE DEVELOPMENT FOR CERTAIN PRODUCT PERFORMANCE DATA REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) SET-ASIDE.—For each of fiscal years [2017 through 2021] 2018 through 2020, the Administrator shall use not more than \$500,000 of the amounts made available to the Administrator in the Reregistration and Expedited Processing Fund for the activities described in subparagraph (B).

“(B) PRODUCTS CLAIMING EFFICACY AGAINST INVERTEBRATE PESTS OF SIGNIFICANT PUBLIC HEALTH OR ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE.—The Administrator shall use amounts made available under subparagraph (A) to develop, receive comments with respect to, finalize, and implement the necessary rulemaking and guidance for product performance data requirements to evaluate products claiming efficacy against the following invertebrate pests of significant public health or economic importance (in order of importance):

“(i) Bed bugs.

“(ii) Premise (including crawling insects, flying insects, and baits).

“(iii) Pests of pets (including pet pests controlled by spot-ons, collars, shampoos, powders, or dips).

“(iv) Fire ants.

“(C) DEADLINES FOR GUIDANCE.—The Administrator shall develop, and publish guidance required by subparagraph (B) with respect to claims of efficacy against pests described in such subparagraph as follows:

“(i) With respect to bed bugs, issue final guidance not later than [June 30, 2017.] 30 days after the effective date of the Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2017.

“(ii) With respect to pests specified in clause (ii) of such subparagraph—

“(I) submit draft guidance to the Scientific Advisory Panel and for public comment not later than June 30, 2018; and

“(II) complete any response to comments received with respect to such draft guidance and finalize the guidance not later than September 30, [2020] 2019.

“(iii) With respect to pests specified in clauses (iii) and (iv) of such subparagraph—

“(I) submit to the Scientific Advisory Panel and for public comment draft guidance not later than June 30, 2019; and

“(II) complete any response to comments received with respect to such draft guidance and finalize the guidance not later than March 31, 2021.

“(D) REVISION.—The Administrator shall revise the guidance required by subparagraph (B) from [time-to-time] time to time, but shall permit applicants and registrants sufficient time to obtain data that meet the requirements specified in such revised guidance.

“(E) DEADLINE FOR PRODUCT PERFORMANCE DATA REQUIREMENTS.—The Administrator shall, not later than September 30, 2021, issue regulations prescribing product performance data requirements for any pesticide intended

for preventing, destroying, repelling, or mitigating any invertebrate pest of significant public health or economic importance specified in clauses (i) through (iv) of subparagraph (B).”.

(d) SET-ASIDE FOR GOOD LABORATORY PRACTICES INSPECTIONS.—Section 4(k) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a-1(k)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

“(5) GOOD LABORATORY PRACTICES INSPECTIONS.—

“(A) SET-ASIDE.—For each of fiscal years [2017 through 2023] 2018 through 2020, the Administrator shall use not more than \$500,000 of the amounts made available to the Administrator in the Reregistration and Expedited Processing Fund for the activities described in subparagraph (B).

“(B) ACTIVITIES.—The Administrator shall use amounts made available under subparagraph (A) for enhancements to the good laboratory practices standards compliance monitoring program established under part 160 of title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), with respect to laboratory inspections and data audits conducted in support of pesticide product registrations under this Act. As part of such monitoring program, the Administrator shall make available to each laboratory inspected under such program in support of such registrations a preliminary summary of inspection observations not later than 60 days after the date on which such an inspection is completed.”; and

(3) in paragraph (7), as so redesignated, by striking “ paragraphs (2), (3), and (4)” and inserting “ paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5)”.

SEC. 4. EXPERIMENTAL USE PERMITS FOR PESTICIDES.

Section 5(a) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136c(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “permit for a pesticide.” and inserting “permit for a pesticide. An application for an experimental use permit for a covered application under section 33(b) shall conform with the requirements of that section.”; and

(2) by inserting “(or in the case of an application for an experimental use permit for a covered application under section 33(b), not later than the last day of the applicable timeframe for such application specified in such section)” after “all required supporting data”.

SEC. 5. PESTICIDE REGISTRATION SERVICE FEES.

(a) EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF FEE AUTHORITY.—Section 33(b) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w-8(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the heading, by striking “PESTICIDE REGISTRATION”; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “or for any other action covered by a table specified in paragraph (3)” after “covered by this Act that is received by the Administrator on or after the effective date of the Pesticide Registration Improvement Act of 2003”;

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) in the heading, by striking “PESTICIDE REGISTRATION APPLICATIONS” and inserting “[“covered application”; and] “covered applications”; and

(B) by striking “pesticide registration application” both places it appears and inserting “covered application”;

(3) in paragraph (6)—

[(A) in subparagraph (A)—

[(i) by striking “pesticide registration”; and

[(ii) by striking “October 1, 2013, and ending on September 30, 2015” and inserting “October 1, 2019, and ending on September 30, 2021”];

[(B) in subparagraph (B)—

[(i) by striking “pesticide registration”; and

[(ii) by striking “2015” both places it appears, and inserting “2021”; and

[(C) in]

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “pesticide registration”; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking “revised registration service fee schedules” and inserting “service fee schedules revised pursuant to this paragraph”;

(4) in paragraph (7)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “covered pesticide registration” and inserting “covered application”; and

(ii) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, except that no waiver or fee reduction shall be provided in connection with a request for a letter of certification (commonly referred to as a Gold Seal letter)”; and

(B) in subparagraph (F)(i), by striking “pesticide registration”; and

(5) in paragraph (8)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “pesticide registration”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking “pesticide registration”; and

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking “pesticide registration” and inserting “covered”; and

(ii) in clause (ii)(I), by striking “pesticide registration” and inserting “covered”.

(b) PESTICIDE REGISTRATION FUND SET-ASIDES FOR WORKER PROTECTION, PARTNERSHIP GRANTS, AND PESTICIDE SAFETY EDUCATION.—Section 33(c)(3)(B) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w-8(c)(3)(B)) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by inserting “, PARTNERSHIP GRANTS, AND PESTICIDE SAFETY EDUCATION” after “WORKER PROTECTION”; and

(2) in clause (i)—

(A) by striking “2017” and inserting “[2023] 2020”; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, with an emphasis on field-worker populations in the United States”; and

(3) in clause (ii), by striking “2017” and inserting “[2023] 2020”; and

(4) in clause (iii), by striking “2017” and inserting “[2023] 2020”.

(c) REFORMS TO REDUCE DECISION TIME REVIEW PERIODS.—Section 33(e) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w-8(e)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2012” and inserting “Pesticide Registration [Enhancement] Improvement Extension Act of 2017”; and

(2) by inserting at the end the following new sentence: “Such reforms shall include identifying opportunities for streamlining review processes for applications for a new active ingredient or a new use and providing prompt feedback to applicants during such review process.”.

(d) DECISION TIME REVIEW PERIODS.—Section 33(f) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act [(7 U.S.C. 136w-8(f)(1))] (7 U.S.C. 136w-8(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2012” and inserting “Pesticide Registration [Enhancement] Improvement Extension Act of 2017”; and

(B) by inserting after “covered pesticide registration actions” the following: “or for any other action covered by a table specified in subsection (b)(3)”; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

“(C) applications for any other action covered by a table specified in subsection (b)(3).”; and

(3) in paragraph (4)(A)—

(A) by striking “a pesticide registration application” and inserting “a covered application”; and

(B) by striking “covered pesticide registration application” and inserting “covered application”.

(e) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 33(k) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w-8(k)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking “2017” and inserting “[2023] 2020”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (D), by striking clause (i) and inserting the following new clause:

“(i) the number of pesticides or pesticide cases reviewed and the number of registration review decisions completed, including—

“(I) the number of cases cancelled;

“(II) the number of cases requiring risk mitigation measures;

“(III) the number of cases removing risk mitigation measures;

“(IV) the number of cases with no risk mitigation needed; and

“(V) the number of cases in which risk mitigation has been fully implemented.”;

(B) in subparagraph (G)—

(i) in clause (i)—

(I) by striking “section 4(k)(4)” and inserting “paragraphs (4) and (5) of section 4(k)”; and

(II) by striking “that section” and inserting “such paragraphs”; and

(ii) by striking clauses (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), and (vi);

(iii) by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

“(ii) implementing enhancements to—

“(I) the electronic tracking of covered applications;

“(II) the electronic tracking of conditional registrations;

“(III) the endangered species database;

“(IV) the electronic review of labels submitted with covered applications; and

“(V) the electronic review and assessment of confidential statements of formula submitted with covered applications; and”;

and (iv) by redesignating clause (vii) as clause (iii);

(C) in subparagraph (I), by striking “and” at the end;

(D) in subparagraph (J), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(E) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(K) a review of the progress made in developing, updating, and implementing product performance test guidelines for pesticide products that are intended to control invertebrate pests of significant public health importance and, by regulation, prescribing product performance data requirements for such pesticide products registered under section 3;

“(L) a review of the progress made in the priority review and approval of new pesticides to control [vector-borne public health pests] *invertebrate public health pests that may transmit vector-borne disease* for use in the United States, including each territory or possession of the United States, and United States military installations globally;

“(M) a review of the progress made in implementing enhancements to the good laboratory practices standards compliance monitoring program established under part 160 of

title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations);

“(N) the number of approvals for active ingredients, new uses, and pesticide end use products granted in connection with the Design for the Environment program (or any successor program) of the Environmental Protection Agency; and

“(O) with respect to funds in the Pesticide Registration Fund reserved under subsection (c)(3), a review that includes—

“(i) a description of the amount and use of such funds—

“(I) to carry out activities relating to worker protection under clause (i) of subsection (c)(3)(B);

“(II) to award partnership grants under clause (ii) of such subsection; and

“(III) to carry out the pesticide safety education program under clause (iii) of such subsection;

“(ii) an evaluation of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the activities, grants, and program described in clause (i);

“(iii) a description of how stakeholders are engaged in the decision to fund such activities, grants, and program; and

“(iv) with respect to activities relating to worker protection carried out under subparagraph (B)(i) of such subsection, a summary of the analyses from stakeholders, including from worker community-based organizations, on the appropriateness and effectiveness of such activities.”.

(f) TERMINATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.—Section 33(m) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w-8(m)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “2017” and inserting “[2023] 2020”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “FISCAL YEAR 2018.—During fiscal year 2018” and inserting “[“FISCAL YEAR 2024.—During fiscal year 2024”]; and [“FISCAL YEAR 2021.—During fiscal year 2021”]; and

(ii) by striking “2017” and inserting “[2023] 2020”;

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “FISCAL YEAR 2019.—During fiscal year 2019” and inserting “[“FISCAL YEAR 2025.—During fiscal year 2025”]; and [“FISCAL YEAR 2022.—During fiscal year 2022”]; and

(ii) by striking “2017” and inserting “[2023] 2020”;

(C) in subparagraph (C), by striking “SEPTEMBER 30, 2019.—Effective September 30, [2019]” and inserting “SEPTEMBER 30, 2025.—Effective September 30, 2025”; and [2019” and inserting “SEPTEMBER 30, 2022.—Effective September 30, 2022”]; and

(D) in subparagraph (D), by striking “2017” both places it appears and inserting “[2023] 2020”.

SEC. 6. REVISION OF TABLES REGARDING COVERED PESTICIDE REGISTRATION APPLICATIONS AND OTHER COVERED ACTIONS AND THEIR CORRESPONDING REGISTRATION SERVICE FEES.

Paragraph (3) of section 33(b) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w-8(b)) is amended to read as follows:

[(3) SCHEDULE OF COVERED APPLICATIONS AND OTHER ACTIONS AND THEIR REGISTRATION SERVICE FEES.—Subject to paragraph (6), the schedule of registration applications and other covered actions and their corresponding registration service fees shall be as follows:]

TABLE 1. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — NEW ACTIVE INGREDIENTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ⁽¹⁾	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee (\$)
R010	1	New Active Ingredient, Food use. (2)(3)	24	753,082
R020	2	New Active Ingredient, Food use; reduced risk. (2)(3)	18	627,568
R040	3	New Active Ingredient, Food use; Experimental Use Permit application; establish temporary tolerance; submitted before application for registration; credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient application that follows. (3)	18	462,502
R060	4	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; outdoor. (2)(3)	21	523,205
R070	5	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; outdoor; reduced risk. (2)(3)	16	436,004
R090	6	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; outdoor; Experimental Use Permit application; submitted before application for registration; credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient application that follows. (3)	16	323,690
R110	7	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; indoor. (2)(3)	20	290,994
R120	8	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; indoor; reduced risk. (2)(3)	14	242,495
R121	9	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; indoor; Experimental Use Permit application; submitted before application for registration; credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient application that follows. (3)	18	182,327
R122	10	Enriched isomer(s) of registered mixed-isomer active ingredient. (2)(3)	18	317,128
R123	11	New Active Ingredient, Seed treatment only; includes agricultural and non-agricultural seeds; residues not expected in raw agricultural commodities. (2)(3)	18	471,861
R125	12	New Active Ingredient, Seed treatment; Experimental Use Permit application; submitted before application for registration; credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient application that follows. (3)	16	323,690

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.】

TABLE 2. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — NEW USES

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ⁽¹⁾	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee (\$)
R130	13	First food use; indoor; food/food handling. (2) (3)	21	191,444
R140	14	Additional food use; Indoor; food/food handling. (3) (4)	15	44,672
R150	15	First food use. (2)(3)	21	317,104
R155	16 (new)	First food use, Experimental Use Permit application; a.i. registered for non-food outdoor use. (3)(4)	21	264,253
R160	17	First food use; reduced risk. (2)(3)	16	264,253
R170	18	Additional food use. (3) (4)	15	79,349
R175	19	Additional food uses covered within a crop group resulting from the conversion of existing approved crop group(s) to one or more revised crop groups. (3)(4)	10	66,124
R180	20	Additional food use; reduced risk. (3)(4)	10	66,124
R190	21	Additional food uses; 6 or more submitted in one application. (3)(4)	15	476,090
R200	22	Additional Food Use; 6 or more submitted in one application; Reduced Risk. (3)(4)	10	396,742
R210	23	Additional food use; Experimental Use Permit application; establish temporary tolerance; no credit toward new use registration. (3)(4)	12	48,986

TABLE 2. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — NEW USES—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ₍₁₎	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee (\$)
R220	24	Additional food use; Experimental Use Permit application; crop destruct basis; no credit toward new use registration. (3)(4)	6	19,838
R230	25	Additional use; non-food; outdoor. (3) (4)	15	31,713
R240	26	Additional use; non-food; outdoor; reduced risk. (3)(4)	10	26,427
R250	27	Additional use; non-food; outdoor; Experimental Use Permit application; no credit toward new use registration. (3)(4)	6	19,838
R251	28	Experimental Use Permit application which requires no changes to the tolerance(s); non-crop destruct basis. (3)	8	19,838
R260	29	New use; non-food; indoor. (3) (4)	12	15,317
R270	30	New use; non-food; indoor; reduced risk. (3)(4)	9	12,764
R271	31	New use; non-food; indoor; Experimental Use Permit application; no credit toward new use registration. (3)(4)	6	9,725
R273	32	Additional use; seed treatment; limited uptake into Raw Agricultural Commodities; includes crops with established tolerances (e.g., for soil or foliar application); includes food and/or non-food uses. (3)(4)	12	50,445
R274	33	Additional uses; seed treatment only; 6 or more submitted in one application; limited uptake into raw agricultural commodities; includes crops with established tolerances (e.g., for soil or foliar application); includes food and/or non-food uses. (3)(4)	12	302,663

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(4) Amendment applications to add the new use(s) to registered product labels are covered by the base fee for the new use(s). All items in the covered application must be submitted together in one package. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval(s) that is submitted in the new use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. However, if a new use application only proposes to register the new use for a new product and there are no amendments in the application, then review of one new product application is covered by the new use fee. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new use decision review time. Any application for a new product or an amendment to the proposed labeling (a) submitted subsequent to submission of the new use application and (b) prior to conclusion of its decision review time and (c) containing the same new uses, will be deemed a separate new-use application, subject to a separate registration service fee and new decision review time for a new use. If the new-use application includes non-food (indoor and/or outdoor), and food (outdoor and/or indoor) uses, the appropriate fee is due for each type of new use and the longest decision review time applies to all of the new uses requested in the application. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screen, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new use application.】

TABLE 3. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — IMPORT AND OTHER TOLERANCES

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ₍₁₎	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee (\$)
R280	34	Establish import tolerance; new active ingredient or first food use. (2)	21	319,072
R290	35	Establish Import tolerance; Additional new food use.	15	63,816
R291	36	Establish import tolerances; additional food uses; 6 or more crops submitted in one petition.	15	382,886
R292	37	Amend an established tolerance (e.g., decrease or increase) and/or harmonize established tolerances with Codex MRLs; domestic or import; applicant-initiated.	11	45,341
R293	38	Establish tolerance(s) for inadvertent residues in one crop; applicant-initiated.	12	53,483
R294	39	Establish tolerances for inadvertent residues; 6 or more crops submitted in one application; applicant-initiated.	12	320,894
R295	40	Establish tolerance(s) for residues in one rotational crop in response to a specific rotational crop application; submission of corresponding label amendments which specify the necessary plant-back restrictions; applicant-initiated. (3) (4)	15	66,124

TABLE 3. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — IMPORT AND OTHER TOLERANCES—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ₍₁₎	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee (\$)
R296	41	Establish tolerances for residues in rotational crops in response to a specific rotational crop petition; 6 or more crops submitted in one application; submission of corresponding label amendments which specify the necessary plant-back restrictions; applicant-initiated. (3) (4)	15	396,742
R297	42	Amend 6 or more established tolerances (e.g., decrease or increase) in one petition; domestic or import; applicant-initiated.	11	272,037
R298	43	Amend an established tolerance (e.g., decrease or increase); domestic or import; submission of corresponding amended labels (requiring science review). (3) (4)	13	58,565
R299	44	Amend 6 or more established tolerances (e.g., decrease or increase); domestic or import; submission of corresponding amended labels (requiring science review). (3) (4)	13	285,261

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(4) Amendment applications to add the revised use pattern(s) to registered product labels are covered by the base fee for the category. All items in the covered application must be submitted together in one package. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval(s) that is submitted in the amendment application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. However, if an amendment application only proposes to register the amendment for a new product and there are no amendments in the application, then review of one new product application is covered by the base fee. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the category decision review time.】

TABLE 4. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ₍₁₎	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee (\$)
R300	45	New product; or similar combination product (already registered) to an identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; registered source of active ingredient; no data review on acute toxicity, efficacy or CRP — only product chemistry data; cite-all data citation, or selective data citation where applicant owns all required data, or applicant submits specific authorization letter from data owner. Category also includes 100% re-package of registered end-use or manufacturing-use product that requires no data submission nor data matrix. (2)(3)	4	1,582
R301	46	New product; or similar combination product (already registered) to an identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; registered source of active ingredient; selective data citation only for data on product chemistry and/or acute toxicity and/or public health pest efficacy (identical data citation and claims to cited product(s)), where applicant does not own all required data and does not have a specific authorization letter from data owner. (2)(3)	4	1,897
R310	47	New end-use or manufacturing-use product with registered source(s) of active ingredient(s); includes products containing two or more registered active ingredients previously combined in other registered products; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; requires review of data package within RD only; includes data and/or waivers of data for only: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● product chemistry and/or ● acute toxicity and/or ● child resistant packaging and/or ● pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for up to 3 target pests. (2)(3) 	7	7,301

TABLE 4. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ⁽¹⁾	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee (\$)
R314	48	New end use product containing up to three registered active ingredients never before registered as this combination in a formulated product; new product label is identical or substantially similar to the labels of currently registered products which separately contain the respective component active ingredients; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; requires review of data package within RD only; includes data and/or waivers of data for only: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● product chemistry and/or ● acute toxicity and/or ● child resistant packaging and/or ● pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for up to 3 target pests. (2)(3) 	8	8,626
R319	49	New end use product containing up to three registered active ingredients never before registered as this combination in a formulated product; new product label is identical or substantially similar to the labels of currently registered products which separately contain the respective component active ingredients; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; requires review of data package within RD only; includes data and/or waivers of data for only: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● product chemistry and/or ● acute toxicity and/or ● child resistant packaging and/or ● pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for 4 to 7 target pests. (2)(3) 	10	12,626
R318	50 (new)	New end use product containing four or more registered active ingredients never before registered as this combination in a formulated product; new product label is identical or substantially similar to the labels of currently registered products which separately contain the respective component active ingredients; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; requires review of data package within RD only; includes data and/or waivers of data for only: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● product chemistry and/or ● acute toxicity and/or ● child resistant packaging and/or ● pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for up to 3 target pests. (2)(3) 	9	13,252
R321	51 (new)	New end use product containing four or more registered active ingredients never before registered as this combination in a formulated product; new product label is identical or substantially similar to the labels of currently registered products which separately contain the respective component active ingredients; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; requires review of data package within RD only; includes data and/or waivers of data for only: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● product chemistry and/or ● acute toxicity and/or ● child resistant packaging and/or ● pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for 4 to 7 target pests. (2)(3) 	11	17,252
R315	52	New end-use, on-animal product, registered source of active ingredient(s), with the submission of data and/or waivers for only: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● animal safety and ● pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) and/or ● product chemistry and/or ● acute toxicity and/or ● child resistant packaging. (2) (3) 	9	9,820
R316	53 (new)	New end-use or manufacturing product with registered source(s) of active ingredient(s) including products containing two or more registered active ingredients previously combined in other registered products; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; and requires review of data and/or waivers for only: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● product chemistry and/or ● acute toxicity and/or ● child resistant packaging and/or ● pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for greater than 3 and up to 7 target pests. (2)(3) 	9	11,301

TABLE 4. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ⁽¹⁾	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee (\$)
R317	54 (new)	New end-use or manufacturing product with registered source(s) of active ingredient(s) including products containing 2 or more registered active ingredients previously combined in other registered products; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; and requires review of data and/or waivers for only: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● product chemistry and/or ● acute toxicity and/or ● child resistant packaging and/or ● pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for greater than 7 target pests. (2)(3) 	10	15,301
R320	55	New product; new physical form; requires data review in science divisions. (2)(3)	12	13,226
R331	56	New product; repack of identical registered end-use product as a manufacturing-use product, or identical registered manufacturing-use product as an end use product; same registered uses only. (2)(3)	3	2,530
R332	57	New manufacturing-use product; registered active ingredient; unregistered source of active ingredient; submission of completely new generic data package; registered uses only; requires review in RD and science divisions. (2)(3)	24	283,215
R333	58	New product; MUP or End use product with unregistered source of active ingredient; requires science data review; new physical form; etc. Cite-all or selective data citation where applicant owns all required data. (2)(3)	10	19,838
R334	59	New product; MUP or End use product with unregistered source of the active ingredient; requires science data review; new physical form; etc. Selective data citation. (2)(3)	11	23,100

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) An application for a new end-use product using a source of active ingredient that (a) is not yet registered but (b) has an application pending with the Agency for review, will be considered an application for a new product with an unregistered source of active ingredient.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(4) For the purposes of classifying proposed registration actions into PRIA categories, "pest(s) requiring efficacy" are: public health pests listed in PR Notice 2002-1, livestock pests (e.g. Horn flies, Stable flies), wood-destroying pests (e.g. termites, carpenter ants, wood-boring beetles) and certain invasive species (e.g. Asian Longhorned beetle, Emerald Ashborer). This list may be updated/refined as invasive pest needs arise. To determine the number of pests for the PRIA categories, pests have been placed into groups (general; e.g., cockroaches) and pest specific (specifically a test species). If seeking a label claim against a pest group (general), use the group listing below and each group will count as 1. The general pests groups are: mites, dust mites, chiggers, ticks, hard ticks, soft ticks, cattle ticks, scorpions, spiders, centipedes, lice, fleas, cockroaches, keds, bot flies, screwworms, filth flies, blow flies, house flies, flesh flies, mosquitoes, biting flies, horse flies, stable flies, deer flies, sand flies, biting midges, black flies, true bugs, bed bugs, stinging bees, wasps, yellow jackets, hornets, ants (excluding carpenter ants), fire and harvester ants, wood destroying beetles, carpenter ants, termites, subterranean termites, dry wood termites, arboreal termites, damp wood termites and invasive species. If seeking a claim against a specific pest without a general claim then each specific pest will count as 1.]

TABLE 5. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — AMENDMENTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ⁽¹⁾	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee (\$)
R340	60	Amendment requiring data review within RD (e.g., changes to precautionary label statements); includes adding/modifying pest(s) claims for up to 2 target pests, excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study. (2)(3)(4)	4	4,988
R341	61 (New)	Amendment requiring data review within RD (e.g., changes to precautionary label statements), includes adding/modifying pest(s) claims for greater than 2 target pests, excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study. (2)(3)(4)	6	5,988
R345	62	Amending on-animal products previously registered, with the submission of data and/or waivers for only: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● animal safety and ● pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) and/or ● product chemistry and/or ● acute toxicity and/or ● child resistant packaging. (2)(3) 	7	8,820
R350	63	Amendment requiring data review in science divisions (e.g., changes to REI, or PPE, or PHI, or use rate, or number of applications; or add aerial application; or modify GW/SW advisory statement). (2)(3)	9	13,226
R351	64	Amendment adding a new unregistered source of active ingredient. (2)(3)	8	13,226
R352	65	Amendment adding already approved uses; selective method of support; does not apply if the applicant owns all cited data. (2) (3)	8	13,226

TABLE 5. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — AMENDMENTS—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ₍₁₎	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee (\$)
R371	66	Amendment to Experimental Use Permit; (does not include extending a permit's time period). (3)	6	10,090

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) (a) EPA-initiated amendments shall not be charged registration service fees. (b) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(c)(3)(B) and are not subject to registration service fees. (c) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments handled by the Antimicrobials Division are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(h) and are not subject to registration service fees. (d) Registrant initiated amendments submitted by notification under PR Notices, such as PR Notice 98-10, continue under PR Notice timelines and are not subject to registration service fees. (e) Submissions with data and requiring data review are subject to registration service fees.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(4) For the purposes of classifying proposed registration actions into PRIA categories, "pest(s) requiring efficacy" are: public health pests listed in PR Notice 2002-1, livestock pests (e.g. Horn flies, Stable flies), wood-destroying pests (e.g. termites, carpenter ants, wood-boring beetles) and certain invasive species (e.g. Asian Longhorned beetle, Emerald Ashborer). This list may be updated/refined as invasive pest needs arise. To determine the number of pests for the PRIA categories, pests have been placed into groups (general; e.g., cockroaches) and pest specific (specifically a test species). If seeking a label claim against a pest group (general), use the group listing below and each group will count as 1. The general pests groups are: mites, dust mites, chiggers, ticks, hard ticks, soft ticks, cattle ticks, scorpions, spiders, centipedes, lice, fleas, cockroaches, keds, bot flies, screwworms, filth flies, blow flies, house flies, flesh flies, mosquitoes, biting flies, horse flies, stable flies, deer flies, sand flies, biting midges, black flies, true bugs, bed bugs, stinging bees, wasps, yellow jackets, hornets, ants (excluding carpenter ants), fire and harvester ants, wood destroying beetles, carpenter ants, termites, subterranean termites, dry wood termites, arboreal termites, damp wood termites and invasive species. If seeking a claim against a specific pest without a general claim then each specific pest will count as 1.】

TABLE 6. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — OTHER ACTIONS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ₍₁₎	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee (\$)
R124	67	Conditional Ruling on Pre-application Study Waivers; applicant-initiated.	6	2,530
R272	68	Review of Study Protocol applicant-initiated; excludes DART, pre-registration conference, Rapid Response review, DNT protocol review, protocol needing HSRB review.	3	2,530
R275	69	Rebuttal of agency reviewed protocol, applicant initiated.	3	2,530
R370	70	Cancer reassessment; applicant-initiated.	18	198,250

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.】

TABLE 7. — ANTIMICROBIALS DIVISION — NEW ACTIVE INGREDIENTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ₍₁₎	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee (\$)
A380	71	New Active Ingredient; Indirect Food use; establish tolerance or tolerance exemption if required. (2)(3)	24	137,841
A390	72	New Active Ingredient; Direct Food use; establish tolerance or tolerance exemption if required. (2)(3)	24	229,733
A410	73	New Active Ingredient Non-food use.(2)(3)	21	229,733
A431	74	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; low-risk. (2)(3)	12	80,225

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.】

TABLE 8. — ANTIMICROBIALS DIVISION — NEW USES

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ₍₁₎	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee (\$)
A440	75	New Use, Indirect Food Use, establish tolerance or tolerance exemption. (2)(3)(4)	21	31,910

TABLE 8. — ANTIMICROBIALS DIVISION — NEW USES—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ⁽¹⁾	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee (\$)
A441	76	Additional Indirect food uses; establish tolerances or tolerance exemptions if required; 6 or more submitted in one application. (3)(4)(5)	21	114,870
A450	77	New use, Direct food use, establish tolerance or tolerance exemption. (2)(3)(4)	21	95,724
A451	78	Additional Direct food uses; establish tolerances or tolerance exemptions if required; 6 or more submitted in one application. (3)(4)(5)	21	182,335
A500	79	New use, non-food. (4)(5)	12	31,910
A501	80	New use, non-food; 6 or more submitted in one application. (4)(5)	15	76,583

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) If EPA data rules are amended to newly require clearance under section 408 of the FFCA for an ingredient of an antimicrobial product where such ingredient was not previously subject to such a clearance, then review of the data for such clearance of such product is not subject to a registration service fee for the tolerance action for two years from the effective date of the rule.

(4) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(5) Amendment applications to add the new use(s) to registered product labels are covered by the base fee for the new use(s). All items in the covered application must be submitted together in one package. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval(s) that is submitted in the new use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. However, if a new use application only proposes to register the new use for a new product and there are no amendments in the application, then review of one new product application is covered by the new use fee. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new use decision review time. Any application for a new product or an amendment to the proposed labeling (a) submitted subsequent to submission of the new use application and (b) prior to conclusion of its decision review time and (c) containing the same new uses, will be deemed a separate new-use application, subject to a separate registration service fee and new decision review time for a new use. If the new-use application includes non-food (indoor and/or outdoor), and food (outdoor and/or indoor) uses, the appropriate fee is due for each type of new use and the longest decision review time applies to all of the new uses requested in the application. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screen, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new use application.】

TABLE 9. — ANTIMICROBIALS DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS AND AMENDMENTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ⁽¹⁾	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee (\$)
A530	81	New product, identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; no data review or only product chemistry data; cite all data citation or selective data citation where applicant owns all required data; or applicant submits specific authorization letter from data owner. Category also includes 100% re-package of registered end-use or manufacturing use product that requires no data submission nor data matrix. (2)(3)	4	1,278
A531	82	New product; identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; registered source of active ingredient: selective data citation only for data on product chemistry and/or acute toxicity and/or public health pest efficacy, where applicant does not own all required data and does not have a specific authorization letter from data owner. (2)(3)	4	1,824
A532	83	New product; identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; registered active ingredient; unregistered source of active ingredient; cite-all data citation except for product chemistry; product chemistry data submitted. (2)(3)	5	5,107
A540	84	New end use product; FIFRA §2(mm) uses only; up to 25 public health organisms. (2)(3)(5)(6)	5	5,107
A541	85 (new)	New end use product; FIFRA §2(mm) uses only; 26-50 public health organisms. (2)(3)(5)(6)	7	8,500
A542	86 (new)	New end use product; FIFRA §2(mm) uses only; ≥ 51 public health organisms. (2)(3)(5)	10	15,000
A550	87	New end-use product; uses other than FIFRA §2(mm); non-FQPA product. (2)(3)(5)	9	13,226
A560	88	New manufacturing use product; registered active ingredient; selective data citation. (2)(3)	6	12,596

TABLE 9. — ANTIMICROBIALS DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS AND AMENDMENTS—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ⁽¹⁾	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee (\$)
A565	89 (new)	New manufacturing-use product; registered active ingredient; unregistered source of active ingredient; submission of new generic data package; registered uses only; requires science review. (2)(3)	12	18,234
A570	90	Label amendment requiring data review; up to 25 public health organisms. (3)(4)(5)(6)	4	3,831
A573	91 (new)	Label amendment requiring data review; 26-50 public health organisms. (2)(3)(5)(7)	6	6,350
A574	92 (new)	Label amendment requiring data review; ≥ 51 public health organisms. (2)(3)(5)(7)	9	11,000
A572	93	New Product or amendment requiring data review for risk assessment by Science Branch (e.g., changes to REI, or PPE, or use rate). (2)(3)(4)	9	13,226

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) An application for a new end-use product using a source of active ingredient that (a) is not yet registered but (b) has an application pending with the Agency for review, will be considered an application for a new product with an unregistered source of active ingredient.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(4)(a) EPA-initiated amendments shall not be charged registration service fees. (b) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(c)(3)(B) and are not subject to registration service fees. (c) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments handled by the Antimicrobials Division are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(h) and are not subject to registration service fees. (d) Registrant initiated amendments submitted by notification under PR Notices, such as PR Notice 98–10, continue under PR Notice timelines and are not subject to registration service fees. (e) Submissions with data and requiring data review are subject to registration service fees.

(5) The applicant must identify the substantially similar product if opting to use cite-all or the selective method to support acute toxicity data requirements.

(6) Once a submission for a new product with public health organisms has been submitted and classified in either A540 or A541, additional organisms submitted for the same product before expiration of the first submission's original decision review time period will result in reclassification of both the original and subsequent submission into the appropriate new category based on the sum of the number or organisms in both submissions. A reclassification would result in a new PRIA start date and require additional fees to meet the fee of the new category.

(7) Once a submission for a label amendment with public health organisms has been submitted and classified in either A570 or A573, additional organisms submitted for the same product before expiration of the first submission's original decision review time period will result in reclassification of both the original and subsequent submission into the appropriate new category based on the sum of the number or organisms in both submissions. A reclassification would result in a new PRIA start date and require additional fees to meet the fee of the new category. ■

TABLE 10. — ANTIMICROBIALS DIVISION — EXPERIMENTAL USE PERMITS AND OTHER ACTIONS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ⁽¹⁾	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee (\$)
A520	94	Experimental Use Permit application, non-food use. (2)	9	6,383
A521	95	Review of public health efficacy study protocol within AD, per AD Internal Guidance for the Efficacy Protocol Review Process; Code will also include review of public health efficacy study protocol and data review for devices making pesticidal claims; applicant-initiated; Tier 1.	4	4,726
A522	96	Review of public health efficacy study protocol outside AD by members of AD Efficacy Protocol Review Expert Panel; Code will also include review of public health efficacy study protocol and data review for devices making pesticidal claims; applicant-initiated; Tier 2.	12	12,156
A537	97 (new)	New Active Ingredient/New Use, Experimental Use Permit application; Direct food use; Establish tolerance or tolerance exemption if required. Credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient/new use application that follows.	18	153,156
A538	98 (new)	New Active Ingredient/New Use, Experimental Use Permit application; Indirect food use; Establish tolerance or tolerance exemption if required Credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient/new use application that follows.	18	95,724
A539	99 (new)	New Active Ingredient/New Use, Experimental Use Permit application; Nonfood use. Credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient/new use application that follows.	15	92,163
A529	100	Amendment to Experimental Use Permit; requires data review or risk assessment. (2)	9	11,429
A523	101	Review of protocol other than a public health efficacy study (i.e., Toxicology or Exposure Protocols).	9	12,156
A571	102	Science reassessment: Cancer risk, refined ecological risk, and/or endangered species; applicant-initiated.	18	95,724
A533	103 (new)	Exemption from the requirement of an Experimental Use Permit. (2)	4	2,482
A534	104 (new)	Rebuttal of agency reviewed protocol, applicant initiated.	4	4,726
A535	105 (new)	Conditional Ruling on Pre-application Study Waiver or Data Bridging Argument; applicant-initiated.	6	2,409
A536	106 (new)	Conditional Ruling on Pre-application Direct Food, Indirect Food, Nonfood use determination; applicant-initiated.	4	2,482

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.】

【TABLE 11. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — NEW ACTIVE INGREDIENTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ⁽¹⁾	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee (\$)
B580	107	New active ingredient; food use; petition to establish a tolerance. (2)(3)	20	51,053
B590	108	New active ingredient; food use; petition to establish a tolerance exemption. (2)(3)	18	31,910
B600	109	New active ingredient; non-food use. (2)(3)	13	19,146
B610	110	New active ingredient; Experimental Use Permit application; petition to establish a temporary tolerance or temporary tolerance exemption. (3)	10	12,764
B611	111	New active ingredient; Experimental Use Permit application; petition to establish permanent tolerance exemption. (3)	12	12,764
B612	112	New active ingredient; no change to a permanent tolerance exemption. (2)(3)	10	17,550
B613	113	New active ingredient; petition to convert a temporary tolerance or a temporary tolerance exemption to a permanent tolerance or tolerance exemption. (2)(3)	11	17,550
B620	114	New active ingredient; Experimental Use Permit application; non-food use including crop destruct. (3)	7	6,383

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.】

【TABLE 12. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — NEW USES

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ⁽¹⁾	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee (\$)
B630	115	First food use; petition to establish a tolerance exemption. (2)(4)	13	12,764
B631	116	New food use; petition to amend an established tolerance. (3)(4)	12	12,764
B640	117	First food use; petition to establish a tolerance. (2)(4)	19	19,146
B643	118	New Food use; petition to amend an established tolerance exemption. (3)(4)	10	12,764
B642	119	First food use; indoor; food/food handling. (2)(4)	12	31,910
B644	120	New use, no change to an established tolerance or tolerance exemption. (3)(4)	8	12,764
B650	121	New use; non-food. (3)(4)	7	6,383
B645	122 (new)	New food use; Experimental Use Permit application; petition to amend or add a tolerance exemption. (4)	12	12,764
B646	123 (new)	New use; non-food use including crop destruct; Experimental Use Permit application. (4)	7	6,383

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) Amendment applications to add the new use(s) to registered product labels are covered by the base fee for the new use(s). All items in the covered application must be submitted together in one package. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval(s) that is submitted in the new use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. However, if a new use application only proposes to register the new use for a new product and there are no amendments in the application, then review of one new product application is covered by the new use fee. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new use decision review time. Any application for a new product or an amendment to the proposed labeling (a) submitted subsequent to submission of the new use application and (b) prior to conclusion of its decision review time and (c) containing the same new uses, will be deemed a separate new-use application, subject to a separate registration service fee and new decision review time for a new use. If the new-use application includes non-food (indoor and/or outdoor), and food (outdoor and/or indoor) uses, the appropriate fee is due for each type of new use and the longest decision review time applies to all of the new uses requested in the application. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screen, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new use application.

(4) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.】

【TABLE 13. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ⁽¹⁾	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee (\$)
B652	124	New product; registered source of active ingredient; requires petition to amend established tolerance or tolerance exemption; requires 1) submission of product specific data; or 2) citation of previously reviewed and accepted data; or 3) submission or citation of data generated at government expense; or 4) submission or citation of scientifically-sound rationale based on publicly available literature or other relevant information that addresses the data requirement; or 5) submission of a request for a data requirement to be waived supported by a scientifically-sound rationale explaining why the data requirement does not apply. (2)(3)	13	12,764
B660	125	New product; registered source of active ingredient(s); identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product. No data review, or only product chemistry data; cite-all data citation, or selective data citation where applicant owns all required data or authorization from data owner is demonstrated. Category includes 100% re-package of registered end-use or manufacturing-use product that requires no data submission or data matrix. For microbial pesticides, the active ingredient(s) must not be re-isolated. (2)(3)	4	1,278
B670	126	New product; registered source of active ingredient(s); requires: 1) submission of product specific data; or 2) citation of previously reviewed and accepted data; or 3) submission or citation of data generated at government expense; or 4) submission or citation of a scientifically-sound rationale based on publicly available literature or other relevant information that addresses the data requirement; or 5) submission of a request for a data requirement to be waived supported by a scientifically-sound rationale explaining why the data requirement does not apply. (2)(3)	7	5,107
B671	127	New product; unregistered source of active ingredient(s); requires a petition to amend an established tolerance or tolerance exemption; requires: 1) submission of product specific data; or 2) citation of previously reviewed and accepted data; or 3) submission or citation of data generated at government expense; or 4) submission or citation of a scientifically-sound rationale based on publicly available literature or other relevant information that addresses the data requirement; or 5) submission of a request for a data requirement to be waived supported by a scientifically-sound rationale explaining why the data requirement does not apply. (2)(3)	17	12,764
B672	128	New product; unregistered source of active ingredient(s); non-food use or food use requires: 1) submission of product specific data; or 2) citation of previously reviewed and accepted data; or 3) submission or citation of data generated at government expense; or 4) submission or citation of a scientifically-sound rationale based on publicly available literature or other relevant information that addresses the data requirement; or 5) submission of a request for a data requirement to be waived supported by a scientifically-sound rationale explaining why the data requirement does not apply. (2)(3)	13	9,118
B673	129	New product MUP/EP; unregistered source of active ingredient(s); citation of Technical Grade Active Ingredient (TGA) data previously reviewed and accepted by the Agency. Requires an Agency determination that the cited data supports the new product. (2)(3)	10	5,107
B674	130	New product MUP; Repack of identical registered end-use product as a manufacturing-use product; same registered uses only. (2)(3)	4	1,278
B675	131	New Product MUP; registered source of active ingredient; submission of completely new generic data package; registered uses only. (2)(3)	10	9,118
B676	132	New product; more than one active ingredient where one active ingredient is an unregistered source; product chemistry data must be submitted; requires: 1) submission of product specific data, and 2) citation of previously reviewed and accepted data; or 3) submission or citation of data generated at government expense; or 4) submission or citation of a scientifically-sound rationale based on publicly available literature or other relevant information that addresses the data requirement; or 5) submission of a request for a data requirement to be waived supported by a scientifically-sound rationale explaining why the data requirement does not apply. (2)(3)	13	9,118
B677	133	New end-use non-food animal product with submission of two or more target animal safety studies; includes data and/or waivers of data for only: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● product chemistry and/or ● acute toxicity and/or ● public health pest efficacy and/or ● animal safety studies and/or ● child resistant packaging. (2)(3) 	10	8,820

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) An application for a new end-use product using a source of active ingredient that (a) is not yet registered but (b) has an application pending with the Agency for review, will be considered an application for a new product with an unregistered source of active ingredient.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.】

【TABLE 14. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — AMENDMENTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ₍₁₎	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee (\$)
B621	134	Amendment; Experimental Use Permit; no change to an established temporary tolerance or tolerance exemption. (3)	7	5,107
B622	135	Amendment; Experimental Use Permit; petition to amend an established or temporary tolerance or tolerance exemption. (3)	11	12,764
B641	136	Amendment of an established tolerance or tolerance exemption.	13	12,764
B680	137	Amendment; registered sources of active ingredient(s); no new use(s); no changes to an established tolerance or tolerance exemption. Requires data submission. (2)(3)	5	5,107
B681	138	Amendment; unregistered source of active ingredient(s). Requires data submission. (2)(3)	7	6,079
B683	139	Label amendment; requires review/update of previous risk assessment(s) without data submission (e.g., labeling changes to REI, PPE, PHI). (2)(3)	6	5,107
B684	140	Amending non-food animal product that includes submission of target animal safety data; previously registered. (2)(3)	8	8,820
B685	141 (new)	Amendment; add a new biochemical unregistered source of active ingredient or a new microbial production site. Requires submission of analysis of samples data and source/production site-specific manufacturing process description. (3)	5	5,107

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) (a) EPA-initiated amendments shall not be charged registration service fees. (b) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(c)(3)(B) and are not subject to registration service fees. (c) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments handled by the Antimicrobials Division are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(h) and are not subject to registration service fees. (d) Registrant initiated amendments submitted by notification under PR Notices, such as PR Notice 98-10, continue under PR Notice timelines and are not subject to registration service fees. (e) Submissions with data and requiring data review are subject to registration service fees.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.】

【TABLE 15. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — SCLP

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ₍₁₎	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee (\$)
B690	142	New active ingredient; food or non-food use. (2)(6)	7	2,554
B700	143	Experimental Use Permit application; new active ingredient or new use. (6)	7	1,278
B701	144	Extend or amend Experimental Use Permit. (6)	4	1,278
B710	145	New product; registered source of active ingredient(s); identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; no change in an established tolerance or tolerance exemption. No data review, or only product chemistry data; cite-all data citation, or selective data citation where applicant owns all required data or authorization from data owner is demonstrated. Category includes 100% re-package of registered end-use or manufacturing-use product that requires no data submission or data matrix. (3)(6)	4	1,278

TABLE 15. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — SCLP—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ⁽¹⁾	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee (\$)
B720	146	New product; registered source of active ingredient(s); requires: 1) submission of product specific data; or 2) citation of previously reviewed and accepted data; or 3) submission or citation of data generated at government expense; or 4) submission or citation of a scientifically-sound rationale based on publicly available literature or other relevant information that addresses the data requirement; or 5) submission of a request for a data requirement to be waived supported by a scientifically-sound rationale explaining why the data requirement does not apply. (3)(6)	5	1,278
B721	147	New product; unregistered source of active ingredient. (3)(6)	7	2,676
B722	148	New use and/or amendment; petition to establish a tolerance or tolerance exemption. (4)(5)(6)	7	2,477
B730	149	Label amendment requiring data submission. (4)(6)	5	1,278

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) An application for a new end-use product using a source of active ingredient that (a) is not yet registered but (b) has an application pending with the Agency for review, will be considered an application for a new product with an unregistered source of active ingredient.

(4) (a) EPA-initiated amendments shall not be charged registration service fees. (b) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(c)(3)(B) and are not subject to registration service fees. (c) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments handled by the Antimicrobials Division are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(h) and are not subject to registration service fees. (d) Registrant initiated amendments submitted by notification under PR Notices, such as PR Notice 98-10, continue under PR Notice timelines and are not subject to registration service fees. (e) Submissions with data and requiring data review are subject to registration service fees.

(5) Amendment applications to add the new use(s) to registered product labels are covered by the base fee for the new use(s). All items in the covered application must be submitted together in one package. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval(s) that is submitted in the new use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. However, if a new use application only proposes to register the new use for a new product and there are no amendments in the application, then review of one new product application is covered by the new use fee. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new use decision review time. Any application for a new product or an amendment to the proposed labeling (a) submitted subsequent to submission of the new use application and (b) prior to conclusion of its decision review time and (c) containing the same new uses, will be deemed a separate new-use application, subject to a separate registration service fee and new decision review time for a new use. If the new-use application includes non-food (indoor and/or outdoor), and food (outdoor and/or indoor) uses, the appropriate fee is due for each type of new use and the longest decision review time applies to all of the new uses requested in the application. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screen, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new use application.

(6) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.】

TABLE 16. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — OTHER ACTIONS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ⁽¹⁾	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee (\$)
B614	150	Pre-application; Conditional Ruling on rationales for addressing a data requirement in lieu of data; applicant-initiated; applies to one rationale at a time.	3	2,530
B615	151	Rebuttal of agency reviewed protocol, applicant initiated.	3	2,530
B682	152	Protocol review; applicant initiated; excludes time for HSRB review.	3	2,432

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.】

TABLE 17. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — PIP

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ⁽¹⁾	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee (\$)
B740	153	Experimental Use Permit application; no petition for tolerance/tolerance exemption. Includes: 1. non-food/feed use(s) for a new (2) or registered (3) PIP (12); 2. food/feed use(s) for a new or registered PIP with crop destruct (12); 3. food/feed use(s) for a new or registered PIP in which an established tolerance/tolerance exemption exists for the intended use(s). (4)(12)	6	95,724

TABLE 17. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — PIP—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ₍₁₎	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee (\$)
B741	154 (new)	Experimental Use Permit application; no petition for tolerance/tolerance exemption. Includes: 1. non-food/feed use(s) for a new (2) or registered (3) PIP; 2. food/feed use(s) for a new or registered PIP with crop destruct; 3. food/feed use(s) for a new or registered PIP in which an established tolerance/tolerance exemption exists for the intended use(s); SAP Review. (12)	12	159,538
B750	155	Experimental Use Permit application; with a petition to establish a temporary or permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient. Includes new food/feed use for a registered (3) PIP. (4)(12)	9	127,630
B770	156	Experimental Use Permit application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish a temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient; credit 75% of B771 fee toward registration application for a new active ingredient that follows; SAP review. (5)(12)	15	191,444
B771	157	Experimental Use Permit application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish a temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient; credit 75% of B771 fee toward registration application for a new active ingredient that follows. (12)	10	127,630
B772	158	Application to amend or extend an Experimental Use Permit; no petition since the established tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient is unaffected. (12)	3	12,764
B773	159	Application to amend or extend an Experimental Use Permit; with petition to extend a temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient. (12)	5	31,910
B780	160	Registration application; new (2) PIP; non-food/feed. (12)	12	159,537
B790	161	Registration application; new (2) PIP; non-food/feed; SAP review. (5)(12)	18	223,351
B800	162	Registration application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient based on an existing temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption. (12)	13	172,300
B810	163	Registration application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient based on an existing temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption. SAP review. (5)(12)	19	236,114
B820	164	Registration application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish or amend a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption of an active ingredient. (12)	15	204,208
B840	165	Registration application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish or amend a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption of an active ingredient. SAP review. (5)(12)	21	268,022
B851	166	Registration application; new event of a previously registered PIP active ingredient(s); no petition since permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s). (12)	9	127,630
B870	167	Registration application; registered (3) PIP; new product; new use; no petition since a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s). (4) (12)	9	38,290
B880	168	Registration application; registered (3) PIP; new product or new terms of registration; additional data submitted; no petition since a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s). (6) (7) (12)	9	31,910
B881	169	Registration application; registered (3) PIP; new product or new terms of registration; additional data submitted; no petition since a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s). SAP review. (5)(6)(7)(12)	15	95,724
B882	170 (new)	Registration application; new (2) PIP, seed increase with negotiated acreage cap and time-limited registration; with petition to establish a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient based on an existing temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption; SAP Review. (8)(12)	15	191,444
B883	171	Registration application; new (2) PIP, seed increase with negotiated acreage cap and time-limited registration; with petition to establish a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient based on an existing temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption. (8) (12)	9	127,630
B884	172	Registration application; new (2) PIP, seed increase with negotiated acreage cap and time-limited registration; with petition to establish a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient. (8)(12)	12	159,537
B885	173	Registration application; registered (3) PIP, seed increase; breeding stack of previously approved PIPs, same crop; no petition since a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s). (9)(12)	6	31,910
B886	174 (new)	Registration application; new (2) PIP, seed increase with negotiated acreage cap and time-limited registration; with petition to establish a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient. SAP Review. (8) (12)	18	223,351
B890	175	Application to amend a seed increase registration; converts registration to commercial registration; no petition since permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s). (12)	9	63,816
B891	176	Application to amend a seed increase registration; converts registration to a commercial registration; no petition since a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption already established for the active ingredient(s); SAP review. (5)(12)	15	127,630

TABLE 17. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — PIP—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ₍₁₎	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee (\$)
B900	177	Application to amend a registration, including actions such as extending an expiration date, modifying an IRM plan, or adding an insect to be controlled. (10)(11)(12)	6	12,764
B901	178	Application to amend a registration, including actions such as extending an expiration date, modifying an IRM plan, or adding an insect to be controlled. SAP review. (10) (11) (12)	12	76,578
B902	179	PIP Protocol review.	3	6,383
B903	180	Inert ingredient tolerance exemption; e.g., a marker such as NPT II; reviewed in BPPD.	6	63,816
B904	181	Import tolerance or tolerance exemption; processed commodities/food only (inert or active ingredient).	9	127,630
B905	182 (new)	SAP Review.	6	63,816
B906	183 (new)	Petition to establish a temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption for one or more active ingredients.	3	31,907
B907	184 (new)	Petition to establish a temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption for one or more active ingredients based on an existing temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption.	3	12,764
B908	185 (new)	Petition to establish a temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption for one or more active ingredients or inert ingredients.	3	44,671

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) New PIP = a PIP with an active ingredient that has not been registered.

(3) Registered PIP = a PIP with an active ingredient that is currently registered.

(4) Transfer registered PIP through conventional breeding for new food/feed use, such as from field corn to sweet corn.

(5) The scientific data involved in this category are complex. EPA often seeks technical advice from the Scientific Advisory Panel on risks that pesticides pose to wildlife, farm workers, pesticide applicators, non-target species, as well as insect resistance, and novel scientific issues surrounding new technologies. The scientists of the SAP neither make nor recommend policy decisions. They provide advice on the science used to make these decisions. Their advice is invaluable to the EPA as it strives to protect humans and the environment from risks posed by pesticides. Due to the time it takes to schedule and prepare for meetings with the SAP, additional time and costs are needed.

(6) Registered PIPs stacked through conventional breeding.

(7) Deployment of a registered PIP with a different IRM plan (e.g., seed blend).

(8) The negotiated acreage cap will depend upon EPA's determination of the potential environmental exposure, risk(s) to non-target organisms, and the risk of targeted pest developing resistance to the pesticidal substance. The uncertainty of these risks may reduce the allowable acreage, based upon the quantity and type of non-target organism data submitted and the lack of insect resistance management data, which is usually not required for seed-increase registrations. Registrants are encouraged to consult with EPA prior to submission of a registration application in this category.

(9) Application can be submitted prior to or concurrently with an application for commercial registration.

(10) For example, IRM plan modifications that are applicant-initiated.

(11) EPA-initiated amendments shall not be charged fees.

(12) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.■

TABLE 18. — INERT INGREDIENTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ₍₁₎	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee (\$)
I001	186	Approval of new food use inert ingredient. (2)(3)	13	27,000
I002	187	Amend currently approved inert ingredient tolerance or exemption from tolerance; new data. (2)	11	7,500
I003	188	Amend currently approved inert ingredient tolerance or exemption from tolerance; no new data. (2)	9	3,308
I004	189	Approval of new non-food use inert ingredient. (2)	6	11,025
I005	190	Amend currently approved non-food use inert ingredient with new use pattern; new data. (2)	6	5,513
I006	191	Amend currently approved non-food use inert ingredient with new use pattern; no new data. (2)	3	3,308
I007	192	Approval of substantially similar non-food use inert ingredients when original inert is compositionally similar with similar use pattern. (2)	4	1,654
I008	193	Approval of new or amended polymer inert ingredient, food use. (2)	5	3,749
I009	194	Approval of new or amended polymer inert ingredient, non-food use. (2)	4	3,087
I010	195	Petition to amend a single tolerance exemption descriptor, or single non-food use descriptor, to add ≤ 10 CASRNs; no new data. (2)	6	1,654
I011	196 (new)	Approval of new food use safener with tolerance or exemption from tolerance. (2)(8)	24	597,683
I012	197 (new)	Approval of new non-food use safener. (2)(8)	21	415,241

TABLE 18. — INERT INGREDIENTS—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ⁽¹⁾	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee (\$)
I013	198 (new)	Approval of additional food use for previously approved safener with tolerance or exemption from tolerance. (2)	15	62,975
I014	199 (new)	Approval of additional non-food use for previously approved safener. (2)	15	25,168
I015	200 (new)	Approval of new generic data for previously approved food use safener. (2)	24	269,728
I016	201 (new)	Approval of amendment(s) to tolerance and label for previously approved safener. (2)	13	55,776

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) If another covered application is submitted that depends upon an application to approve an inert ingredient, each application will be subject to its respective registration service fee. The decision review time line for both submissions will be the longest of the associated applications. If the application covers multiple ingredients grouped by EPA into one chemical class, a single registration service fee will be assessed for approval of those ingredients.

(3) If EPA data rules are amended to newly require clearance under section 408 of the FFDCA for an ingredient of an antimicrobial product where such ingredient was not previously subject to such a clearance, then review of the data for such clearance of such product is not subject to a registration service fee for the tolerance action for two years from the effective date of the rule.

(4) Any other covered application that is associated with and dependent on the HSRB review will be subject to its separate registration service fee. The decision review times for the associated actions run concurrently, but will end at the date of the latest review time.

(5) Any other covered application that is associated with and dependent on the SAP review will be subject to its separate registration service fee. The decision review time for the associated action will be extended by the decision review time for the SAP review.

(6) An application for a new end-use product using a source of active ingredient that (a) is not yet registered but (b) has an application pending with the Agency for review, will be considered an application for a new product with an unregistered source of active ingredient.

(7) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(8) If a new safener is submitted in the same package as a new active ingredient, and that new active ingredient is determined to be reduced risk, then the safener would get the same reduced time-frame as the new active ingredient.】

TABLE 19. — EXTERNAL REVIEW AND MISCELLANEOUS ACTIONS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ⁽¹⁾	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee (\$)
M001	202	Study protocol requiring Human Studies Review Board review as defined in 40 CFR Part 26 in support of an active ingredient. (4)	9	7,938
M002	203	Completed study requiring Human Studies Review Board review as defined in 40 CFR Part 26 in support of an active ingredient. (4)	9	7,938
M003	204	External technical peer review of new active ingredient, product, or amendment (e.g., consultation with FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel) for an action with a decision timeframe of less than 12 months. Applicant initiated request based on a requirement of the Administrator, as defined by FIFRA § 25(d), in support of a novel active ingredient, or unique use pattern or application technology. Excludes PIP active ingredients. (5)	12	63,945
M004	205	External technical peer review of new active ingredient, product, or amendment (e.g., consultation with FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel) for an action with a decision timeframe of greater than 12 months. Applicant initiated request based on a requirement of the Administrator, as defined by FIFRA § 25(d), in support of a novel active ingredient, or unique use pattern or application technology. Excludes PIP active ingredients. (5)	18	63,945
M005	206	New Product: Combination, Contains a combination of active ingredients from a registered and/or unregistered source; conventional, antimicrobial and/or biopesticide. Requires coordination with other regulatory divisions to conduct review of data, label and/or verify the validity of existing data as cited. Only existing uses for each active ingredient in the combination product. (6)(7)	9	22,050
M006	207	Request for up to 5 letters of certification (Gold Seal) for one actively registered product (excludes distributor products). (8)	1	277
M007	208	Request to extend Exclusive Use of data as provided by FIFRA Section 3(c)(1)(F)(ii).	12	5,513
M008	209	Request to grant Exclusive Use of data as provided by FIFRA Section 3(c)(1)(F)(vi) for a minor use, when a FIFRA Section 2(II)(2) determination is required.	15	1,654
M009	210 (new)	Non-FIFRA Regulated Determination: Applicant initiated, per product.	4	2,363
M010	211 (new)	Conditional ruling on pre-application, product substantial similarity.	4	2,363
M011	212 (new)	Label amendment to add the DfE logo; requires data review; no other label changes. (9)	4	3,648

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) If another covered application is submitted that depends upon an application to approve an inert ingredient, each application will be subject to its respective registration service fee. The decision review time line for both submissions will be the longest of the associated applications. If the application covers multiple ingredients grouped by EPA into one chemical class, a single registration service fee will be assessed for approval of those ingredients.

(3) If EPA data rules are amended to newly require clearance under section 408 of the FFDCA for an ingredient of an antimicrobial product where such ingredient was not previously subject to such a clearance, then review of the data for such clearance of such product is not subject to a registration service fee for the tolerance action for two years from the effective date of the rule.

(4) Any other covered application that is associated with and dependent on the HSRB review will be subject to its separate registration service fee. The decision review times for the associated actions run concurrently, but will end at the date of the latest review time.

(5) Any other covered application that is associated with and dependent on the SAP review will be subject to its separate registration service fee. The decision review time for the associated action will be extended by the decision review time for the SAP review.

(6) An application for a new end-use product using a source of active ingredient that (a) is not yet registered but (b) has an application pending with the Agency for review, will be considered an application for a new product with an unregistered source of active ingredient.

(7) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(8) Due to low fee and short time frame this category is not eligible for small business waivers. Gold seal applies to one registered product.

(9) This category includes amendments the sole purpose of which is to add DfE (or equivalent terms that do not use "safe" or derivatives of "safe") logos to a label. DfE is a voluntary program. A label bearing a DfE logo is not considered an Agency endorsement because the ingredients in the qualifying product must meet objective, scientific criteria established and widely publicized by EPA."]

“(3) *SCHEDULE OF COVERED APPLICATIONS AND OTHER ACTIONS AND THEIR REGISTRATION SERVICE FEES.*—Subject to paragraph (6), the scheduled actions and their corresponding registration service fees shall be as follows:

“TABLE 1. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — NEW ACTIVE INGREDIENTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)⁽¹⁾	Registration Service Fee (\$)
R010	1	New Active Ingredient, Food use. (2)(3)	24	753,082
R020	2	New Active Ingredient, Food use; reduced risk. (2)(3)	18	627,568
R040	3	New Active Ingredient, Food use; Experimental Use Permit application; establish temporary tolerance; submitted before application for registration; credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient application that follows. (3)	18	462,502
R060	4	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; outdoor. (2)(3)	21	523,205
R070	5	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; outdoor; reduced risk. (2)(3)	16	436,004
R090	6	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; outdoor; Experimental Use Permit application; submitted before application for registration; credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient application that follows. (3)	16	323,690
R110	7	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; indoor. (2)(3)	20	290,994
R120	8	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; indoor; reduced risk. (2)(3)	14	242,495
R121	9	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; indoor; Experimental Use Permit application; submitted before application for registration; credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient application that follows. (3)	18	182,327
R122	10	Enriched isomer(s) of registered mixed-isomer active ingredient. (2)(3)	18	317,128
R123	11	New Active Ingredient, Seed treatment only; includes agricultural and non-agricultural seeds; residues not expected in raw agricultural commodities. (2)(3)	18	471,861
R125	12	New Active Ingredient, Seed treatment; Experimental Use Permit application; submitted before application for registration; credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient application that follows. (3)	16	323,690

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

“TABLE 2. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — NEW USES

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)⁽¹⁾	Registration Service Fee (\$)
R130	13	First food use; indoor; food/food handling. (2) (3)	21	191,444
R140	14	Additional food use; Indoor; food/food handling. (3) (4)	15	44,672
R150	15	First food use. (2)(3)	21	317,104
R155	16 (new)	First food use, Experimental Use Permit application; a.i. registered for non-food outdoor use. (3)(4)	21	264,253
R160	17	First food use; reduced risk. (2)(3)	16	264,253
R170	18	Additional food use. (3) (4)	15	79,349
R175	19	Additional food uses covered within a crop group resulting from the conversion of existing approved crop group(s) to one or more revised crop groups. (3)(4)	10	66,124
R180	20	Additional food use; reduced risk. (3)(4)	10	66,124
R190	21	Additional food uses; 6 or more submitted in one application. (3)(4)	15	476,090
R200	22	Additional Food Use; 6 or more submitted in one application; Reduced Risk. (3)(4)	10	396,742
R210	23	Additional food use; Experimental Use Permit application; establish temporary tolerance; no credit toward new use registration. (3)(4)	12	48,986
R220	24	Additional food use; Experimental Use Permit application; crop destruct basis; no credit toward new use registration. (3)(4)	6	19,838
R230	25	Additional use; non-food; outdoor. (3) (4)	15	31,713
R240	26	Additional use; non-food; outdoor; reduced risk. (3)(4)	10	26,427
R250	27	Additional use; non-food; outdoor; Experimental Use Permit application; no credit toward new use registration. (3)(4)	6	19,838
R251	28	Experimental Use Permit application which requires no changes to the tolerance(s); non-crop destruct basis. (3)	8	19,838
R260	29	New use; non-food; indoor. (3) (4)	12	15,317
R270	30	New use; non-food; indoor; reduced risk. (3)(4)	9	12,764
R271	31	New use; non-food; indoor; Experimental Use Permit application; no credit toward new use registration. (3)(4)	6	9,725
R273	32	Additional use; seed treatment; limited uptake into Raw Agricultural Commodities; includes crops with established tolerances (e.g., for soil or foliar application); includes food and/or non-food uses. (3)(4)	12	50,445
R274	33	Additional uses; seed treatment only; 6 or more submitted in one application; limited uptake into raw agricultural commodities; includes crops with established tolerances (e.g., for soil or foliar application); includes food and/or non-food uses. (3)(4)	12	302,663

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(4) Amendment applications to add the new use(s) to registered product labels are covered by the base fee for the new use(s). All items in the covered application must be submitted together in one package. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval(s) that is submitted in the new use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. However, if a new use application only proposes to register the new use for a new product and there are no amendments in the application, then review of one new product application is covered by the new use fee. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new use decision review time. Any application for a new product or an amendment to the proposed labeling (a) submitted subsequent to submission of the new use application and (b) prior to conclusion of its decision review time and (c) containing the same new uses, will be deemed a separate new-use application, subject to a separate registration service fee and new decision review time for a new use. If the new-use application includes non-food (indoor and/or outdoor), and food (outdoor and/or indoor) uses, the appropriate fee is due for each type of new use and the longest decision review time applies to all of the new uses requested in the application. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screen, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new use application.

“TABLE 3. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — IMPORT AND OTHER TOLERANCES

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ⁽¹⁾	Registration Service Fee (\$)
R280	34	Establish import tolerance; new active ingredient or first food use. (2)	21	319,072
R290	35	Establish Import tolerance; Additional new food use.	15	63,816
R291	36	Establish import tolerances; additional food uses; 6 or more crops submitted in one petition.	15	382,886
R292	37	Amend an established tolerance (e.g., decrease or increase) and/or harmonize established tolerances with Codex MRLs; domestic or import; applicant-initiated.	11	45,341
R293	38	Establish tolerance(s) for inadvertent residues in one crop; applicant-initiated.	12	53,483
R294	39	Establish tolerances for inadvertent residues; 6 or more crops submitted in one application; applicant-initiated.	12	320,894
R295	40	Establish tolerance(s) for residues in one rotational crop in response to a specific rotational crop application; submission of corresponding label amendments which specify the necessary plant-back restrictions; applicant-initiated. (3) (4)	15	66,124
R296	41	Establish tolerances for residues in rotational crops in response to a specific rotational crop petition; 6 or more crops submitted in one application; submission of corresponding label amendments which specify the necessary plant-back restrictions; applicant-initiated. (3) (4)	15	396,742
R297	42	Amend 6 or more established tolerances (e.g., decrease or increase) in one petition; domestic or import; applicant-initiated.	11	272,037
R298	43	Amend an established tolerance (e.g., decrease or increase); domestic or import; submission of corresponding amended labels (requiring science review). (3) (4)	13	58,565
R299	44	Amend 6 or more established tolerances (e.g., decrease or increase); domestic or import; submission of corresponding amended labels (requiring science review). (3) (4)	13	285,261

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(4) Amendment applications to add the revised use pattern(s) to registered product labels are covered by the base fee for the category. All items in the covered application must be submitted together in one package. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval(s) that is submitted in the amendment application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. However, if an amendment application only proposes to register the amendment for a new product and there are no amendments in the application, then review of one new product application is covered by the base fee. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the category decision review time.

“TABLE 4. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)⁽¹⁾	Registration Service Fee (\$)
R300	45	New product; or similar combination product (already registered) to an identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; registered source of active ingredient; no data review on acute toxicity, efficacy or CRP — only product chemistry data; cite-all data citation, or selective data citation where applicant owns all required data, or applicant submits specific authorization letter from data owner. Category also includes 100% re-package of registered end-use or manufacturing-use product that requires no data submission nor data matrix. (2)(3)	4	1,582
R301	46	New product; or similar combination product (already registered) to an identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; registered source of active ingredient; selective data citation only for data on product chemistry and/or acute toxicity and/or public health pest efficacy (identical data citation and claims to cited product(s)), where applicant does not own all required data and does not have a specific authorization letter from data owner. (2)(3)	4	1,897
R310	47	New end-use or manufacturing-use product with registered source(s) of active ingredient(s); includes products containing two or more registered active ingredients previously combined in other registered products; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; requires review of data package within RD only; includes data and/or waivers of data for only: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● product chemistry and/or ● acute toxicity and/or ● child resistant packaging and/or ● pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for up to 3 target pests. (2)(3) 	7	7,301
R314	48	New end use product containing up to three registered active ingredients never before registered as this combination in a formulated product; new product label is identical or substantially similar to the labels of currently registered products which separately contain the respective component active ingredients; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; requires review of data package within RD only; includes data and/or waivers of data for only: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● product chemistry and/or ● acute toxicity and/or ● child resistant packaging and/or ● pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for up to 3 target pests. (2)(3) 	8	8,626
R319	49	New end use product containing up to three registered active ingredients never before registered as this combination in a formulated product; new product label is identical or substantially similar to the labels of currently registered products which separately contain the respective component active ingredients; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; requires review of data package within RD only; includes data and/or waivers of data for only: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● product chemistry and/or ● acute toxicity and/or ● child resistant packaging and/or ● pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for 4 to 7 target pests. (2)(3) 	10	12,626

“TABLE 4. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)⁽¹⁾	Registration Service Fee (\$)
R318	50 (new)	New end use product containing four or more registered active ingredients never before registered as this combination in a formulated product; new product label is identical or substantially similar to the labels of currently registered products which separately contain the respective component active ingredients; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; requires review of data package within RD only; includes data and/or waivers of data for only: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● product chemistry and/or ● acute toxicity and/or ● child resistant packaging and/or ● pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for up to 3 target pests. (2)(3) 	9	13,252
R321	51 (new)	New end use product containing four or more registered active ingredients never before registered as this combination in a formulated product; new product label is identical or substantially similar to the labels of currently registered products which separately contain the respective component active ingredients; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; requires review of data package within RD only; includes data and/or waivers of data for only: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● product chemistry and/or ● acute toxicity and/or ● child resistant packaging and/or ● pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for 4 to 7 target pests. (2)(3) 	11	17,252
R315	52	New end-use, on-animal product, registered source of active ingredient(s), with the submission of data and/or waivers for only: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● animal safety and ● pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) and/or ● product chemistry and/or ● acute toxicity and/or ● child resistant packaging. (2) (3) 	9	9,820
R316	53 (new)	New end-use or manufacturing product with registered source(s) of active ingredient(s) including products containing two or more registered active ingredients previously combined in other registered products; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; and requires review of data and/or waivers for only: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● product chemistry and/or ● acute toxicity and/or ● child resistant packaging and/or ● pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for greater than 3 and up to 7 target pests. (2)(3) 	9	11,301
R317	54 (new)	New end-use or manufacturing product with registered source(s) of active ingredient(s) including products containing 2 or more registered active ingredients previously combined in other registered products; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; and requires review of data and/or waivers for only: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● product chemistry and/or ● acute toxicity and/or ● child resistant packaging and/or ● pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for greater than 7 target pests. (2)(3) 	10	15,301
R320	55	New product; new physical form; requires data review in science divisions. (2)(3)	12	13,226
R331	56	New product; repack of identical registered end-use product as a manufacturing-use product, or identical registered manufacturing-use product as an end use product; same registered uses only. (2)(3)	3	2,530

“TABLE 4. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)⁽¹⁾	Registration Service Fee (\$)
R332	57	New manufacturing-use product; registered active ingredient; unregistered source of active ingredient; submission of completely new generic data package; registered uses only; requires review in RD and science divisions. (2)(3)	24	283,215
R333	58	New product; MUP or End use product with unregistered source of active ingredient; requires science data review; new physical form; etc. Cite-all or selective data citation where applicant owns all required data. (2)(3)	10	19,838
R334	59	New product; MUP or End use product with unregistered source of the active ingredient; requires science data review; new physical form; etc. Selective data citation. (2)(3)	11	23,100

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) An application for a new end-use product using a source of active ingredient that (a) is not yet registered but (b) has an application pending with the Agency for review, will be considered an application for a new product with an unregistered source of active ingredient.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(4) For the purposes of classifying proposed registration actions into PRIA categories, “pest(s) requiring efficacy” are: public health pests listed in PR Notice 2002-1, livestock pests (e.g. Horn flies, Stable flies), wood-destroying pests (e.g. termites, carpenter ants, wood-boring beetles) and certain invasive species (e.g. Asian Longhorned beetle, Emerald Ashborer). This list may be updated/refined as invasive pest needs arise. To determine the number of pests for the PRIA categories, pests have been placed into groups (general; e.g., cockroaches) and pest specific (specifically a test species). If seeking a label claim against a pest group (general), use the group listing below and each group will count as 1. The general pests groups are: mites, dust mites, chiggers, ticks, hard ticks, soft ticks, cattle ticks, scorpions, spiders, centipedes, lice, fleas, cockroaches, keds, bot flies, screwworms, filth flies, blow flies, house flies, flesh flies, mosquitoes, biting flies, horse flies, stable flies, deer flies, sand flies, biting midges, black flies, true bugs, bed bugs, stinging bees, wasps, yellow jackets, hornets, ants (excluding carpenter ants), fire and harvester ants, wood destroying beetles, carpenter ants, termites, subterranean termites, dry wood termites, arboreal termites, damp wood termites and invasive species. If seeking a claim against a specific pest without a general claim then each specific pest will count as 1.

“TABLE 5. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — AMENDMENTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)⁽¹⁾	Registration Service Fee (\$)
R340	60	Amendment requiring data review within RD (e.g., changes to precautionary label statements); includes adding/modifying pest(s) claims for up to 2 target pests, excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study. (2)(3)(4)	4	4,988
R341	61 (New)	Amendment requiring data review within RD (e.g., changes to precautionary label statements), includes adding/modifying pest(s) claims for greater than 2 target pests, excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study. (2)(3)(4)	6	5,988
R345	62	Amending on-animal products previously registered, with the submission of data and/or waivers for only: ● animal safety and ● pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) and/or ● product chemistry and/or ● acute toxicity and/or ● child resistant packaging. (2)(3)	7	8,820
R350	63	Amendment requiring data review in science divisions (e.g., changes to REI, or PPE, or PHI, or use rate, or number of applications; or add aerial application; or modify GW/SW advisory statement). (2)(3)	9	13,226
R351	64	Amendment adding a new unregistered source of active ingredient. (2)(3)	8	13,226
R352	65	Amendment adding already approved uses; selective method of support; does not apply if the applicant owns all cited data. (2) (3)	8	13,226
R371	66	Amendment to Experimental Use Permit; (does not include extending a permit's time period). (3)	6	10,090

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) (a) EPA-initiated amendments shall not be charged registration service fees. (b) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(c)(3)(B) and are not subject to registration service fees. (c) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments handled by the Antimicrobials Division are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(h) and are not subject to registration service fees. (d) Registrant initiated amendments submitted by notification under PR Notices, such as PR Notice 98-10, continue under PR Notice timelines and are not subject to registration service fees. (e) Submissions with data and requiring data review are subject to registration service fees.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(4) For the purposes of classifying proposed registration actions into PRIA categories, "pest(s) requiring efficacy" are: public health pests listed in PR Notice 2002-1, livestock pests (e.g. Horn flies, Stable flies), wood-destroying pests (e.g. termites, carpenter ants, wood-boring beetles) and certain invasive species (e.g. Asian Longhorned beetle, Emerald Ashborer). This list may be updated/refined as invasive pest needs arise. To determine the number of pests for the PRIA categories, pests have been placed into groups (general; e.g., cockroaches) and pest specific (specifically a test species). If seeking a label claim against a pest group (general), use the group listing below and each group will count as 1. The general pests groups are: mites, dust mites, chiggers, ticks, hard ticks, soft ticks, scorpions, spiders, centipedes, lice, fleas, cockroaches, keds, bot flies, screwworms, filth flies, blow flies, house flies, flesh flies, mosquitoes, biting flies, horse flies, stable flies, deer flies, sand flies, biting midges, black flies, true bugs, bed bugs, stinging bees, wasps, yellow jackets, hornets, ants (excluding carpenter ants), fire and harvester ants, wood destroying beetles, carpenter ants, termites, subterranean termites, dry wood termites, arboreal termites, damp wood termites and invasive species. If seeking a claim against a specific pest without a general claim then each specific pest will count as 1.

“TABLE 6. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — OTHER ACTIONS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ⁽¹⁾	Registration Service Fee (\$)
R124	67	Conditional Ruling on Pre-application Study Waivers; applicant-initiated.	6	2,530
R272	68	Review of Study Protocol applicant-initiated; excludes DART, pre-registration conference, Rapid Response review, DNT protocol review, protocol needing HSRB review.	3	2,530
R275	69	Rebuttal of agency reviewed protocol, applicant initiated.	3	2,530
R370	70	Cancer reassessment; applicant-initiated.	18	198,250

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

“TABLE 7. — ANTIMICROBIALS DIVISION — NEW ACTIVE INGREDIENTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ⁽¹⁾	Registration Service Fee (\$)
A380	71	New Active Ingredient; Indirect Food use; establish tolerance or tolerance exemption if required. (2)(3)	24	137,841
A390	72	New Active Ingredient; Direct Food use; establish tolerance or tolerance exemption if required. (2)(3)	24	229,733
A410	73	New Active Ingredient Non-food use.(2)(3)	21	229,733
A431	74	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; low-risk. (2)(3)	12	80,225

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

“TABLE 8. — ANTIMICROBIALS DIVISION — NEW USES

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ⁽¹⁾	Registration Service Fee (\$)
A440	75	New Use, Indirect Food Use, establish tolerance or tolerance exemption. (2)(3)(4)	21	31,910

“TABLE 8. — ANTIMICROBIALS DIVISION — NEW USES—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)⁽¹⁾	Registration Service Fee (\$)
A441	76	Additional Indirect food uses; establish tolerances or tolerance exemptions if required; 6 or more submitted in one application. (3)(4)(5)	21	114,870
A450	77	New use, Direct food use, establish tolerance or tolerance exemption. (2)(3)(4)	21	95,724
A451	78	Additional Direct food uses; establish tolerances or tolerance exemptions if required; 6 or more submitted in one application. (3)(4)(5)	21	182,335
A500	79	New use, non-food. (4)(5)	12	31,910
A501	80	New use, non-food; 6 or more submitted in one application. (4)(5)	15	76,583

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) If EPA data rules are amended to newly require clearance under section 408 of the FFDCA for an ingredient of an antimicrobial product where such ingredient was not previously subject to such a clearance, then review of the data for such clearance of such product is not subject to a registration service fee for the tolerance action for two years from the effective date of the rule.

(4) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(5) Amendment applications to add the new use(s) to registered product labels are covered by the base fee for the new use(s). All items in the covered application must be submitted together in one package. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval(s) that is submitted in the new use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. However, if a new use application only proposes to register the new use for a new product and there are no amendments in the application, then review of one new product application is covered by the new use fee. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new use decision review time. Any application for a new product or an amendment to the proposed labeling (a) submitted subsequent to submission of the new use application and (b) prior to conclusion of its decision review time and (c) containing the same new uses, will be deemed a separate new-use application, subject to a separate registration service fee and new decision review time for a new use. If the new-use application includes non-food (indoor and/or outdoor), and food (outdoor and/or indoor) uses, the appropriate fee is due for each type of new use and the longest decision review time applies to all of the new uses requested in the application. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screen, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new use application.

“TABLE 9. — ANTIMICROBIALS DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS AND AMENDMENTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)⁽¹⁾	Registration Service Fee (\$)
A530	81	New product, identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; no data review or only product chemistry data; cite all data citation or selective data citation where applicant owns all required data; or applicant submits specific authorization letter from data owner. Category also includes 100% re-package of registered end-use or manufacturing use product that requires no data submission nor data matrix. (2)(3)	4	1,278
A531	82	New product; identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; registered source of active ingredient; selective data citation only for data on product chemistry and/or acute toxicity and/or public health pest efficacy, where applicant does not own all required data and does not have a specific authorization letter from data owner. (2)(3)	4	1,824

“TABLE 9. — ANTIMICROBIALS DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS AND AMENDMENTS—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)⁽¹⁾	Registration Service Fee (\$)
A532	83	New product; identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; registered active ingredient; unregistered source of active ingredient; cite-all data citation except for product chemistry; product chemistry data submitted. (2)(3)	5	5,107
A540	84	New end use product; FIFRA §2(mm) uses only; up to 25 public health organisms. (2)(3)(5)(6)	5	5,107
A541	85 (new)	New end use product; FIFRA §2(mm) uses only; 26-50 public health organisms. (2)(3)(5)(6)	7	8,500
A542	86 (new)	New end use product; FIFRA §2(mm) uses only; ≥ 51 public health organisms. (2)(3)(5)	10	15,000
A550	87	New end-use product; uses other than FIFRA §2(mm); non-FQPA product. (2)(3)(5)	9	13,226
A560	88	New manufacturing use product; registered active ingredient; selective data citation. (2)(3)	6	12,596
A565	89 (new)	New manufacturing-use product; registered active ingredient; unregistered source of active ingredient; submission of new generic data package; registered uses only; requires science review. (2)(3)	12	18,234
A570	90	Label amendment requiring data review; up to 25 public health organisms. (3)(4)(5)(6)	4	3,831
A573	91 (new)	Label amendment requiring data review; 26-50 public health organisms. (2)(3)(5)(7)	6	6,350
A574	92 (new)	Label amendment requiring data review; ≥ 51 public health organisms. (2)(3)(5)(7)	9	11,000
A572	93	New Product or amendment requiring data review for risk assessment by Science Branch (e.g., changes to REI, or PPE, or use rate). (2)(3)(4)	9	13,226

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) An application for a new end-use product using a source of active ingredient that (a) is not yet registered but (b) has an application pending with the Agency for review, will be considered an application for a new product with an unregistered source of active ingredient.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(4)(a) EPA-initiated amendments shall not be charged registration service fees. (b) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(c)(3)(B) and are not subject to registration service fees. (c) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments handled by the Antimicrobials Division are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(h) and are not subject to registration service fees. (d) Registrant initiated amendments submitted by notification under PR Notices, such as PR Notice 98-10, continue under PR Notice timelines and are not subject to registration service fees. (e) Submissions with data and requiring data review are subject to registration service fees.

(5) The applicant must identify the substantially similar product if opting to use cite-all or the selective method to support acute toxicity data requirements.

(6) Once a submission for a new product with public health organisms has been submitted and classified in either A540 or A541, additional organisms submitted for the same product before expiration of the first submission's original decision review time period will result in reclassification of both the original and subsequent submission into the appropriate new category based on the sum of the number of organisms in both submissions. A reclassification would result in a new PRIA start date and require additional fees to meet the fee of the new category.

(7) Once a submission for a label amendment with public health organisms has been submitted and classified in either A570 or A573, additional organisms submitted for the same product before expiration of the first submission's original decision review time period will result in reclassification of both the original and subsequent submission into the appropriate new category based on the sum of the number of organisms in both submissions. A reclassification would result in a new PRIA start date and require additional fees to meet the fee of the new category.

“TABLE 10. — ANTIMICROBIALS DIVISION — EXPERIMENTAL USE PERMITS AND OTHER ACTIONS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)⁽¹⁾	Registration Service Fee (\$)
A520	94	Experimental Use Permit application, non-food use. (2)	9	6,383
A521	95	Review of public health efficacy study protocol within AD, per AD Internal Guidance for the Efficacy Protocol Review Process; Code will also include review of public health efficacy study protocol and data review for devices making pesticidal claims; applicant-initiated; Tier 1.	4	4,726

“TABLE 10. — ANTIMICROBIALS DIVISION — EXPERIMENTAL USE PERMITS AND OTHER ACTIONS—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)⁽¹⁾	Registration Service Fee (\$)
A522	96	Review of public health efficacy study protocol outside AD by members of AD Efficacy Protocol Review Expert Panel; Code will also include review of public health efficacy study protocol and data review for devices making pesticidal claims; applicant-initiated; Tier 2.	12	12,156
A537	97 (new)	New Active Ingredient/New Use, Experimental Use Permit application; Direct food use; Establish tolerance or tolerance exemption if required. Credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient/new use application that follows.	18	153,156
A538	98 (new)	New Active Ingredient/New Use, Experimental Use Permit application; Indirect food use; Establish tolerance or tolerance exemption if required Credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient/new use application that follows.	18	95,724
A539	99 (new)	New Active Ingredient/New Use, Experimental Use Permit application; Nonfood use. Credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient/new use application that follows.	15	92,163
A529	100	Amendment to Experimental Use Permit; requires data review or risk assessment. (2)	9	11,429
A523	101	Review of protocol other than a public health efficacy study (i.e., Toxicology or Exposure Protocols).	9	12,156
A571	102	Science reassessment: Cancer risk, refined ecological risk, and/or endangered species; applicant-initiated.	18	95,724
A533	103 (new)	Exemption from the requirement of an Experimental Use Permit. (2)	4	2,482
A534	104 (new)	Rebuttal of agency reviewed protocol, applicant initiated.	4	4,726
A535	105 (new)	Conditional Ruling on Pre-application Study Waiver or Data Bridging Argument; applicant-initiated.	6	2,409
A536	106 (new)	Conditional Ruling on Pre-application Direct Food, Indirect Food, Nonfood use determination; applicant-initiated.	4	2,482

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

“TABLE 11. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — NEW ACTIVE INGREDIENTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)⁽¹⁾	Registration Service Fee (\$)
B580	107	New active ingredient; food use; petition to establish a tolerance. (2)(3)	20	51,053
B590	108	New active ingredient; food use; petition to establish a tolerance exemption. (2)(3)	18	31,910
B600	109	New active ingredient; non-food use. (2)(3)	13	19,146
B610	110	New active ingredient; Experimental Use Permit application; petition to establish a temporary tolerance or temporary tolerance exemption. (3)	10	12,764
B611	111	New active ingredient; Experimental Use Permit application; petition to establish permanent tolerance exemption. (3)	12	12,764
B612	112	New active ingredient; no change to a permanent tolerance exemption. (2)(3)	10	17,550
B613	113	New active ingredient; petition to convert a temporary tolerance or a temporary tolerance exemption to a permanent tolerance or tolerance exemption. (2)(3)	11	17,550

“TABLE 11. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — NEW ACTIVE INGREDIENTS—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)⁽¹⁾	Registration Service Fee (\$)
B620	114	New active ingredient; Experimental Use Permit application; non-food use including crop destruct. (3)	7	6,383

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

“TABLE 12. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — NEW USES

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)⁽¹⁾	Registration Service Fee (\$)
B630	115	First food use; petition to establish a tolerance exemption. (2)(4)	13	12,764
B631	116	New food use; petition to amend an established tolerance. (3)(4)	12	12,764
B640	117	First food use; petition to establish a tolerance. (2)(4)	19	19,146
B643	118	New Food use; petition to amend an established tolerance exemption. (3)(4)	10	12,764
B642	119	First food use; indoor; food/food handling. (2)(4)	12	31,910
B644	120	New use, no change to an established tolerance or tolerance exemption. (3)(4)	8	12,764
B650	121	New use; non-food. (3)(4)	7	6,383
B645	122 (new)	New food use; Experimental Use Permit application; petition to amend or add a tolerance exemption. (4)	12	12,764
B646	123 (new)	New use; non-food use including crop destruct; Experimental Use Permit application. (4)	7	6,383

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) Amendment applications to add the new use(s) to registered product labels are covered by the base fee for the new use(s). All items in the covered application must be submitted together in one package. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval(s) that is submitted in the new use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. However, if a new use application only proposes to register the new use for a new product and there are no amendments in the application, then review of one new product application is covered by the new use fee. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new use decision review time. Any application for a new product or an amendment to the proposed labeling (a) submitted subsequent to submission of the new use application and (b) prior to conclusion of its decision review time and (c) containing the same new uses, will be deemed a separate new-use application, subject to a separate registration service fee and new decision review time for a new use. If the new-use application includes non-food (indoor and/or outdoor), and food (outdoor and/or indoor) uses, the appropriate fee is due for each type of new use and the longest decision review time applies to all of the new uses requested in the application. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screen, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new use application.

(4) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

“TABLE 13. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)⁽¹⁾	Registration Service Fee (\$)
B652	124	New product; registered source of active ingredient; requires petition to amend established tolerance or tolerance exemption; requires 1) submission of product specific data; or 2) citation of previously reviewed and accepted data; or 3) submission or citation of data generated at government expense; or 4) submission or citation of scientifically-sound rationale based on publicly available literature or other relevant information that addresses the data requirement; or 5) submission of a request for a data requirement to be waived supported by a scientifically-sound rationale explaining why the data requirement does not apply. (2)(3)	13	12,764
B660	125	New product; registered source of active ingredient(s); identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product. No data review, or only product chemistry data; cite-all data citation, or selective data citation where applicant owns all required data or authorization from data owner is demonstrated. Category includes 100% repackage of registered end-use or manufacturing-use product that requires no data submission or data matrix. For microbial pesticides, the active ingredient(s) must not be re-isolated. (2)(3)	4	1,278
B670	126	New product; registered source of active ingredient(s); requires: 1) submission of product specific data; or 2) citation of previously reviewed and accepted data; or 3) submission or citation of data generated at government expense; or 4) submission or citation of a scientifically-sound rationale based on publicly available literature or other relevant information that addresses the data requirement; or 5) submission of a request for a data requirement to be waived supported by a scientifically-sound rationale explaining why the data requirement does not apply. (2)(3)	7	5,107
B671	127	New product; unregistered source of active ingredient(s); requires a petition to amend an established tolerance or tolerance exemption; requires: 1) submission of product specific data; or 2) citation of previously reviewed and accepted data; or 3) submission or citation of data generated at government expense; or 4) submission or citation of a scientifically-sound rationale based on publicly available literature or other relevant information that addresses the data requirement; or 5) submission of a request for a data requirement to be waived supported by a scientifically-sound rationale explaining why the data requirement does not apply. (2)(3)	17	12,764
B672	128	New product; unregistered source of active ingredient(s); non-food use or food use requires: 1) submission of product specific data; or 2) citation of previously reviewed and accepted data; or 3) submission or citation of data generated at government expense; or 4) submission or citation of a scientifically-sound rationale based on publicly available literature or other relevant information that addresses the data requirement; or 5) submission of a request for a data requirement to be waived supported by a scientifically-sound rationale explaining why the data requirement does not apply. (2)(3)	13	9,118
B673	129	New product MUP/EP; unregistered source of active ingredient(s); citation of Technical Grade Active Ingredient (TGAI) data previously reviewed and accepted by the Agency. Requires an Agency determination that the cited data supports the new product. (2)(3)	10	5,107
B674	130	New product MUP; Repack of identical registered end-use product as a manufacturing-use product; same registered uses only. (2)(3)	4	1,278
B675	131	New Product MUP; registered source of active ingredient; submission of completely new generic data package; registered uses only. (2)(3)	10	9,118
B676	132	New product; more than one active ingredient where one active ingredient is an unregistered source; product chemistry data must be submitted; requires: 1) submission of product specific data, and 2) citation of previously reviewed and accepted data; or 3) submission or citation of data generated at government expense; or 4) submission or citation of a scientifically-sound rationale based on publicly available literature or other relevant information that addresses the data requirement; or 5) submission of a request for a data requirement to be waived supported by a scientifically-sound rationale explaining why the data requirement does not apply. (2)(3)	13	9,118

“TABLE 13. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)⁽¹⁾	Registration Service Fee (\$)
B677	133	New end-use non-food animal product with submission of two or more target animal safety studies; includes data and/or waivers of data for only: • product chemistry and/or • acute toxicity and/or • public health pest efficacy and/or • animal safety studies and/or • child resistant packaging. (2)(3)	10	8,820

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) An application for a new end-use product using a source of active ingredient that (a) is not yet registered but (b) has an application pending with the Agency for review, will be considered an application for a new product with an unregistered source of active ingredient.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

“TABLE 14. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — AMENDMENTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)⁽¹⁾	Registration Service Fee (\$)
B621	134	Amendment; Experimental Use Permit; no change to an established temporary tolerance or tolerance exemption. (3)	7	5,107
B622	135	Amendment; Experimental Use Permit; petition to amend an established or temporary tolerance or tolerance exemption. (3)	11	12,764
B641	136	Amendment of an established tolerance or tolerance exemption.	13	12,764
B680	137	Amendment; registered sources of active ingredient(s); no new use(s); no changes to an established tolerance or tolerance exemption. Requires data submission. (2)(3)	5	5,107
B681	138	Amendment; unregistered source of active ingredient(s). Requires data submission. (2)(3)	7	6,079
B683	139	Label amendment; requires review/update of previous risk assessment(s) without data submission (e.g., labeling changes to REI, PPE, PHI). (2)(3)	6	5,107
B684	140	Amending non-food animal product that includes submission of target animal safety data; previously registered. (2)(3)	8	8,820
B685	141 (new)	Amendment; add a new biochemical unregistered source of active ingredient or a new microbial production site. Requires submission of analysis of samples data and source/production site-specific manufacturing process description. (3)	5	5,107

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) (a) EPA-initiated amendments shall not be charged registration service fees. (b) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(c)(3)(B) and are not subject to registration service fees. (c) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments handled by the Antimicrobials Division are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(h) and are not subject to registration service fees. (d) Registrant initiated amendments submitted by notification under PR Notices, such as PR Notice 98-10, continue under PR Notice timelines and are not subject to registration service fees. (e) Submissions with data and requiring data review are subject to registration service fees.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

“TABLE 15. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — SCLP

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ⁽¹⁾	Registration Service Fee (\$)
B690	142	New active ingredient; food or non-food use. (2)(6)	7	2,554
B700	143	Experimental Use Permit application; new active ingredient or new use. (6)	7	1,278
B701	144	Extend or amend Experimental Use Permit. (6)	4	1,278
B710	145	New product; registered source of active ingredient(s); identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; no change in an established tolerance or tolerance exemption. No data review, or only product chemistry data; cite-all data citation, or selective data citation where applicant owns all required data or authorization from data owner is demonstrated. Category includes 100% re-package of registered end-use or manufacturing-use product that requires no data submission or data matrix. (3)(6)	4	1,278
B720	146	New product; registered source of active ingredient(s); requires: 1) submission of product specific data; or 2) citation of previously reviewed and accepted data; or 3) submission or citation of data generated at government expense; or 4) submission or citation of a scientifically-sound rationale based on publicly available literature or other relevant information that addresses the data requirement; or 5) submission of a request for a data requirement to be waived supported by a scientifically-sound rationale explaining why the data requirement does not apply. (3)(6)	5	1,278
B721	147	New product; unregistered source of active ingredient. (3)(6)	7	2,676
B722	148	New use and/or amendment; petition to establish a tolerance or tolerance exemption. (4)(5)(6)	7	2,477
B730	149	Label amendment requiring data submission. (4)(6)	5	1,278

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) An application for a new end-use product using a source of active ingredient that (a) is not yet registered but (b) has an application pending with the Agency for review, will be considered an application for a new product with an unregistered source of active ingredient.

(4) (a) EPA-initiated amendments shall not be charged registration service fees. (b) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(c)(3)(B) and are not subject to registration service fees. (c) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments handled by the Antimicrobials Division are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(h) and are not subject to registration service fees. (d) Registrant initiated amendments submitted by notification under PR Notices, such as PR Notice 98-10, continue under PR Notice timelines and are not subject to registration service fees. (e) Submissions with data and requiring data review are subject to registration service fees.

(5) Amendment applications to add the new use(s) to registered product labels are covered by the base fee for the new use(s). All items in the covered application must be submitted together in one package. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval(s) that is submitted in the new use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. However, if a new use application only proposes to register the new use for a new product and there are no amendments in the application, then review of one new product application is covered by the new use fee. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new use decision review time. Any application for a new product or an amendment to the proposed labeling (a) submitted subsequent to submission of the new use application and (b) prior to conclusion of its decision review time and (c) containing the same new uses, will be deemed a separate new-use application, subject to a separate registration service fee and new decision review time for a new use. If the new-use application includes non-food (indoor and/or outdoor), and food (outdoor and/or indoor) uses, the appropriate fee is due for each type of new use and the longest decision review time applies to all of the new uses requested in the application. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screen, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new use application.

(6) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

“TABLE 16. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — OTHER ACTIONS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ⁽¹⁾	Registration Service Fee (\$)
B614	150	Pre-application; Conditional Ruling on rationales for addressing a data requirement in lieu of data; applicant-initiated; applies to one rationale at a time.	3	2,530
B615	151	Rebuttal of agency reviewed protocol, applicant initiated.	3	2,530
B682	152	Protocol review; applicant initiated; excludes time for HSRB review.	3	2,432

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

“TABLE 17. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — PIP

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months) ⁽¹⁾	Registration Service Fee (\$)
B740	153	Experimental Use Permit application; no petition for tolerance/tolerance exemption. Includes: 1. non-food/feed use(s) for a new (2) or registered (3) PIP (12); 2. food/feed use(s) for a new or registered PIP with crop destruct (12); 3. food/feed use(s) for a new or registered PIP in which an established tolerance/tolerance exemption exists for the intended use(s). (4)(12)	6	95,724
B741	154 (new)	Experimental Use Permit application; no petition for tolerance/tolerance exemption. Includes: 1. non-food/feed use(s) for a new (2) or registered (3) PIP; 2. food/feed use(s) for a new or registered PIP with crop destruct; 3. food/feed use(s) for a new or registered PIP in which an established tolerance/tolerance exemption exists for the intended use(s); SAP Review. (12)	12	159,538
B750	155	Experimental Use Permit application; with a petition to establish a temporary or permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient. Includes new food/feed use for a registered (3) PIP. (4)(12)	9	127,630
B770	156	Experimental Use Permit application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish a temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient; credit 75% of B771 fee toward registration application for a new active ingredient that follows; SAP review. (5)(12)	15	191,444
B771	157	Experimental Use Permit application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish a temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient; credit 75% of B771 fee toward registration application for a new active ingredient that follows. (12)	10	127,630
B772	158	Application to amend or extend an Experimental Use Permit; no petition since the established tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient is unaffected. (12)	3	12,764
B773	159	Application to amend or extend an Experimental Use Permit; with petition to extend a temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient. (12)	5	31,910
B780	160	Registration application; new (2) PIP; non-food/feed. (12)	12	159,537
B790	161	Registration application; new (2) PIP; non-food/feed; SAP review. (5)(12)	18	223,351
B800	162	Registration application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient based on an existing temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption. (12)	13	172,300
B810	163	Registration application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient based on an existing temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption. SAP review. (5)(12)	19	236,114
B820	164	Registration application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish or amend a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption of an active ingredient. (12)	15	204,208

“TABLE 17. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — PIP—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)⁽¹⁾	Registration Service Fee (\$)
B840	165	Registration application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish or amend a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption of an active ingredient. SAP review. (5)(12)	21	268,022
B851	166	Registration application; new event of a previously registered PIP active ingredient(s); no petition since permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s). (12)	9	127,630
B870	167	Registration application; registered (3) PIP; new product; new use; no petition since a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s). (4) (12)	9	38,290
B880	168	Registration application; registered (3) PIP; new product or new terms of registration; additional data submitted; no petition since a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s). (6) (7) (12)	9	31,910
B881	169	Registration application; registered (3) PIP; new product or new terms of registration; additional data submitted; no petition since a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s). SAP review. (5)(6)(7)(12)	15	95,724
B882	170 (new)	Registration application; new (2) PIP, seed increase with negotiated acreage cap and time-limited registration; with petition to establish a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient based on an existing temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption; SAP Review. (8)(12)	15	191,444
B883	171	Registration application; new (2) PIP, seed increase with negotiated acreage cap and time-limited registration; with petition to establish a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient based on an existing temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption. (8) (12)	9	127,630
B884	172	Registration application; new (2) PIP, seed increase with negotiated acreage cap and time-limited registration; with petition to establish a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient. (8)(12)	12	159,537
B885	173	Registration application; registered (3) PIP, seed increase; breeding stack of previously approved PIPs, same crop; no petition since a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s). (9)(12)	6	31,910
B886	174 (new)	Registration application; new (2) PIP, seed increase with negotiated acreage cap and time-limited registration; with petition to establish a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient. SAP Review. (8) (12)	18	223,351
B890	175	Application to amend a seed increase registration; converts registration to commercial registration; no petition since permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s). (12)	9	63,816
B891	176	Application to amend a seed increase registration; converts registration to a commercial registration; no petition since a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption already established for the active ingredient(s); SAP review. (5)(12)	15	127,630
B900	177	Application to amend a registration, including actions such as extending an expiration date, modifying an IRM plan, or adding an insect to be controlled. (10)(11)(12)	6	12,764
B901	178	Application to amend a registration, including actions such as extending an expiration date, modifying an IRM plan, or adding an insect to be controlled. SAP review. (10) (11) (12)	12	76,578
B902	179	PIP Protocol review.	3	6,383
B903	180	Inert ingredient tolerance exemption; e.g., a marker such as NPT II; reviewed in BPPD.	6	63,816
B904	181	Import tolerance or tolerance exemption; processed commodities/food only (inert or active ingredient).	9	127,630
B905	182 (new)	SAP Review.	6	63,816
B906	183 (new)	Petition to establish a temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption for one or more active ingredients.	3	31,907
B907	184 (new)	Petition to establish a temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption for one or more active ingredients based on an existing temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption.	3	12,764

“TABLE 17. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — PIP—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)⁽¹⁾	Registration Service Fee (\$)
B908	185 (new)	Petition to establish a temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption for one or more active ingredients or inert ingredients.	3	44,671

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) New PIP = a PIP with an active ingredient that has not been registered.

(3) Registered PIP = a PIP with an active ingredient that is currently registered.

(4) Transfer registered PIP through conventional breeding for new food/feed use, such as from field corn to sweet corn.

(5) The scientific data involved in this category are complex. EPA often seeks technical advice from the Scientific Advisory Panel on risks that pesticides pose to wildlife, farm workers, pesticide applicators, non-target species, as well as insect resistance, and novel scientific issues surrounding new technologies. The scientists of the SAP neither make nor recommend policy decisions. They provide advice on the science used to make these decisions. Their advice is invaluable to the EPA as it strives to protect humans and the environment from risks posed by pesticides. Due to the time it takes to schedule and prepare for meetings with the SAP, additional time and costs are needed.

(6) Registered PIPs stacked through conventional breeding.

(7) Deployment of a registered PIP with a different IRM plan (e.g., seed blend).

(8) The negotiated acreage cap will depend upon EPA's determination of the potential environmental exposure, risk(s) to non-target organisms, and the risk of targeted pest developing resistance to the pesticidal substance. The uncertainty of these risks may reduce the allowable acreage, based upon the quantity and type of non-target organism data submitted and the lack of insect resistance management data, which is usually not required for seed-increase registrations. Registrants are encouraged to consult with EPA prior to submission of a registration application in this category.

(9) Application can be submitted prior to or concurrently with an application for commercial registration.

(10) For example, IRM plan modifications that are applicant-initiated.

(11) EPA-initiated amendments shall not be charged fees.

(12) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

“TABLE 18. — INERT INGREDIENTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)⁽¹⁾	Registration Service Fee (\$)
I001	186	Approval of new food use inert ingredient. (2)(3)	13	27,000
I002	187	Amend currently approved inert ingredient tolerance or exemption from tolerance; new data. (2)	11	7,500
I003	188	Amend currently approved inert ingredient tolerance or exemption from tolerance; no new data. (2)	9	3,308
I004	189	Approval of new non-food use inert ingredient. (2)	6	11,025
I005	190	Amend currently approved non-food use inert ingredient with new use pattern; new data. (2)	6	5,513
I006	191	Amend currently approved non-food use inert ingredient with new use pattern; no new data. (2)	3	3,308
I007	192	Approval of substantially similar non-food use inert ingredients when original inert is compositionally similar with similar use pattern. (2)	4	1,654
I008	193	Approval of new or amended polymer inert ingredient, food use. (2)	5	3,749
I009	194	Approval of new or amended polymer inert ingredient, non-food use. (2)	4	3,087
I010	195	Petition to amend a single tolerance exemption descriptor, or single non-food use descriptor, to add ≤ 10 CASRNs; no new data. (2)	6	1,654
I011	196 (new)	Approval of new food use safener with tolerance or exemption from tolerance. (2)(8)	24	597,683
I012	197 (new)	Approval of new non-food use safener. (2)(8)	21	415,241
I013	198 (new)	Approval of additional food use for previously approved safener with tolerance or exemption from tolerance. (2)	15	62,975
I014	199 (new)	Approval of additional non-food use for previously approved safener. (2)	15	25,168
I015	200 (new)	Approval of new generic data for previously approved food use safener. (2)	24	269,728
I016	201 (new)	Approval of amendment(s) to tolerance and label for previously approved safener. (2)	13	55,776

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) If another covered application is submitted that depends upon an application to approve an inert ingredient, each application will be subject to its respective registration service fee. The decision review time line for both submissions will be the longest of the associated applications. If the application covers multiple ingredients grouped by EPA into one chemical class, a single registration service fee will be assessed for approval of those ingredients.

(3) If EPA data rules are amended to newly require clearance under section 408 of the FFDCA for an ingredient of an antimicrobial product where such ingredient was not previously subject to such a clearance, then review of the data for such clearance of such product is not subject to a registration service fee for the tolerance action for two years from the effective date of the rule.

(4) Any other covered application that is associated with and dependent on the HSRB review will be subject to its separate registration service fee. The decision review times for the associated actions run concurrently, but will end at the date of the latest review time.

(5) Any other covered application that is associated with and dependent on the SAP review will be subject to its separate registration service fee. The decision review time for the associated action will be extended by the decision review time for the SAP review.

(6) An application for a new end-use product using a source of active ingredient that (a) is not yet registered but (b) has an application pending with the Agency for review, will be considered an application for a new product with an unregistered source of active ingredient.

(7) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(8) If a new safener is submitted in the same package as a new active ingredient, and that new active ingredient is determined to be reduced risk, then the safener would get the same reduced timeframe as the new active ingredient.

“TABLE 19. — EXTERNAL REVIEW AND MISCELLANEOUS ACTIONS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)⁽¹⁾	Registration Service Fee (\$)
M001	202	Study protocol requiring Human Studies Review Board review as defined in 40 CFR Part 26 in support of an active ingredient. (4)	9	7,938
M002	203	Completed study requiring Human Studies Review Board review as defined in 40 CFR Part 26 in support of an active ingredient. (4)	9	7,938
M003	204	External technical peer review of new active ingredient, product, or amendment (e.g., consultation with FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel) for an action with a decision timeframe of less than 12 months. Applicant initiated request based on a requirement of the Administrator, as defined by FIFRA § 25(d), in support of a novel active ingredient, or unique use pattern or application technology. Excludes PIP active ingredients. (5)	12	63,945
M004	205	External technical peer review of new active ingredient, product, or amendment (e.g., consultation with FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel) for an action with a decision timeframe of greater than 12 months. Applicant initiated request based on a requirement of the Administrator, as defined by FIFRA § 25(d), in support of a novel active ingredient, or unique use pattern or application technology. Excludes PIP active ingredients. (5)	18	63,945
M005	206	New Product: Combination, Contains a combination of active ingredients from a registered and/or unregistered source; conventional, antimicrobial and/or biopesticide. Requires coordination with other regulatory divisions to conduct review of data, label and/or verify the validity of existing data as cited. Only existing uses for each active ingredient in the combination product. (6)(7)	9	22,050
M006	207	Request for up to 5 letters of certification (Gold Seal) for one actively registered product (excludes distributor products). (8)	1	277
M007	208	Request to extend Exclusive Use of data as provided by FIFRA Section 3(c)(1)(F)(ii).	12	5,513
M008	209	Request to grant Exclusive Use of data as provided by FIFRA Section 3(c)(1)(F)(vi) for a minor use, when a FIFRA Section 2(l)(2) determination is required.	15	1,654
M009	210 (new)	Non-FIFRA Regulated Determination: Applicant initiated, per product.	4	2,363
M010	211 (new)	Conditional ruling on pre-application, product substantial similarity.	4	2,363
M011	212 (new)	Label amendment to add the DfE logo; requires data review; no other label changes. (9)	4	3,648

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) If another covered application is submitted that depends upon an application to approve an inert ingredient, each application will be subject to its respective registration service fee. The decision review time line for both submissions will be the longest of the associated applications. If the application covers multiple ingredients grouped by EPA into one chemical class, a single registration service fee will be assessed for approval of those ingredients.

(3) If EPA data rules are amended to newly require clearance under section 408 of the FFDCA for an ingredient of an antimicrobial product where such ingredient was not previously subject to such a clearance, then review of the data for such clearance of such product is not subject to a registration service fee for the tolerance action for two years from the effective date of the rule.

(4) Any other covered application that is associated with and dependent on the HSRB review will be subject to its separate registration service fee. The decision review times for the associated actions run concurrently, but will end at the date of the latest review time.

(5) Any other covered application that is associated with and dependent on the SAP review will be subject to its separate registration service fee. The decision review time for the associated action will be extended by the decision review time for the SAP review.

(6) An application for a new end-use product using a source of active ingredient that (a) is not yet registered but (b) has an application pending with the Agency for review, will be considered an application for a new product with an unregistered source of active ingredient.

(7) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(8) Due to low fee and short time frame this category is not eligible for small business waivers. Gold seal applies to one registered product.

(9) This category includes amendments the sole purpose of which is to add DfE (or equivalent terms that do not use "safe" or derivatives of "safe") logos to a label. DfE is a voluntary program. A label bearing a DfE logo is not considered an Agency endorsement because the ingredients in the qualifying product must meet objective, scientific criteria established and widely publicized by EPA."

SEC. 7. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act take effect on October 1, 2017.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Udall amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to, the committee-reported amendments, as amended, be agreed to, and the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 3392) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the bill)

On page 1, line 6, strike "2017" and insert "2018".

On page 2, line 12, strike "2018 through 2020" and insert "2019 through 2023".

On page 2, line 17, strike "2018 through 2020" and insert "2019 through 2023".

On page 2, line 21, strike "2018 through 2020" and insert "2019 through 2023".

On page 3, line 5, strike "2018 through 2020" and insert "2019 through 2023".

On page 3, line 23, strike "2017" and insert "2018".

On page 3, line 24, strike "2022" and insert "2025".

On page 7, line 21, strike "2017" and insert "2018".

On page 12, strike lines 23 and 24 and insert the following:

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking "pesticide registration"; and

(ii) by striking "October 1, 2013, and ending on September 30, 2015" and inserting "October 1, 2019, and ending on September 30, 2021";

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking "pesticide registration"; and

(ii) by striking "2015" each place it appears and inserting "2021"; and

On page 13, line 1, strike "(B)" and insert "(C)".

On page 21, line 11, strike "2021" and insert "2024".

On page 21, line 12, strike "2021" and insert "2024".

On page 21, line 19, strike "2022" and insert "2025".

On page 21, line 20, strike "2022" and insert "2025".

On page 22, line 2, strike "2022" and insert "2025".

On page 22, line 3, strike "2022" and insert "2025".

On page 186, strike lines 1 through 3 and insert the following:

SEC. 7. EXTENSION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or amendment made by this Act, any reference in this Act or an amendment

made by this Act to "2020" shall be deemed to be a reference to "2023".

SEC. 8. AGRICULTURAL WORKER PROTECTION STANDARD; CERTIFICATION OF PESTICIDE APPLICATORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending not earlier than October 1, 2021, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (referred to in this section as the "Administrator")—

(1) shall carry out—

(A) the final rule of the Administrator entitled "Pesticides; Agricultural Worker Protection Standard Revisions" (80 Fed. Reg. 67496 (November 2, 2015)); and

(B) the final rule of the Administrator entitled "Pesticides; Certification of Pesticide Applicators" (82 Fed. Reg. 952 (January 4, 2017)); and

(2) shall not revise or develop revisions to the rules described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1).

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Prior to October 1, 2021, the Administrator may propose, and after a notice and public comment period of not less than 90 days, promulgate revisions to the final rule described in subsection (a)(1)(A) addressing application exclusion zones under part 170 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, consistent with the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136 et seq.).

(c) GAO REPORT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) conduct a study on the use of the designated representative, including the effect of that use on the availability of pesticide application and hazard information and worker health and safety; and

(2) not later than October 1, 2021, make publicly available a report describing the study under paragraph (1), including any recommendations to prevent the misuse of pesticide application and hazard information, if that misuse is identified.

The committee-reported amendments, as amended, were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 1029), as amended, was passed.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the following calendar bills en bloc: Calendar Nos. 453 through 465.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bills en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bills be considered read a third time and passed, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MAJOR ROBERT ODELL OWENS POST OFFICE

The bill (S. 2549) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1234 Saint Johns Place in Brooklyn, New York, as the "Major Robert Odell Owens Post Office", was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2549

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

SECTION 1. MAJOR ROBERT ODELL OWENS POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1234 Saint Johns Place in Brooklyn, New York, shall be known and designated as the "Major Robert Odell Owens Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Major Robert Odell Owens Post Office".

STANLEY MICHELS POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (S. 2692) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4558 Broadway in New York, New York, as the "Stanley Michels Post Office," was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2692

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

SECTION 1. STANLEY MICHELS POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4558

Broadway in New York, New York, shall be known and designated as the "Stanley Michels Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Stanley Michels Post Office Building".

MARVIN GAYE POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 1496) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3585 South Vermont Avenue in Los Angeles, California, as the "Marvin Gaye Post Office," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

LANCE CORPORAL JORDAN S. BASTEAN POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 2673) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 514 Broadway Street in Pekin, Illinois, as the "Lance Corporal Jordan S. Bastean Post Office," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

U.S. NAVY SEAMAN DAKOTA KYLE RIGSBY POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 3183) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13683 James Madison Highway in Palmyra, Virginia, as the "U.S. Navy Seaman Dakota Kyle Rigsby Post Office," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

J. ELLIOTT WILLIAMS POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 4301) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 201 Tom Hall Street in Fort Mill, South Carolina, as the "J. Elliott Williams Post Office Building," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

TUSKEGEE AIRMEN POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 4406) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 99 Macombs Place in New York, New York, as the "Tuskegee Airmen Post Office Building," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MABEL LEE MEMORIAL POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 4463) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6 Doyers Street in New York, New York, as the "Mabel Lee Memorial Post Office," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

BLOOMINGDALE VETERANS MEMORIAL POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 4574) to designate the facility of the United States Postal

Service located at 108 West Schick Road in Bloomingdale, Illinois, as the "Bloomingdale Veterans Memorial Post Office Building," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

LANCE CORPORAL THOMAS E. RIVERS, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 4646) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1900 Corporate Drive in Birmingham, Alabama, as the "Lance Corporal Thomas E. Rivers, Jr. Post Office Building," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

FIRST SERGEANT P. ANDREW MCKENNA JR. POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 4685) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 515 Hope Street in Bristol, Rhode Island, as the "First Sergeant P. Andrew McKenna Jr. Post Office," ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MAURICE D. HINCHEY POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 4722) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 111 Market Street in Saugerties, New York, as the "Maurice D. Hinchey Post Office Building," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

SERGEANT FIRST CLASS ALWYN CRENDALL CASHE POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 4840) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 567 East Franklin Street in Oviedo, Florida, as the "Sergeant First Class Alwyn Crendall Cashe Post Office Building," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

CELEBRATING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN HOMEBREWERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 567, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 567) celebrating the 40th anniversary of the American Homebrewers Association.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to recon-

sider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 567) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

GREAT OUTDOORS MONTH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 568, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 568) designating June 2018 as "Great Outdoors Month."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 568) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the following bills en bloc: Calendar No. 100, S. 724, with a floor amendment; Calendar No. 306, H.R. 219; Calendar No. 159, H.R. 220; Calendar No. 96, S. 215; Calendar No. 130, S. 490; Calendar No. 139, H.R. 2292; Calendar No. 144, H.R. 951; Calendar No. 136, H.R. 446; Calendar No. 137, H.R. 447; and Calendar No. 138, H.R. 2122.

I further ask unanimous consent that applicable committee or floor amendments be agreed to, the bills, as amended, if amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TO AMEND THE FEDERAL POWER ACT TO MODERNIZE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR NECESSARY HYDROPOWER APPROVALS

Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 724) to amend the Federal Power Act to modernize authorizations for necessary hydropower approvals.

The amendment (No. 3391) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To include a provision relating to the payment of annual charges)

At the end, add the following:

(c) OBLIGATION FOR PAYMENT OF ANNUAL CHARGES.—Any obligation of a licensee or exemptee for the payment of annual charges under section 10(e) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 803(e)) for a project that has not commenced construction as of the date of enactment of this Act shall commence not earlier than the latest of—

(1) the date by which the licensee or exemptee is required to commence construction; or

(2) the date of any extension of the deadline under paragraph (1).

The bill (S. 724), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 724

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

SECTION 1. MODERNIZING AUTHORIZATIONS FOR NECESSARY HYDROPOWER APPROVALS.

(a) PRELIMINARY PERMITS.—Section 5 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 798) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “three” and inserting “4”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “Commission may extend the period of a preliminary permit once for not more than 2 additional years beyond the 3 years” and inserting the following: “Commission may—

“(1) extend the period of a preliminary permit once for not more than 4 additional years beyond the 4 years”;

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) after the end of an extension period granted under paragraph (1), issue an additional permit to the permittee if the Commission determines that there are extraordinary circumstances that warrant the issuance of the additional permit.”.

(b) TIME LIMIT FOR CONSTRUCTION OF PROJECT WORKS.—Section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) is amended in the second sentence by striking “once but not longer than two additional years” and inserting “for not more than 8 additional years.”.

(c) OBLIGATION FOR PAYMENT OF ANNUAL CHARGES.—Any obligation of a licensee or exemptee for the payment of annual charges under section 10(e) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 803(e)) for a project that has not commenced construction as of the date of enactment of this Act shall commence not earlier than the latest of—

(1) the date by which the licensee or exemptee is required to commence construction; or

(2) the date of any extension of the deadline under paragraph (1).

SWAN LAKE HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT BOUNDARY CORRECTION ACT

The bill (H.R. 219) to correct the Swan Lake hydroelectric project survey boundary and to provide for the conveyance of the remaining tract of land within the corrected survey boundary to the State of Alaska, was considered, was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

TO AUTHORIZE THE EXPANSION OF AN EXISTING HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

The bill (H.R. 220) to authorize the expansion of an existing hydroelectric project, and for other purposes, was considered, was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZING THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION TO ISSUE AN ORDER CONTINUING A STAY OF A HYDROELECTRIC LICENSE

The bill (S. 215) to authorize the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to issue an order continuing a stay of a hydroelectric license for the Mahoney Lake hydroelectric project in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes, was considered, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 215

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

SECTION 1. STAY AND REINSTATEMENT OF FERC LICENSE NO. 11393 FOR THE MAHONEY LAKE HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMISSION.—The term “Commission” means the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

(2) LICENSE.—The term “license” means the license for the Commission project numbered 11393.

(3) LICENSEE.—The term “licensee” means the holder of the license.

(b) STAY OF LICENSE.—On the request of the licensee, the Commission shall issue an order continuing the stay of the license.

(c) LIFTING OF STAY.—On the request of the licensee, but not later than 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall—

(1) issue an order lifting the stay of the license under subsection (b); and

(2) make the effective date of the license the date on which the stay is lifted under paragraph (1).

(d) EXTENSION OF LICENSE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the time period specified in section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) that would otherwise apply to the Commission project numbered 11393, the Commission may, at the request of the licensee, and after reasonable notice, in accordance with the good faith, due diligence, and public interest requirements of, and the procedures of the Commission under, that section, extend the time period during which the licensee is required to commence the construction of the project for not more than 3 consecutive 2-year periods from the date of the expiration of the extension originally issued by the Commission.

(2) REINSTATEMENT OF EXPIRED LICENSE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the period required for the commencement of construction of the project described in paragraph (1) has expired prior to the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission may reinstate the license effective as of the date of the expiration of the license.

(B) EXTENSION.—If the Commission reinstates the license under subparagraph (A), the first extension authorized under paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date of that expiration.

(e) EFFECT.—Nothing in this Act prioritizes, or creates any advantage or dis-

advantage to, Commission project numbered 11393 under Federal law, including the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 791a et seq.) or the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2601 et seq.), as compared to—

(1) any electric generating facility in existence on the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) any electric generating facility that may be examined, proposed, or developed during the period of any stay or extension of the license under this Act.

TO REINSTATE AND EXTEND THE DEADLINE FOR COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION OF A HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT INVOLVING THE GIBSON DAM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 490) to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the Gibson Dam, which had been reported from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

S. 490

SECTION 1. REINSTATEMENT AND EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION PROJECT INVOLVING GIBSON DAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the time period specified in section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) that would otherwise apply to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission project numbered 12478-003, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (referred to in this section as the “Commission”) may, at the request of the licensee for the project, and after reasonable notice, in accordance with the good faith, due diligence, and public interest requirements of, and the procedures of the Commission under, that section, extend the time period during which the licensee is required to commence construction of the project for not more than 3 consecutive 2-year periods from the date of the expiration of the extension originally issued by the Commission.

(b) REINSTATEMENT OF EXPIRED LICENSE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the period required for the commencement of construction of the project described in subsection (a) has expired prior to the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission may reinstate the license effective as of that date of expiration.

(2) EXTENSION.—If the Commission reinstates the license under paragraph (1), the first extension authorized under subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of that expiration.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 490), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

TO EXTEND A PROJECT OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION INVOLVING THE CANNONVILLE DAM

The bill (H.R. 2292) to extend a project of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission involving the Cannonville Dam, was considered, was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

TO EXTEND THE DEADLINE FOR COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION OF A HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

The bill (H.R. 951) to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project, was considered, was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

TO EXTEND THE DEADLINE FOR COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION OF A HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

The bill (H.R. 446) to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project, was considered, was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

TO EXTEND THE DEADLINE FOR COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION OF A HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

The bill (H.R. 447) to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project, was considered, was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

REINSTATE AND EXTEND THE DEADLINE FOR COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION OF A HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT INVOLVING JENNINGS RANDOLPH DAM

Extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving Jennings Randolph Dam, was considered, was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS U.S. WORKFORCE ACT OF 2018

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 5956.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5956) to incentivize the hiring of United States workers in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 5956) was passed.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mo-

tion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MARRAKESH TREATY IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 414, S. 2559.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2559) to amend title 17, United States Code, to implement the Marrakesh Treaty, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2559) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2559

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Marrakesh Treaty Implementation Act”.

SEC. 2. IMPLEMENTATION AMENDMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1 of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 121—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by inserting “in the United States” after “distribute”;

(ii) by striking “, nondramatic”;

(iii) by inserting “or of a previously published musical work that has been fixed in the form of text or notation” after “literary work”;

(iv) by striking “specialized formats” and inserting “accessible formats”; and

(v) by striking “blind or other persons with disabilities” and inserting “eligible persons”;

(B) in subsection (b)(1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by inserting “in the United States” after “distributed”;

(II) by striking “a specialized format” and inserting “an accessible format”; and

(III) by striking “blind or other persons with disabilities” and inserting “eligible persons”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “a specialized format” and inserting “an accessible format”;

(C) in subsection (c)(3), by striking “specialized formats” and inserting “accessible formats”; and

(D) in subsection (d)—

(i) by striking paragraphs (2) and (4);

(ii) by redesignating paragraph (1) as paragraph (2);

(iii) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4);

(iv) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following:

“(1) ‘accessible format’ means an alternative manner or form that gives an eligible person access to the work when the copy or phonorecord in the accessible format is used

exclusively by the eligible person to permit him or her to have access as feasibly and comfortably as a person without such disability as described in paragraph (3);”;

(v) by inserting after paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following:

“(3) ‘eligible person’ means an individual who, regardless of any other disability—

“(A) is blind;

“(B) has a visual impairment or perceptual or reading disability that cannot be improved to give visual function substantially equivalent to that of a person who has no such impairment or disability and so is unable to read printed works to substantially the same degree as a person without an impairment or disability; or

“(C) is otherwise unable, through physical disability, to hold or manipulate a book or to focus or move the eyes to the extent that would be normally acceptable for reading; and”;

(vi) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated, by striking “; and” at the end and inserting a period; and

(2) by inserting after section 121 the following:

“§ 121A. Limitations on exclusive rights: reproduction for blind or other people with disabilities in Marrakesh Treaty countries

“(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 106 and 602, it is not an infringement of copyright for an authorized entity, acting pursuant to this section, to export copies or phonorecords of a previously published literary work or of a previously published musical work that has been fixed in the form of text or notation in accessible formats to another country when the exportation is made either to—

“(1) an authorized entity located in a country that is a Party to the Marrakesh Treaty; or

“(2) an eligible person in a country that is a Party to the Marrakesh Treaty,

if prior to the exportation of such copies or phonorecords, the authorized entity engaged in the exportation did not know or have reasonable grounds to know that the copies or phonorecords would be used other than by eligible persons.

“(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 106 and 602, it is not an infringement of copyright for an authorized entity or an eligible person, or someone acting on behalf of an eligible person, acting pursuant to this section, to import copies or phonorecords of a previously published literary work or of a previously published musical work that has been fixed in the form of text or notation in accessible formats.

“(c) In conducting activities under subsection (a) or (b), an authorized entity shall establish and follow its own practices, in keeping with its particular circumstances, to—

“(1) establish that the persons the authorized entity serves are eligible persons;

“(2) limit to eligible persons and authorized entities the distribution of accessible format copies by the authorized entity;

“(3) discourage the reproduction and distribution of unauthorized copies;

“(4) maintain due care in, and records of, the handling of copies of works by the authorized entity, while respecting the privacy of eligible persons on an equal basis with others; and

“(5) facilitate effective cross-border exchange of accessible format copies by making publicly available—

“(A) the titles of works for which the authorized entity has accessible format copies or phonorecords and the specific accessible formats in which they are available; and

“(B) information on the policies, practices, and authorized entity partners of the authorized entity for the cross-border exchange of accessible format copies.

“(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed to establish—

“(1) a cause of action under this title; or

“(2) a basis for regulation by any Federal agency.

“(e) Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the ability to engage in any activity otherwise permitted under this title.

“(f) For purposes of this section—

“(1) the terms ‘accessible format’, ‘authorized entity’, and ‘eligible person’ have the meanings given those terms in section 121; and

“(2) the term ‘Marrakesh Treaty’ means the Marrakesh Treaty to Facilitate Access to Published Works by Visually Impaired Persons and Persons with Print Disabilities concluded at Marrakesh, Morocco, on June 28, 2013.”.

(b) TABLE OF SECTIONS AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 1 of title 17, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 121 the following:

“121A. Limitations on exclusive rights: reproduction for blind or other people with disabilities in Marrakesh Treaty countries.”.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, JUNE 29, 2018, THROUGH MONDAY, JULY 9, 2018

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn, to then convene for pro forma sessions only, with no business being conducted, on the following dates and times, and that following each pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Friday, June 29, at 8:30 a.m.; Tuesday, July 3, at 9 a.m.; Thursday, July 5, at 1 p.m. I further ask that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, July 5, it next convene at 3 p.m., Monday, July 9; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Bennett nomination; finally, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture motions filed during today's session ripen at 5:30 p.m., Monday, July 9.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL AT 8:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:37 p.m., adjourned until Friday, June 29, 2018, at 8:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

ALAN RAY SHAFFER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF DEFENSE FOR ACQUISITION AND SUSTAINMENT. (NEW POSITION)

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

MICHAEL T. HARVEY, OF TEXAS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE PAIGE EVE ALEXANDER, RESIGNED.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

GEN. ROBERT B. ABRAMS

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

KATHLEEN E. AALDERINK

TRAVIS F. ABEITA

BENJAMIN C. ABSHIRE

ASHLEE R. ADAME

BROOKS D. ADAMO

BRYAN D. ADAMS

CHRISTOPHER K. ADAMS

DANIEL J. ADAMS

DONALD J. ADAMS

MATTHEW G. ADAMS

MICHAEL A. ADAMS II

NICHOLAS S. ADAMS

SCOTT D. ADAMSON

ADEKUNBIH ADEWUNMI

LANCE A. ADSITT

SARAH E. AFFALTER

TIA M. AHLF

ANDREW D. AHN

SIMMONA A. AHN

JUSTIN V. AHRENS

MERRIDITH T. AKERS

JACOB A. AKINS

STEPHEN D. ALBERT

JOSHUA R. ALBRITTON

TREVOR J. ALDRIDGE

BENJAMIN J. ALDRUS

JEREMIAH A. ALEFOSIO

KELLY N. ALEXANDER

TIMOTHY A. ALEXANDER

WILLIAM J. ALEXSON

DANIEL C. ALLEN

DOUGLAS C. ALLEN

JOEL M. ALLEN

PATRICK C. ALLEN

ROBERT D. ALLEN

TIMOTHY J. ALLEN

ERIN A. ALMEIDA

ERIC A. ALMEIDA

KEDEN J. ALON

JASON A. ALTENHOFEN

HUNTER LESLIE L. ALTMAN

RAFAEL A. ALVARADO

JOSE L. ALVAREZ, JR.

TIMOTHY R. ALVORD

DANIEL C. AMACK

DANIELLE S. AMASON

JACKY R. AMERSON, JR.

DARBY L. ANABLE

JOSEPH M. ANDERSEN

AMANDA Y. ANDERSON

BRYAN C. ANDERSON

DAVID J. ANDERSON

ESTHER M. ANDERSON

GEORGE E. ANDERSON

JON R. ANDERSON

KEVIN S. ANDERSON

MUNSON J. ANDERSON III

RYAN T. ANDERSON

SEAN K. ANDERSON

DEREK S. ANDREWEG

JEFFREY S. ANDRADE

JONATHAN S. ANDRESEN

JOSHUA R. ANSON

JEFFREY D. ANTAL

JEREMY P. ANTHONY

MARCUS K. ANTHONY

THOMAS D. ANTONOFF, JR.

BRYANNA N. APPLEBY

SHARON ARANA

GEORGE A. ARBUCKLE

ROBERT A. ARCAD

JEFFREY B. ARCHER

ZACHARY W. ARENDSEE

JOSEPH M. ARGANBRIGHT

MARVIN RAY ARIDA

JOSHUA M. ARNALL

AARON C. ARNTZ

ANTHONY D. AROCHA

JONATHAN M. ARONOFF

JARED M. ASCHENBRENNER

MICHAEL C. ATKINSON

TRENTON C. ATWOOD

BRADY J. AUGUSTIN

LAJUAN D. AUSTIN

LANCE A. AUSTIN

KEVIN AUTREY

THOMAS V. AVOLIO

TY S. AXSON

MICHELLE L. AXTMAN

JOHNMICHAEL B. AYERS

RICHARD T. AYERS

CURTIS A. BABBIE

PHILIP W. BACHMEYER

EVAN J. BACKES

EDWARD J. BAE

LEIGHTON F. BAGBY

MARK A. BAILIE

ADAM L. BAIR

CASSIDY J. BAIR

CHRISTOPHER M. BAIR

KAITLIN R. BAIRD

NICHOLAS J. BAKER

MICHAEL V. BAKKE

DANIEL A. BALCH

ERIC K. BALDOCK

JOSEPH R. BALDWIN

MARY K. BALDWIN

NEWTON L. BANG

JOEL F. BANJOJOHNSON

DOUGLAS H. BANNING

KARAN BANSAL

WAYNE R. BARBER

JASON M. BARHORST

ROBERT D. BARLOW

AUSTIN M. BARNES

BRETT O. BARNES

CAMERON A. BARNES

JOEL R. BARNES

ALEXANDER E. BARNETT

LEVI J. BARNETT

RYAN J. BARNUM

DONALD A. BARRETT

MARIE F. BARRETT

JOSHUA B. BARROGA

MATTHEW M. BARRY

MARK J. BARTAK

STEVEN M. BARTELS

AUSTIN G. BARTLETT

LYNDON G. BARTLETT

DAVE G. BARTOLOME

ALEXANDER P. BARWIKOWSKI

ZACHRY H. BASNIGHT

JACOB ALAN BASS

JUSTIN K. BATEMAN

DOUGLAS S. BATES

SEAN M. D. BATSON

JUSTIN J. BAUMAN

DAVID T. BAXTER

CHARLES L. BAYNE

JAMES E. BEARD

ANDREW L. BEASLEY

KENDALL G. BEASLEY

THOMAS M. BEASLEY

MATTHEW A. BEAUDREAULT

ANDREW J. BEAUREGARD

JESSICA L. BEAUREGARD

JOSEPH M. BECKER

JEFFREY K. BEENE

BRADY L. BEHRENDT

ANDREW T. BEIDLER

JOHN R. BEILSTEIN

JESSE D. BEINHOWER

BRADLEY S. BELL

BRETT I. BELL

JUSTIN R. BELLAMY

BRIAN A. BELONGIA

REBECCA R. W. BELONGIA

RAFAEL E. BELTRAN

ROBERT J. BELUS

JOSH A. BENFER

LOUIS L. BENNETT

WILLIAM G. BENNETT

CODY A. BENY

HOWARD D. BENSINGER

CHRISTOPHER D. BENSON

ROBERT L. BENT

TIMOTHY J. BENT

NICHOLAUS J. BENTE

STEVEN L. BENTHAL

TYLER R. BERENSEN

TEREMY S. BERGER

KAWIKA H. BERGGREN

ADAM P. BERGOO

RICHARD C. BERNARD

THERON R. BERRY

MYLES A. BERTHOLD

PETER J. BETZ

DANIEL B. BEVERS

PATRICK E. BEVILLE

JAMES E. BEVINS

SAMUEL M. BEXTEN

BRIAN J. BEYER

BRIAN A. BIACAN

GREGORY A. BIELER

DEREK J. BIERMANN

NICHOLAS D. BIGGERT

PETER C. BILLINGS

KYLE L. BINGMAN

LEVI S. BIRD

DERRICK W. BIRDSSELL

KEVIN W. BISHOP

MARK R. BISHOP

MICHAEL J. BLACK

TIMOTHY A. BLACK

AARON M. BLACKBURN

SAMUEL A. BLAKELY

ANDREW S. D. BLANCHARD

JASON D. BLAND

KYLE C. BLANK
ALDRIN P. BLASQUEZ
MARC P. BLEHA
DAVID L. BLESSINGER
JAMES H. BLICK
ALEXANDER J. BLUE
DAYTON D. BLUME
HOBAN A. BLUME
ROBERT B. BLUMENKRANTZ
WILLIAM W. BLUMHOEFER
DAVID J. BLUMMER
MARK A. BOATMAN
NEIL F. BOCKUS
JESTIN A. BOELMAN
KEENAN M. BOES
SCOTT D. BOGNER
MICHAEL S. BOLTON
JEFFREY R. BONNER
STEVEN M. BOOKER
GORDON D. BOOM
KYLE J. BOOMER
JASON D. BOOTH
MELVIN K. BOOTHE
DEVIN M. BORDELON
MARY L. BORDELON
ANDREW D. BORDERS
CORTNEY R. BORGAN
JUSTIN D. BORGERDING
MICHELLE D. BOSTIC
STEVEN P. BOSTWICK
JOSHUA C. BOSWORTH
BENJAMIN J. BOTNICK
RICHARD G. BOTTINELLI
REBECCA J. BOULERICE
SINORAKHOUNE BOUNMASANONH
JARED J. BOWEN
RUDOLPH T. BOWEN II
JOSHUA D. BOWER
GLENN D. BOWERSOX
BRADLEY B. BOWLES
JAMES A. BOWMAN
NATHAN H. BOTER
STEPHANIE A. BOYER
ANTHONY C. BRADEN
CHASE B. BRADLEY
KEVIN A. BRADY
TAYLOR M. BRANCO
CHAD R. BRANDL
THOMAS A. BRATTON
JUSTIN M. BRAZELL
JOHN T. BREAM
CODY J. BREAUX
JASON P. BREAZEALE
CHAD J. BRENNER
SCOTT A. BRENNER
DANIEL R. BREWER
JOSEPH C. BREWER
NICHOLAS K. BREWER
STEPHEN R. BRIGHTMAN
JOSEPH M. BROCK
MARK S. BRODIE
JEFFREY A. BROFFMAN
JAMES W. BRONCHEAU
RYAN K. BROOKINS
ROGER K. BROOKS
JACOB G. BROULLIRE
AARON R. BROWN
CHRISTOPHER M. BROWN
COREY A. BROWN
DAVID T. BROWN
DAVID W. BROWN, JR.
ERIK BROWN
GREGORY E. BROWN
JAMIL L. BROWN
JEFFERY L. BROWN, JR.
JESSE ANDREW BROWN
NICHOLAS W. BROWN
NIKITA F. BROWN
ROBERT L. BROWN
ELEANOR J. BROWNDYMKOSKI
JUSTIN J. BROZZETTI
SEAN M. BRUCERENNICK
ELON N. BRUMFIELD
TYLER M. BRUMMER
VINCENT C. BRUNO
KYLE M. BRUTON
PATRICK J. BRUTON
BRADLEY W. BRYANT
MICHAEL J. BRYANT
ANDREW J. BUCHANAN
DANIEL R. BUCHANAN
SAMANTHA L. BUCHHOLTZ
ERIC A. BUCHARELLI
JACOB D. BUCKMAN
CHERIE L. BUDAY
JAMES M. BUELL
KENNETH I. BULL
AMBER D. BULLARD
AUSTIN R. BULLER
ADAM M. BUNKER
ANTHONY BUNKER
JESUS M. BURCIAGA, JR.
NICHOLAS K. BURG
ALEXANDER D. BURGESS
TY J. BURGESS
PATRICK T. BURKE
JAMES T. BURNETT
TRAVIS J. BURNETTE
MICHAEL S. BURNS
RONALD W. BURNS
SHAWN C. BURNSIDE
JACOB B. BURNUM
KEVIN D. BURRIS
ERIC D. BURTON
ADAM N. BUSH
MALIA D. BUSH
PHILIP J. BUSH

CASEY G. BUTIKOFER
DAVID J. BUTLER
JOHN A. BUTLER
JOSEPH G. BUTLER
TITUS A. BUTLER
SPENCER A. BUTT
DAVID P. BUTZIN
CHRISTOPHER L. BUZZETTA
BRADLEY M. BYINGTON
DANIEL K. BYNUM
KYLE L. BYRD
WILLIAM R. BYRNE
RAFAEL V. CABRERA
ERIC P. CADORETTE
CHRISTOPHER C. CADY
CHRISTOPHER S. CAHILL
AARON M. CAIN
SHAUN C. CAIN
JUAN C. CALDERON
JAMES C. CALDWELL
ROY M. CALLILUNG
LISA M. CALLAHAN
SEAN T. CALLAHAN
JOSHUA CALTAGIRONE HOLZLI
CHARDAY S. CAMINERO
ANDREW C. CAMPBELL
GREGORY S. CAMPBELL
JOHN M. CAMPBELL
LAURA E. CAMPBELL
MATTHEW C. CAMPBELL
JEFFREY J. CAMPEAU
BRIAN M. CAMPION
DELWYN CAMPO
DEREK J. CANDIOTTI
JOSHUA R. CARAGAN
DARYL R. CARDEN
DEREK J. CARDEN
JOSEPH A. CARDOZA
SCOTT M. CARLAN
CLAIRE J. CARLOS
BRIAN J. CARPENTER
ROBERT D. CARPENTER
WILLIAM A. CARPENTER
THOMAS E. CARR
SHAWN E. CARRIER
BRIEANNA C. CARROLL
JASON D. CARROLL
TYLER D. CARROLL
SHANNAN L. CARTER
MATTHEW S. CARVER
MICHAEL F. CASANO
MICHAEL C. CASE
KEITH R. CASEY
MICHAEL A. CASEY
JOSHUA P. CASKEY
JUSTIN L. CASSIDY
RENEE D. CASSIDY
JENNIFER L. CASTANEDA
DANIEL A. CASTLE
JOSEPH V. CASTRO
ANDREW L. CAULK
ROBERT F. CAULK
GREGORY L. CAYLOR
KASIDIT V. CHALAOPAK
JOEL N. CHALMERS
AARON S. CHAMBERLAIN
ROBERT E. CHANCE III
CLINTON H. CHANDLER
KEVIN M. CHANG
JOSE A. CHAPARRO
NICHOLAS A. CHARBONNEAU
TRAVIS LEE CHASE
MICHAEL J. CHETKOWSKI
BRYANT Y. CHEUNG
DAVID F. CHICK, JR.
KYLE A. CHILDRESS
NICHOLAS M. CHISLER
MATTHEW I. CHISM
RANDALL V. CHLEBEK
RACHEL E. CHRASH
PETER CHRIST
NICHOLAS R. CHRISTI
RYAN D. CHRISTIE
ANDREW J. CHUNG
DEAN A. CHUV A
RYAN S. CHYLEWSKI
DANIEL CIPERA
ANDREW D. CIPOLLA
COLBY B. CLARK
GARY M. CLARK
TYLER C. CLARK
MEGAN A. CLAYTON
KATRINA M. CLEGG
KYLE D. CLEMENTS
JONATHAN R. CLIMER
RYAN W. CLISSET
PHILIP D. CLOSSON
KURT D. CLOUTIER
JAMES A. COCHRAN
JOHN M. COCKBURN
JOHN J. COCOMAZZI
JEFFREY M. COE
MATTHEW S. COFFEY
BENJAMIN R. COFFMAN
MAYO L. COINER III
THOMAS G. COKER
DEREK COLE
KYLE J. COLE
SHANE E. COLEMAN
KEVIN D. COLLETT
GARRETT C. COLLINS
PHIL D. COMPTON
CHRISTOPHER R. CONLEY
LIAM D. CONLEY
MICHAEL B. CONNELLY
BRIAN P. CONNOLLY, JR.
NOEL B. CONRAD

JARED M. CONSOLO
ELLIE J. CONSTANTINE
RYAN C. CONWAY
JOEL E. COOKE
ANDREW L. COOPER
AUSTIN B. COOPER
NICHOLAS A. COOPER
LUKE J. COQUERILLE
HUGH T. CORBETT
CURTIS D. CORDON
JOHN C. CORDOVA
MATTHEW M. CORK
STEWART J. CORNETT
ROBERTO J. CORNIER
TATIANA C. CORNIER
MICHAEL Q. CORPUZ
JASON A. CORRELL
MATTHEW R. CORUM
CHRISTOPHER M. COSTELLO
ROBERT G. COURTADE
ROBERT L. COWSBERT
ANGIE M. COX
MICHAEL G. COX
SHAWN D. COX
ZACHARY J. CRAMPTON
MATTHEW C. CRANDALL
IAN R. CRAWFORD
JON L. CREMER
CHRISTOPHER W. CREVELING
DENNIS M. CROSS
DANIEL W. CROUCH
COREY W. CROWELL
STANLEY D. CROZIER, JR.
STEPHEN L. CROZIER
BRIAN B. CRUM
JAMIE CUBARRUBIA
ANGELICA CUBILLOS FONSECA
BRIAN J. CUCE
TARYRECE CULBERSONSWINT
FRANKLIN B. CULICK
STEPHANIE M. CULP
ELIJAH D. CULPEPPER
BROOKE C. CULTRA
RICHARD D. CULVER
BRET M. CUNNINGHAM
JUSTIN F. CUNNINGHAM
NICHOLAS L. CUNNINGHAM
BRIAN A. CURD
JOSEPH R. CURRAN
MICHELLE M. CURRAN
MAXWELL D. CURRIER
THOMAS PATRICK CUSHING
JOSEPH D. CZIKO
AARON A. DACHROEDEN
JOSEPH J. DAGOSTINO
KRISTOFER R. DAHL
JASON M. DALL
DANIEL C. DALRYMPLE
JACOB J. DALRYMPLE
DEVIN K. DALTON
CHRISTOPHER J. DAMELE
DAVID R. DAMERON
WILLIAM P. DANA
RICHARD S. DANAHER
JUSTIN W. DANCER
MATTHEW R. DANIELS
THOMAS E. DANIELS
MATTHEW G. DARBY
ANTHONY R. DARR
JOEL K. DARRINGTON
AARON W. DARTY
MANUEL S. DASO
SEBASTIEN L. A. DAUBY
THOMAS R. DAUGHERTY
TIMOTHY M. DAVES
RONALD C. DAVIES
ALAN P. DAVIS
ANDREW R. DAVIS
CHRISTOPHER A. DAVIS
DANIEL J. DAVIS
DONALD A. DAVIS
ERIC L. DAVIS
KYLE J. E. DAVIS
KYLE S. DAVIS
LOVELL C. K. DAVIS, JR.
MATTHEW W. DAVIS
MELVIN L. DAVIS
NICHOLAS J. DAVIS
SCOTT D. DAVIS
STEVEN A. DAVIS
TRENT A. DAVIS
JOSH J. DAWKINS
JUSTIN D. DAY
LINNA T. DE CUIR
ADRIAN D. DE LA CRUZ
JESUS R. DE LEON
WILLIAM E. DEAN
CHRISTOPHER B. DEANS
MATTHEW A. DEARBORN
NATHAN L. DEEVER
RYAN A. DECAMP
MATTHEW R. DECKER
NATHAN S. DECKER
CATTYAN A. DEFABO
JOSHUA D. DEFRAK
JEREMY K. DEGUZMAN
LUCIAN A. DEKICH
CHRISTOPHER M. DEL CAMPO
ANTHONY J. DEL VECCHIO
ROBERT J. DELABAR
COLLEEN M. DELAWARE
NATHAN L. E. DELLEON
ALFREDO DELGADO
JONATHAN J. DELGADO
JOSE O. DELIZSOTO
JOHN A. DELOSREYES
WESLEY J. DEMBEK

DAJON D. DEMILLE
CHRISTOPHER P. DEMMON
BRIAN J. DENDY
GABRIEL J. DENNY
CARL P. DENSFORD
VENANCIO E. DEOCARIZA
AMBER N. DERIGGI
BENJAMIN P. DERIGGI
RACHAEL J. DEROCHÉ
AUGUST P. DEROSA
MIHIR P. DESAI
THOMAS R. DESBIENS
NICHOLAS G. DETLOFF
KIRK H. DEVINE
LISA M. DEWALT
BRADLEY R. DEWEES
JARED C. DEWIRE
NICOLAS F. DEWULF
DAVID DIAZ II
ANTHONY M. DIBIASE
KELLY M. DICKERSON
MATTHEW B. DICKERSON
MATTHEW C. DICKSON
GRADY N. DIDERICKSEN
KEVIN S. DIEFENDERFER
MATTHEW A. DIETRICH
JAROD L. DIGEORGE
JEFFREY J. DILL
GARRETT E. DILLEY
ZEBULON J. DIMMETT
LUKE N. DINH
SEAN P. DINNELL
JONATHAN F. DIPPOLD
NATHAN A. DIRKS
ALLEN F. DISMUKE, JR.
ERIC C. DISS
VICTOR V. DITOMMASO
NICHOLAS L. DIXON
ANDELYNN DOANE
CASEY R. DOANE
MICHAEL E. DOBBS
CHARLES M. DODD IV
SCOTT Z. DOLAR
JUSTIN A. DOMINGUEZ
IAN C. DONESKI
MICHAEL W. DOROSKI
BRENDAN S. DORSEYSPITZ
BRIAN L. DOSA
JOSEPH P. DOUGHERTY
BRANDON J. DOWNEY
JASON J. DOWNS
DUSTIN M. DOYLE
TRAVARES RAY DOZIER
SHANA L. DRAHN HOFFMAN
NATHANIAL C. DRECKHAHN
SCOTT A. DREERUP
KENNETH J. DREW
KEVIN T. DRUMM
CHRISTOPHER R. DUBOIS
PATRICK J. DUFFEY
THOMAS C. DUFFY
BRYAN C. DUKES
BRIAN J. DUNN
JAMES R. DUNN
JOHN W. DUNN
ROBERTA M. DUNN
ROBERT D. DURHAM
ROMANIE J. DURIN
ALEXANDER W. DURSTEIN
WILLIAM W. DYKE
JACOB A. DYKSTRA
JAMES P. EAGAN
ALEX M. EARLY
THOMAS J. EASTER
AARON C. ECHOLS
DANIEL W. ECKLEBE
SHELLEY P. ECKLEBE
JUSTIN L. EDMUNDS
TROY E. EGBERT
CASEY J. EICKHOLT
NATHAN J. ELDREDGE
KENDRIC J. ELLERBE
ERIC B. ELLES
MICHAEL J. ELLINGSEN
KENNETH A. ELLINGTON
ABIGAIL E. ELLIOTT
CODY L. ELLIOTT
MICHAEL D. ELLIOTT
STEPHEN B. ELLIOTT
JOHN M. ELLIS
JOSEPH B. ELLIS
LINDSEY K. ELLIS
PAUL D. ELLIS
WILLIAM R. ELLIS II
NATHAN E. ELLSWORTH
JOSHUA L. ELLMSHAEUSER
CHRISTOPHER R. ENGELKEN
KYLE S. ENNEN
KYLE L. EPPERSON
JARRED A. EPSSTEIN
BRYNGEL J. ERICKSON
ROBERT A. ERICKSON
JAMES T. ERKARD III
ANDREW J. ERLANDSON
DANIEL A. ESPOSITO
ALLEN L. ESTALILLA
BRET M. EVANS
DANIEL C. EVANS
EDMUND E. EVANS
KIRK D. EVANS
LAURA WALSH EVANS
PETER J. EVANS
JOANA R. EVERETT
CHRISTOPHER J. EWALD
TRICIA T. EWING
KACEY L. EZELL
ZACHARY W. FAIR

NICHOLAS E. FAIRBROTHER
LOREN M. FAIRE
MICHAEL L. FANTAUZZI
BENJAMIN M. FARBER
JOSEPH D. FARINASH
JENIFER FARKAS
MICHAEL J. FARRARA
EVAN J. FARREN
DANIEL S. FAULK
BENJAMIN P. FECTEAU
JOSHUA J. FEDERER
JOSHUA FEHD
LUKE S. FEKETTE
IRA J. M. FELICIANO
RYAN L. FERENZ
ANDREW P. FERGUSON
CHRISTOPHER R. FERGUSON
AUTUMN L. FERKALUK
KRISTOFER T. FERNANDEZ
ANTHONY J. FERRARA
DAVID J. FERRARA
KEVIN E. FICKERT II
COURTNEY L. FIELDS
DENNIS C. FIELDS
JACOB M. FIELDS
KRISTOFER FIGUEROA
JACK T. FINE
COLIN M. FINK
BRETT M. FINNERAN
SCOTT R. FISCHER
JON R. FISHER
TODD M. FISK
BRANDON S. FISKE
KEITH D. FITSCHEN
SEAN T. FITZGERALD
BRIAN J. FITZPATRICK
DENNIS M. FLANARY
MARK R. FLANNERY
MATTHEW J. FLEHARTY
CHRISTOPHER G. FLEISSNER
THOMAS J. FLETCHER
JAMES G. FLICK
SHIELA H. FLINDERS
CELESTE L. FLORELL
XAVIER A. FLORES
JOHN A. FLORO
BRIAN P. FLYNN
DARIN C. FLYNN
JOSHUA J. FORD
JONATHAN E. FORSYTH
HENRY A. FORTINBERRY
DONALD C. FOSSUM
MITCHELL E. FOSSUM
DANIEL E. FOSTER
RYAN J. FOSTER
EDWARD P. FOULON
ANDREW A. FOX
JEREMY D. FOX
MARK H. FOYLE
SCOTT I. FRANCIS
DAVID R. FRANCK
CARLOS A. FRANCO
CONOR B. FRANKLIN
MATTHEW J. FRANTZ
ANGELA L. FRAZIER
JONATHAN P. FREDRICK
ADAM M. FREE
BRYAN T. FREEMAN
CHARLTON E. FREEMAN
ODIE L. FREEMAN III
ANDREW D. FREITAG
AARON K. FRENCH
NATALIA Y. FROLOVA
JOHN ANDREW J. FUGATE
LEANDROS FUGATE
WESTON L. FULPER
BEVERLY P. FULGENCIO
PAUL C. GABOR
MATTHEW M. GABSO
PURVIS C. GADDIS
JOSIAH D. GAFFNEY
LUCAS C. GAGLIARDI
CHAD M. GAGNON
ROBERT R. GAISER
ERIC J. GALL
DANIEL M. GALLAGHER
ANDREA C. GALLEGO
ALEXANDER C. GALLMAN
SCOTT L. GALLOWAY
DAVID J. GALLUZZO
ANDREW J. GAMACHE
GABRIEL H. GAMACHE
LUIS C. GARCIA
MATTHEW G. GARDNER
JESSE E. GARREPY
JASON A. GARRISH
VINCENT P. GARZONE
AMBER M. GASPARETTO BRUNING
VANESSA A. GASSWINT
KYLE R. GATES
CHRISTOPHER E. GEARY
SCOTT M. GEBAUER
GEORGE M. GEIGES
ERIN C. GENTILE
KEVIN D. GEORGE
PAUL J. GEPHART III
RAYMOND J. GERARD
ANNETTE D. GERINGER
DANIEL C. GERMAINE
JOSEPH A. GERTIS
NIKKI C. GESSNER
THOMAS B. GETZ III
MICHAEL J. GIANNONE
MICHAEL P. GIBB
TAYLOR G. GIFFEN
MADISON L. GILBERT
MATTHEW A. GILBERT

NICHOLAS A. GILBERT
ANDREW V. GILL
BRIAN D. GILLIAM
CRAIG P. GILMAN
MICHAEL V. GILPATRICK
ANDREW J. GILZEAN
COLBY C. GLASGOW
ROBERT A. GLENN
SANDRA S. GLIDEWELL
MELISSA A. GLINDMEYER
HEATHER M. GLINSKI
CHARLES G. GLOVER III
GARRETT M. GLOVER
LARRY L. M. GLOVER
ROBERT E. GLOVER
ANDREW J. GLOWA
STEVEN D. GLOWACKI
JOSHUA M. GMINSKI
DANIEL J. GNAZZO
ROBERT E. GOBRECHT
DARYL R. GODFREY
NEIL F. GODWIN
DANIEL C. GOESER
PATRICK R. GOINGCO
JONATHAN G. GOKEY
BENJAMIN A. GOLATA
JOHN J. GOLDEN
WALTER M. GOLDEN
ANTHONY M. GOLE
ZACHARIAH D. GONYEA
ASHLEY E. GONZALES
ADRIAN GONZALEZ
KEVIN H. GONZALEZ
KIMBERLY A. GONZALEZ
SETH J. GONZALEZ
MARC G. GOODMAN
TIMOTHY L. GORSKI
STEVEN J. GORSS
CARL A. GOTWALD
HAROLD J. GOTWALD
CLAYTON C. GRACE
JOSHUA A. GRADAILLE
MARK A. GRAFF
SARAH J. GRAFTON
HOLLY J. GRAMKOW
PATRICK J. GRANDSAERT
KYLE D. GRANT
EMILY N. GRAVES
MATTHEW E. GRAY
KEVIN J. GREBB
AARON B. GREEN
KALI J. GREEN
MICHAEL A. GREENE
EVIN P. GREENSFELDER
COLBY S. GREGORY
NATHAN A. GREINER
COLLIN M. GREISER
NICHOLAS J. GRIECO
NICHOLAS R. GRIESE
JEREMY D. GRIFFIN
MARK D. GRIFFIN
JIMMY LEROY D. GRIFFITH
RYAN T. BRIGGS
KIMBERLY D. GRISSON
JEFFREY K. GROLL
NEAL D. GROSSHEIDER
BRIAN D. GROTH
GREGORY C. GROVES
DONALD A. GRUBER
JOHN G. GRUCELLA
JOSEPH V. GRUNWALDT
SABINA T. GRUNSWICK
DALE B. GSELLMAN
KIMBERLY J. GUEST
MELISSA L. GULDAN
BRANDEN W. GULICK
BRANDON D. GUNNELS
IAN N. GUNTHER
JOHN B. GUPTILL
CHRISTOPHER M. GURROLA
ANDREW W. GUSTAFSON
CRAIG D. GUSTAFSON
JAMES P. GUTHRIE
EMMANUEL GUZMAN
MARY B. GUZOWSKI
EDWARD T. HABERMAYER
KIRK A. HABRUN
CHAD M. HAFERMANN
CLAYTON T. HAFERNIK
MICHAEL E. HAFNER
BENJAMIN J. HAGARDT
RYAN M. HAGNER
GAVIN S. HAGENS
NATHANIEL L. HAGOOD
KIMBERLY N. HALE
CRAIG J. HALES
DIANA L. HALFERTY
BEN D. HALL
BRIAN T. HALL
JAMES B. HALL
JONATHAN E. HALL
MATTHEW S. HALL
ADAM C. HALLMAN
MATTHEW G. HALLMAN
JOEL F. HALPERT
BRANDIANN M. HAMADA
BLAKE A. HAMILTON
BRYAN C. HAMILTON
JOHN C. HAMILTON
NICOLAS S. HAMILTON
WILLIAM S. HAMILTON
ROBERT A. I. HAMMERBECK
BRANDON C. HAMMOND
EDWARD R. HAMMOND
MELISSA A. HAMMOND
TIMOTHY J. HAMMOND
JEREMY J. HANCOCK

MATTHEW R. HANCOCK
 JUSTIN W. HAND
 ZACHARY G. HANEY
 MICHAEL A. HANK
 MATTHEW P. HANNAN
 WESTON J. HANOKA
 JOSEPH S. HANSEN
 RYAN A. HANSEN
 PATRICK A. HANSON
 KRISTEN E. HAP
 ADDISON A. HARDING
 CHRISTOPHER R. HARDING
 JAMES W. HARDWICK
 TYLER J. HARDY
 DALE J. HARGIS
 CRAIG S. HARMS
 JUSTIN D. HARMS
 BLAKE S. HARNESSE
 ANDREA V. HARRINGTON
 KYLE HARRINGTON
 ANDREW L. HARRIS
 CASEY A. HARRIS
 DANIEL A. HARRIS
 JERED L. HARRIS
 JOHN M. HARRIS
 JOHN T. HARRIS
 SIDNEY M. HARRIS
 WYATT J. HARRIS
 MATTHEW D. HARRISON
 RYAN F. HARRISON
 WILLIAM J. HARRISON
 JOSIAH D. HART
 GREGORY C. HARTMAN
 JOHN H. HARVEY III
 DILLON J. HATFIELD
 JOHN S. HATFIELD
 DANIEL M. HATZUNG
 JOSHUA D. HAUSMANN
 GREGORY W. HAVERKORN
 WILLIE L. HAW
 KENNETH J. HAWKINS
 MICHAEL D. HAWKINS
 NATHAN C. HAWKINS
 WHITNEY B. HAWKINS
 WILLIAM R. HAWKINS II
 MICHAEL M. HAYES
 RYAN J. HEARY
 JASON R. HECHLER
 JOSHUA J. HEFFERNEN
 KAIS HEIMBURGER
 MICHAEL L. HEINER
 SCOTT A. HEINLEN
 CAROLYN R. HEISER
 CHRISTOPHER P. HEISERMAN
 KRISTEN M. HEISERMAN
 WILLIAM D. HEITSHUSEN
 DANIEL R. HEJDE
 JD E. HELM
 DUSTIN B. HELSEL
 ERIK M. HENDEN
 STEPHEN K. HENDERSHOT
 AARON P. HENDERSON
 DAVID N. HENDERSON
 JOSHUA E. HENDERSONCASTEEL
 DANIEL P. HENDREN
 ERIC I. HENDRICKER
 MATTHEW R. HENDRIX
 BRADLEY J. HENICKE
 SCHUYLER A. HENRY
 JUSTIN T. HEPPE
 ALAN M. HERBOL
 CESAR A. HERNANDEZ
 ELIZABETH M. M. HERNANDEZ
 SAMUEL R. HERRING IV
 TORIN T. HERRING
 ANTHONY E. HERTACH
 MATTHEW E. HERZBERG
 BRIAN J. HESS
 JOSHUA A. HESS
 PAUL A. HESSER
 TYLER J. HEWKO
 MICHAEL T. HEWLETT
 TYLER H. HITT
 JAMES C. HICKERSON
 JONATHAN HICKMAN
 BRIAN R. HICKNER
 ANDREW M. HICKS
 SKYLER R. HILBURN
 BRIAN A. HILL
 ERIC R. HILL
 PATTERSON S. HILL
 ERIK M. HILLARD
 JESSICA M. HILLARD
 MICHAEL H. HILLIER
 KRISTINA M. HIMMELREICH
 WILLIAM J. HINCHEY
 ERIC L. HINEMAN
 TIMOTHY J. HINOJOSA
 BRYAN J. HLADIK
 HANS B. HOBBS
 NATHAN G. HOCKING
 JOSEPH C. HOECHERL
 TYSON W. HOFFINE
 BRYAN N. HOFFLER
 DANIEL H. HOFFMAN
 MICHAEL R. HOFFMAN
 JONATHAN D. HOGAN
 LAUREN S. HOGG
 MICHAEL J. HOGGARD
 SAMUEL K. HOLBROOK
 RYAN J. HOLBETS
 MATTHEW D. HOLLAND
 CHRISTOPHER D. HOLLIDAY
 HARRIS W. HOLLIS
 ERIN N. HOLLMON
 WILL M. HOLMES
 CURTIS D. HOLTMAN

JASON M. HOLZMAN
 HEATH A. HONAKER
 MATTHEW J. HONEYMAN
 ANDREW S. HONG
 LEON E. HONTZ III
 DAVID J. HOOK
 CARISSA M. HOOSLINE
 ADAM R. HOPKINS
 DEREK D. HOPKINS
 MATTHEW F. HORAN
 THOMAS J. HORAN
 ALEX A. HORTIN
 JESSE R. HORTON
 DANIEL J. HOWE
 ANTHONY J. HOWELL
 JORDAN M. HOWEN
 SCOTT N. HOWLEY
 DERRICK A. HOXIE
 LAUREN P. HOYT
 BRIAN D. HUCKS
 LUKAS J. HUEBENER
 RYAN T. HUFF
 ANTHONY K. HUGHES
 COLIN T. HUGHES
 HENRY W. HUGHES
 JENNIFER A. HUGHES
 JOSHUA M. HUGHES
 ERIC D. HULSHIZER
 SETH W. HULTIN
 JACOB I. HUMMEL
 ROBERT L. HUMPHRIES
 DREW C. HUNDLEY
 BRADLEY M. HUNT
 FREDERICK C. HUNT III
 PETER E. HUNT
 ANNALEIS M. HUNTER
 IAN T. HURDLE
 ERIC R. HUTTON
 LLOYD P. HUTTON, JR.
 KEVIN M. HUWEL
 ROBERT C. HYATT
 PAUL E. HYDE
 SHAUN D. HYLANDMOORE
 ANTHONY E. HYLKO
 CATHERINE W. HYNIE
 JONATHAN F. ICE
 CHRISTOPHER A. IFFT
 MATTHEW C. IGO
 RUBEN I. IHUIT
 MATTHEW P. ILLOWSKY
 COY D. INCAPRERA
 WILLIAM G. INDELICATO
 LARRY B. INGERSOLL
 REID P. INMAN
 GYSCAR J. INOCENCIAHOLLOWAY
 WHIMY E. INVENTOR
 CAITLIN P. IRBY
 RICHARD J. ISER
 VIOLANDRINO V. ISIP
 DAVID M. IZZO
 NICHOLAS J. JACKS
 BARRY R. JACKSON
 DANIEL J. JACKSON
 LEROY P. JACKSON
 MATTHEW R. JACKSON
 RICHARD W. JACKSON
 TYLER I. JACKSON
 TRAVIS D. JACOBS
 BRANDON S. JACOBSON
 CHRISTOPHER A. JAGGERS
 DANIEL R. JAMERSON
 FRANK A. JAMERSON
 CHRISTOPHER C. JAMES
 JOHNATHAN P. JAMES
 MELISSA E. JAMSON
 RICHARD E. JANSEN
 CINDIE M. JANSSEN
 DAVID M. JANTZEN
 BRANDEN P. JARMON
 BRIAN K. JARRELL
 TIMOTHY D. JARRELL
 MARK A. JASZCZAK
 SUZANNE M. JEDROSKO
 SETH T. JEFFERSON
 GREGORY A. JEMO
 MICHAEL R. JENCIC
 AMY J. JENKINS
 MICHAEL C. JENNINGS
 JACOBUS J. JENS
 MADELEINE J. JENSEN
 MATTHEW W. JENSEN
 DANIEL JENSON
 ROBERT G. JEPPESEN
 LUCAS D. JESSEN
 LUIS M. JIMENEZ
 LUKE E. JOHANSON
 RUSSELL H. JOHN
 ANDREW P. JOHNSON
 ANWAR L. JOHNSON
 ASHLEY A. JOHNSON
 BRYCE L. JOHNSON
 CHRISTOPHER W. JOHNSON
 CLIFFORD D. JOHNSON
 JAMES B. JOHNSON
 JENNIFER M. JOHNSON
 JEREMIAH S. JOHNSON
 JOEL J. JOHNSON
 LUKE S. JOHNSON
 MITCHELL D. JOHNSON
 NATHAN J. JOHNSON
 RICHARD J. JOHNSON
 ROBERT R. JOHNSON
 SANSEN E. JOHNSON
 SPENCER E. JOHNSON
 TREVOR H. JOHNSON
 CHRISTOPHER L. JOHNSTON
 EVAN W. JOHNSTON

KEVIN D. JOHNSTON
 RACHEL A. JOHNSTON
 BLAKE A. JONES
 BRANDON J. JONES
 CHASMINE M. JONES
 CHRISTOPHER R. JONES
 DAVID W. JONES, JR.
 KYLE D. JONES
 KYLE S. JONES
 RHONDA JONES
 ROSSER M. JONES
 TAYLOR C. JONES
 DAVID M. JORDAN
 NATHAN O. JORGENSEN
 CHARITY A. JOYNER
 STEPHEN R. JUDE
 DAVID M. JUEL
 ADAM C. JUNG
 ASHLEY C. JUNG
 KELLY J. JUNKINS
 ROBERT E. JURGENSMEIER
 STEPHANIE L. KAARI
 MATTHEW T. KADING
 DIANA P. KANE
 JAMES J. KANG
 JENNIFER N. KANNEGAARD
 BRYAN S. KAPES
 PHILLIP E. KAPETS
 DUSTIN S. KARAS
 DOUGLAS A. KARL
 BRETT T. KASISCHKE
 DAVID KASKY
 LUKE M. KASPARI
 SIMON P. KASSEMI
 EMILY A. KATZ
 SHANNON D. KAUFMAN
 JAMES E. C. KAWECKI
 DEAN D. KAZI
 CHRISTOPHER R. KEAN
 CHARLES G. KEATON
 CHARLES W. KEELING
 ALANNA KEITH
 KYLE P. KEITH
 THOMAS J. KELLAMS II
 PATRICK E. KELLERMAN
 THOMAS W. KELLERMANN
 JUSTIN D. KELLETT
 JENNIFER G. KELLEY
 WILLIAM W. KELLEY
 KRISTOPHER M. KELLY
 MICHAEL A. KELLY
 MATTHEW L. KEMERER
 ANNE M. KEMP
 MICHAEL B. KEMP
 THEODORE R. KEMP
 CHARLES B. KENNEDY
 WILLIAM M. KENNEDY
 NICHOLAS A. KENNEL
 BRENT R. KERNS
 PATRICK S. KEUTMANN
 LARENZO S. KEY
 RYAN M. KIGGINS
 CHEHUN KIM
 YONGMIN KIM
 TROY F. KINCHEN
 JOSHUA M. KING
 KRISTA M. KING
 MARISA J. KING
 MATTHEW P. KING
 RICHARD P. KING IV
 TRAVIS J. KING
 BRIAN A. KINGCADE
 CECILIA P. KINNEY
 KYLE M. KINNEY
 COLBY D. KINSEL
 LINDSEY A. KINSINGER
 ALEXANDER S. KIPP
 ANDREW W. KIRK
 DEREK K. KIRKWOOD
 RICHARD M. KISWAN
 WILLIAM R. KISER
 ERIC D. KITAF
 STEVEN E. KITNER
 CONNOR P. KLEIN
 KYLE A. KLEIN
 DANIEL L. KLEPPER
 ADAM M. KLING
 ROBERT C. KLINGENSMITH
 JUSTIN J. KLUK
 MICHAEL W. KNAPP
 BROOKLYNN A. KNIGHT
 JAMES M. KNIGHT
 BARRY E. KNOBLOCK
 DAVID K. KNUTZEN
 PETER N. KOBER
 KARL H. KOCH
 ANDREW M. KOCHMAN
 CAMERON K. KOEHLER
 MATTHEW L. KOHLER
 DAMIEN P. KOOLIS
 THOMAS P. KOPIETZ
 KATHERINE A. KORDECKI
 HANNAH J. KOSIROG
 JASON K. KOTLEWSKI
 DOUGLAS J. KOTTRABA
 ZACHARIAH S. KOVARIK
 KEVIN M. KOWALCHUK
 MICHAEL J. KRACHT
 ERICH C. KRAMER
 SHANNON N. KRANICH
 NIKOLAUS J. KRAUSE
 MICHAEL A. KRAVITZ
 MICHAEL P. KRETSER
 DANIEL A. KRIEVS
 NICHOLAS M. KRIZ
 BRIAN G. KROEGER

BRYON J. KROGER
ALEX B. KROLL
RUSSELL P. KRONES
JUSTIN T. KRULL
LAUREN K. KRUSE
MATTHEW J. KUBIK
GARRETT B. KUHLIS
JULIANN E. KUHN
JUSTIN D. KULM
SCOTT E. KUMPULA
JAMES C. KUNDERT
JOSEPH R. KUZAN, JR.
ROLAND R. LA FRANCE, JR.
STEPHEN A. LABIT
JOHN J. LABOULIERE
JOHN J. LACHIEWICZ
FRANKLIN P. LADSON, JR.
DAVID R. LAINE
RASHID O. LAMB
ANTHONY T. LAMBERT
ISAAC M. LANDECKER
ERIK A. LANDERS
JESSICA L. LANDGRAF
KENNETH J. LANDGRAF
RICHARD J. LANDSVERK
MICHAEL T. LANEY
MICHAEL W. LANGDON
TOR J. LANGEHAUG
JOHN K. LANGLEY
DUANE O. LANKFORD
NICHOLAS A. LANKFORD
JAIME O. LARIOSBARBOSA
DAVID G. LARSON
MATTHEW J. LARSON
KARLA M. LASCOT
ADAM J. LATAPIE
KATHLEEN I. LAU
JONATHAN B. LAUGHRUN
ADRIAN V. LAW
ANDREW W. LAWLER
JORDAN R. LAWRENCE
JUSTIN E. LAWSON
ALEKSANDER C. LAYNE
KATIE E. LEACH
PATRICK J. LEAHY
BRIAN J. LEBER
DANIEL A. LEBLANC
JUSTIN K. LECHNER
SCOTT D. LECHNER
CORY A. LECKRONE
JUSTIN T. LEDVINA
ANDREW C. LEE
JOHN W. LEE
JUSTIN P. LEE
SPENSER D. LEE
STEVEN C. LEEMON
JAMES J. LEENMAN
PETER O. LEESTMA
JONATHAN S. LEETCH
KEITH A. LEFEVRE
THOMAS G. LEINEWEBER
JEFFREY A. LEMBRICK
ANDREW J. LENELL
MICHAEL J. LENOYEL
MARK R. LEPCZYK
BRETT R. LESSER
ISAAC J. LEUNG
BRANDON A. LEVESQUE
VINCENT J. LEVRAEA
ANDREW C. LEVY
ALLEN D. LEWIS
CHRISTIAN M. LEWIS
CHRISTOPHER M. LEWIS
CODY T. LEWIS
DONALD J. LEWIS
MAVERICK W. LEWIS
SHARON L. M. LI
THOMAS C. LIDE
LEVI J. LIMAS
WYETH J. LINDEKE
JOSEPH D. LINDQUIST
ANDREW J. LINGENFELTER
MICHAEL J. LINTZ
RUSSELL A. LIPOFF
ERIC W. LIPP
JEFFREY T. LIPPERT
CAREY F. LIPSCOMB
NATHAN S. LIPTAK
DAVID M. LITTLE
RYAN M. LITTLE
SHAUN A. LITTLE
JASON J. LO
JOSHUA C. LOCKE
MASON L. LOCKE
AISHA L. LOCKETT
COLIN R. LOCKHART
JAMES M. LODGE, JR.
RICHARD P. LOESCH
KRISTOPHER H. LOEWECHE
RUSSELL J. LOGAN
CHRISTOPHER O. LOGSDON
ANDREW W. LONG
JOHN H. LONG
PATRICK J. LOOBY
JESUS LOPEZ, JR.
JESSICA L. LORD
JUSTIN C. LOWE
MATTHEW R. LOWE
RYAN W. LOWENSTEIN
JACOB R. LOWRIE
NATHANIEL C. LOYD
KEIL M. LUBER
BRANDON R. LUBLIN
BRENT A. LUDDINGTON
ERIC W. LUM
KYLE M. LUNDBERG
CHRISTIAN J. LUNDIN

JOHN E. LUPO
STEPHEN A. LUPO
MATTHEW P. LUVERA
BRIAN C. LYDY
BRANDEN M. LYNAM
KATHRYN D. LYONS
MATTHEW R. MACDONALD
STEPHEN A. MACDONALD
STEVEN D. MACK
DAVID D. MACKINTOSH
JOHN E. MADSEN
KEITH S. MADSEN
KYLE F. MAEGER
JAMES R. MAHAN
JONATHAN G. MAHAN
CHRISTOPHER D. MAHER
STEPHEN D. MAKSIM
MALLORY A. MALDA
ANGELINA M. MALDONADO
LUIS MALDONADO
KELLY A. MANGANO
MICHAEL L. MANGANO
JOSHUA G. MANN
TYLER B. MANN
OMAR M. MANNING
ROBERT C. MANNING
MARK M. MANSHIP
TRAVIS J. MANTER
CHRISTOPHER L. MANTLE
SHANE R. MANUEL
JULIAN S. MAPP
BRANDON M. MARCHEK
SHAFFI R. MARK
JOSEPH D. MARKOFF
STEVEN D. MARKS
JEFFREY A. MARSHALL
KEITH C. MARSHALL
SEAN R. MARSHALL
VINCENT E. MARSHALL
MATTHEW J. MARTENSON
CHRISTOPHER A. MARTI
BRENDA S. MARTIN
CLAYTON A. MARTIN
DANIEL M. MARTIN
RICHARD M. MARTIN
LAURA K. MARTINEAU
GENELLE M. MARTINEZ
MICHAEL E. MARTINEZ
JOSHUA S. MARTZ
SID B. MARU
JARED R. MARVIN
RYAN M. MARVIN
JACKSON W. MASON
JUSTIN K. MASON
LYKA L. MASON
ERIC R. MAST
SARAH R. MAST
CASEY N. MASTERS
MIYA E. MATA
MAURITIANA W. MATSUDA
ANDREW P. MATTHEWS
JENNIFER M. MATTHEWS
SHAWNA A. MATTHYS
CARLOS M. MATURANA
KEVIN S. MAUER
CHAD A. MAURICE
MICHAEL D. MAURO
AMANDA J. MAY
ANDREA L. MAY
ROSE E. MAY
SEAN A. MAY
DUSTIN D. MAYES
RUSSELL D. MAYNARD
ROBERT K. MAYO
SCOTT C. MAYO
MICHAEL P. MAYOR
FRANKLIN D. MAYS
WAYLON V. MAYS
IAN F. MAZERSKI
ANDREW S. MAZZARELLI
BRETT C. MCAULIFF
VICTORIA A. MCBRIDE
SAMUEL J. MCCABE
MATTHEW W. MCCALLUM
NATHAN C. MCCASKEY
BOSTON MCCLAIN III
AMANDA L. MCCLEARY
LILA C. MCCLINTOC
ADAM J. MCCLISH
BRANDON T. MCCLUNG
KYLE B. MCCLURE
MARK A. MCCOLLOUGH
CHRISTOPHER J. MCCOLLUM
BENJAMIN J. MCCORKLE
MATTHEW M. MCCORMACK
ERIN M. MCCORMICK
KELLY M. MCCORMICK
MICHAEL E. MCCORMICK
KYLE S. MCCracken
KYLE I. MCCULLOUGH
ANDREW J. MCCUNE
JAES K. MCDANIEL
RICHARD F. MCDANIEL
JAMES R. MCDAVITT
TED J. MCDEVITT
CHASE F. MCFARLAND
KALE L. MCGINNIS
PATRICK S. MCGREW
RYAN M. MCGUIRE
MITCHELL B. MCKENNEY
CHARNEICE K. MCKENZIE
MELISSA A. MCCLAIN
DANIEL J. MCCLAUGHLIN
BRIAN A. MCLELLAND
DAVID F. MCMAHON
TYLER R. MCMILLIAN
MILES C. MCMULLAN

BRADLEY J. MCNAMARA
JOSEPH M. MCNAMARA
JEREMY D. MCNATT
EVAN P. MCNEAL
EVAN D. MCNICHOLS
JOSHUA A. MCREYNOLDS
MICHAEL J. MCVAY
ANTHONY G. MEADOWS
ELKIN MEDINA
HEATHER M. MEGEE
SERGIO C. MELARA
JOSEPH J. MELLONE
RUBEN E. MENDEZ
JOHN E. MENEZES
CORY J. MENSEN
CAMI L. MERCADO
JOSEPH M. MERCURIO
WESLEY D. MEREDITH
DANA L. MERRILL
BRIAN P. MERRITT
JENNIFER L. MESSINGER
TYLER R. METZ
ANDREW D. METZGER
ANDREW J. METZGER
JOSHUA A. METZGER
KIMBERLY F. MEYERS
GARRETT E. MEYER
GARY J. MEYER
SAMUEL J. MEYER
THOMAS D. MEYER
ERIC C. MICHAEL
ROBERT A. MICHAEL
JOSEPH N. MIGLIACCIO
ANDREW E. MILLER
DANIEL C. MILLER
DAVID J. MILLER
DAYTON J. MILLER
DEBRA S. MILLER
DREW L. MILLER
ERIC M. MILLER
JAMES B. MILLER
JAMES E. MILLER
JAMES W. MILLER
JEREMY J. MILLER
JOSEPH W. MILLER
JUSTIN A. MILLER
LINCOLN K. MILLER
STEVEN L. MILLER
TRAVIS J. MILLER
SCOTT R. MILLS
DEAN E. MILNER
JAMES F. MILTENBERG
EDWIN J. MILTENBERGER
JOSE L. MIRANDA, JR.
DANIEL E. MITCHELL
ROBERT C. MITCHELL
SCOTT A. MITCHELL
WALTER A. MITCHELL
WILLIAM L. MOAK
ELIZABETH L. MOBLEY
ROBERT J. MOBLEY
NATHANIEL A. MOCALIS
MATTHEW P. MOERBE
TRAVIS M. MONGEON
ANDREW G. MONKS
AMANDA M. MONTAGUE
KENNETH S. MONTAGUE
RUDY J. MONTEAGUT
ISAIAH L. MONTEMAYOR
TURNER J. MONTGOMERY
DANIEL I. MONTILLA
BRANDON A. MONTVOYA
DANIEL A. MONTVILLE
ADAM C. MOODY
JEREMY T. MOON
PRESTON P. MOON
MEGAN E. MOONEY
ALEXANDER J. MOORE
CRAIG D. MOORE
JOHN J. MOORE
JOSHUA D. MOORE
MICHAEL A. MOORE
EMIRA S. MOORE
CLARK J. MORGAN
DAVID L. MORGAN
SEAN J. MORGAN
SKYLAR D. MORGAN
DANIEL J. MORTITZ
ANDREW C. MORRIS
KERI L. MORRIS
MICHAEL D. MORRIS
WADE F. MORRIS
CHRISTOPHER G. MORSE
SHALER J. MORTENSEN
NICHOLAS J. MORTIMER
DEREK T. MOSER
JESSE M. MOULTON
PATRICK C. MOUNT
RYAN N. MUDRY
JULIO W. MUECKAY
BRIAN C. MUELLER
THOMAS A. MUELLER
ANDREW J. MUEHCH
NATHAN A. MULHOLLAND
ERIK S. MULKEY
WILLIAM L. MULLAN
RANDALL D. MULLEN
MARK P. MULLER
ROBERT J. MULLER
KEVIN J. MULLIGAN
MELVIN E. MURPHREY III
CALEB S. MURPHY
JANICE S. MURRAY
JUSTIN S. MURRAY
CHRISTOPHER R. MURRI
JONATHAN D. MUSE
BRYAN E. MUSSLER

RICHARD J. MUTARI, JR.
DANIEL S. MYERS
JASON L. MYL
JASON L. NAAKTGEBOREN
NATHANIEL P. NABER
JUSTIN M. NADAL
JOHN E. NAGY, JR.
BEN T. NAIL
BRACK T. NALL, JR.
JOSEPH R. NANGLE
SARAH M. NARRAWAY
JOSEPH M. NASH
WILLIAM R. NEAL
DUSTIN A. NEDOLAST
DYLAN J. NEIDORFF
TRAVIS J. NEIHEISEL
PETER E. NELSEN
CODY J. NELSON
BRITT R. NEMETH
JOHN J. NERWINSKI
TIMOTHY J. NESBITT
CHRISTOPHER L. NETTLES
COLLIN C. NEU
ANDREW E. NEUBAUER
GRIFFIN E. NEVITT
KASEY E. NEWCOMER
DAVID A. NEWMAN
JOSEPH W. NEWMAN
JOSHUA C. NEWMAN
ANH VU N. NGUYEN
THAI H. NGUYEN
VINH D. NGUYEN
JAMES A. NICHOLAS
RYAN J. NICHOLS
STEPHEN O. NICHOLS
VICTORIA E. NICHOLSON
MISTI L. NICKEL
CHRISTOPHER M. NICKLAS
MICHAEL T. NIZZI
CLIFTON M. NOBLE
GABRIELLE Z. NOCE
IAN A. NOEL
DUSTIN A. NORDMAN
KYLE A. NORRIS
REBECCA J. NORTHERN
DANIEL F. NORTON
RICHARD J. NOVA
RUDY L. NOVAK
DAVID W. NUGENT
OSCAR NUNEZ, JR.
JOHN H. NUSSBAUM
ALEX B. NUTTING
BENJAMIN W. OATLEY
RYAN A. OBRIEN
TIMOTHY D. OBRIEN
CHRISTINE E. O'CONNELL
DANIEL M. O'DONOHUE
MATTHEW J. OETKEN
KEITH G. OFALLON
GERALD A. OFARRELL
CHARLES J. O'GONOWSKI
JOSEPH C. OLETTI
MAXIM OLIVINE
GARY J. OLKOWSKI
TYLER K. OLMSTEAD
FREDERICK J. OLSEN
ANDREW S. OLSON
PHILIP D. OLSON
GORDON A. OMEARA
ROBERT J. OMEARA
PATRICK J. ONEIL
KEVIN C. ONEILL
KEVIN J. ONEILL
DAVID K. OPERCHAL
NATHANIEL P. OPIE
JOSHUA D. OREDSON
JAMES C. OREND
ROBIN M. ORR
FERNANDO ORTEGA
ANTHONY H. ORTIZ
SEBASTIAN F. ORTIZ
AARON J. OSBORNE
ANTHONY T. OSHEA
EAMONN D. OSHEA
SHAWN S. OSTBY
BENJAMIN F. OSTER
CHARLES M. OSTERHOUT
DANIEL J. OSULLIVAN
PATRICK J. OSULLIVAN
GREGORY C. OSWALD
RONALD K. OSWALT
NATHAN T. OTT
STEPHEN G. OTT
ADAM M. OTTEN
JAMES B. OUTLAND
LADARIAN C. OUTSEY
AARON M. OWENS
JOSEPH H. OWENS
MICHAEL S. OWENS
CURTIS W. PACLEB
SAMUEL D. PACE
MATTHEW M. PALANDECH
JASON A. PALLA
LILLIANNE T. PALLO
BRANDON P. PALMER
BRIAN O. PALMER
EVERETT B. PALMER IV
TRENTON R. PALMER
RHEESA A. PALUAY
JOSHUA M. PALUCH
FRANK J. PANEBIANCO
ALEXANDER F. PAPPALARDO
DUKMIN J. PARK
ELISA A. PARK
MICHAEL B. PARK
DANIEL E. PARKER
JAPHETH E. PARKER

ROBERTA J. PARKER
SAMANTHA U. PARKER
WESLEY M. PARKER
MICHAEL J. PARRISH
RYAN C. PARRISH
AARON A. PARSONS
DAVID K. PARSONS
TONY D. PARSRAM
PAUL L. PASKELL
BRANDON A. PASTERSKI
KAVIR H. PATEL
VISHAL K. PATEL
BERNARD L. PATENAUE
QUAN J. PATTEN
BRANDON C. PATTERSON
CHRISTOPHER E. PATTON
MICHAEL C. PAUL
CHRISTOPHER A. PAULY
DANIEL G. PAYNE II
JACQUELEAN M. PAYNE
JEFFREY R. PAYNE
LANCE B. PEAK
KYLE D. PEARCE
BRIAN L. PEARSON
MARCIANNA J. PEASE
JEFFREY M. PECORA
ERIC J. PEDERSON
JUSTIN T. PEDONE
MARCUS J. PEDUZZI
BRADY W. PEIRANO
ANGELO PELLIGRINI
ZACHARY T. PENDLETON
JEREMY S. PEPIN
ADAM K. PEREIRA
CHLOE A. PEREZ
DIANE PEREZ
RYAN A. PERHALA
RANDY W. PERKINS
MICHAEL J. PEROLIO
CODY W. PERRY
DOMINIC A. PERRY
FRANK W. PERRY, JR.
SEAN D. PERRY
TYLER C. PERRY
ADAM C. PETERSON
ADAM K. PETERSON
BRIAN A. PETERSON
JASON W. PETERSON
MELISSA M. PETERSON
MICHAEL D. PETERSON
GREGORY R. PETSCHAUER
CHRISTOPHER M. PEZZINI
MATTHEW M. PFARR
ANHMINH PHAM
JUSTIN M. PHELPS
DAVID M. PHILIPP
MICHAEL A. PHILLIPICH
DAYLAN A. PHILLIPS
ERIC M. PHILLIPS
JOSEPH S. PHILLIPS
PRESTON E. PHILLIPS
TIMOTHY G. PHILLIPS
ZACHARY A. PHILLIPS
STEVEN J. PIASTA
JONATHAN E. PIEKARCZYK
TIMIKA N. PIERCE
TROY L. PIERCE, JR.
WILLIAM C. PIERCE
CHRISTOPHER W. PIERCY
JARRETT D. PIESKE
CARI M. PIHA
IVAN O. PINDERBEY
LAURENCE Y. PINEDA
MATTHEW L. PINEDA
RYAN J. PINNER
JUANCARLOS A. PINO
BRANDON G. PINTO
ALAN D. PIPPIN
BRIAN W. PITMAN
CAMERON J. PITOU
DANIEL O. PITTMER
JOSEPH A. PLACE
DAVID L. PLACHNO
MARK S. PLEIS, JR.
JUSTIN L. PLETCHER
HAYDEN R. POE
WILLIAM F. POESCHL
BRETT A. POLAGE
JOSHUA R. POLK
NORMAN D. POPP
CHRISTOPHER M. PORTER
JARED D. PORTER
ORSON S. PORTER
VICTORIA B. PORTO
SCOTT S. PORTUE
HECTOR POSADA BRUNO
BENJAMIN R. POWELL
GLENNA A. POWER
JAMES E. POWERS
MICHAEL E. POWERS
JONATHAN R. POYSER
JESSE M. PRATER
EDWIN C. PRATT
JESSICA M. PRATT
MARK R. PRATT
SCOTT M. PRATT
JASON G. PRAVITZ
ADAM J. PRAZAK
ERIC F. PRECHTIL
ALYSSA M. PREMUS
DANIEL H. PRESCOTT
JERRY PRIBYL
SCOTT S. PRIDE
AMBERLY L. PRILL
RAYMOND J. PRIMMER
JOHN D. PRINCE
MICHAEL E. PROBASCO

JOSEPH R. PROHASKA
ERIC B. PROSSER
CHRISTOPHER E. PROTOS
DAVID J. PUCHALLA
MARK E. PUFFENBARGER
KELVIN PUK
EMILY A. PURCELL
ISAAC B. PUTNAM
TONI L. PYATOK
HOUSTON W. PYE
MATTHEW PYLYPCIW
MATTHEW R. QUAN
NATALIE M. QUINN
JOSE QUINTANILLA
DEREK J. RAABE
JUSTIN M. RAABE
JAMES T. RADFORD
JOSHUA D. RADFORD
ANDREW W. RADLOFF
KENNETH E. RAGSDALE
WILLIAM M. RAINE
DARRON M. RAINES
MICHAEL T. RAINES
JULIE E. RAINWATERS
KYLE D. RAINWATERS
BRIAN S. RAIRDON
JOSEPH J. RAISNER
TIMOTHY M. RAK
KELLY L. RALSTON
RYAN M. RAMIREZ
ELIZABETH K. RAMOSO
KYLE S. RAMSEY
JEFFREY G. RANDOLPH
BREANNA M. RANEY
CHAD E. RANEY
ALLEN D. RATLIFF
MARGARET S. RAWLS
JULIE N. RAY
NICHOLAS S. RAYL
MICHAEL T. RAYNOR
ANDREW E. RAYO
ROBERT D. READ
LUKE J. REARDON
ADAM J. REARICK
MICHAEL P. REDDING
JOSHUA D. REDDIS
KARMISHA J. REEB
DAVID PAUL REED
MICHAEL B. REEDER
JEFFREY S. REES
BRANDON M. REEVES
MATTHEW K. REILLY
JONATHAN B. REMBER
KEVAN M. REMICK
TYLER W. REMKUS
MICHAEL R. RENNA
MICHAEL A. RENOLAYAN
GREGORY S. RETTLER
CHRISTOPHER J. REUSSER
KIMBERLY L. REXWINKEL
ALEJANDRO REYES
WILLIAM D. RICE
JOHN B. RICHARD
MITCHELL F. RICHARDSON
ANTHONY D. RICHARDSON
CHRISTOPHER D. RICHARDSON
ANDREW J. RICHTER
JOHN P. RICHWINE
MATTHEW J. RILEY
RAMIRO RIOS
KADEN L. RIPINGILL
MICHAEL J. RISTOM
JOSHUA A. RITTENHOUSE
HENRY C. RIVERA
MICHAEL A. RIVERA
KEVIN C. RIVERS
JEREMIAH A. ROBBINS
MATTHEW R. ROBBINS
MICHAEL J. ROBBEE
ANDREW J. ROBERTS
JEREMY S. ROBERTS
JAMES W. ROBERTSON
JODY E. ROBERTSON
MAXIMILIAN ROEBIDOUX
NICOLE A. ROBILARD
AARON J. ROBINSON
BRYAN A. ROCCO
JONATHAN K. RODGERS
ANTHONY N. RODRIGUEZ
CYNTHIA J. RODRIGUEZ
EMILIO H. RODRIGUEZ
LISA M. RODRIGUEZ
OSVALDO RODRIGUEZ
THOMAS F. RODRIGUEZ
RANDY C. ROGERS
ROBIN C. ROGERS
DANIELLE M. ROGOWSKI
MATTHEW D. ROHLMAN
STEVEN M. ROHMILLER
PATRICK T. ROKS
MATTHEW T. ROLAND
ALEXANDE W. ROMAN
DANIEL R. ROMERO
NICHOLAS C. ROMERO
RICHARD A. ROMICK
LUKE M. ROONEY
JOSHUA S. ROOSE
DAVID A. ROSE
PHILIP M. ROSE
NATHANIEL J. ROSEVEARE
ROBYN L. ROSS
TIMM L. ROSS
CARL D. ROSSINI III
KEVIN ROTH
KRISTA L. ROTH
SHAWN A. ROUSSEAU

ALEXANDER K. ROWTON
 CONRAD R. RUIZ
 JOHN D. RULIEN
 ROBERT K. RUNSHE, JR.
 FRANCIS E. RUPERT
 BENDEL S. RUSHING
 MATTHEW H. RUSSEL
 RYAN H. RUTHERFORD
 LAURA E. RYAN
 MICHAEL H. RYAN
 MILES H. RYAN
 MATTHEW R. SAAR
 BRIAN J. SAARI
 JACOB D. SABIN
 ORYAN A. SAGUN
 RALPH W. SALAZAR
 THOMAS R. SALLENGER II
 JESSE W. SALMON
 MICHAEL W. SALTZMAN
 GILBERTO SAMBOLIN PEREZ
 HARRIZON B. SANCHEZ
 LUKE C. SANDBECKMORIARTY
 MICHAEL B. SANDERS
 TERICKA S. SANDERS
 JESSE N. SANDSTROM
 LUIS O. SANTIAGO
 ANTHONY L. SANTOSUS
 ALEXIA R. SARE
 JAMES A. SARVER
 MARIO A. SAUCEDA
 GREGORY C. SAUDER
 ZACHARY L. SAUERMAN
 PATRICK B. SAUNCY
 DANIELLE R. SAUNDERS
 KHALISHA SAVAGE
 ALTAY SAVRUN
 JERAD K. SAYLER
 KRISTA M. SCHAEFFER
 MEGAN A. SCHAFFER
 RICHARD K. SCHANDA
 DANIEL J. SCHLICKOPH
 ADDISON W. SCHENK
 ELIZABETH M. SCHERRER
 JEFFREY K. SCHIELD
 ASHLEY J. SCHIRNER
 ROBERT J. SCHLAGEL
 NICHOLAS R. SCHLAGHECK
 BRANDON C. SCHMIDT
 PAUL A. SCHMIDT
 CHARLES H. SCHOEN
 CHARLES E. J. SCHOLFIELD
 JACOB A. SCHONIG
 JOHN P. SCHRADER
 MARK B. SCHRINER
 JOHN W. SCHROEDER
 KURTIS A. SCHUBECK
 MICHAEL A. SCHUBERT
 CHRISTOPHER S. SCHUETTE
 DANIEL F. SCHULTZ
 JOSHUA L. SCHULZE
 MICHAEL J. SCHUMACHER
 JEREMY L. SCHUSTER
 KYLE E. SCHWAB
 LINDSAY E. SCOTT
 MARK A. SCOTT
 MICHAEL C. SCOTT
 STEPHANIE D. SCOTT
 CHARMECKA L. SCROGGINS
 JONATHAN D. SEAGLE
 HEATHER N. SEALOVER
 CHRISTOPHER R. SEAY
 DENNIS B. SEAY
 JONATHAN S. SEDLACEK
 KURT J. SEDL
 ALEXANDER J. SEIFERT
 KYLE D. SELLNER
 KURTIS C. SEMANKO
 BRIAN A. SEYMOUR
 BRIANNE L. SEYMOUR
 ISRAEL S. SHANKEL
 KEVIN P. SHANNON
 SEAN D. SHAY
 PATRICK R. SHEEHAN
 JACK A. SHEPHERD III
 RICHARD D. SHEPHERD
 WESLEY A. SHEPPARD, JR.
 KENJI J. SHINODA
 REID R. SHINTAKU
 DAVID M. SHIPMAN
 JOSHUA L. SHORT
 CARLTON G. SHREVE
 TIMOTHY J. SHUCK
 ZACHARY B. SHULER
 DANIEL M. SICKLES
 JORDAN L. SIEPKES
 DANIEL G. SIEMEN
 LARRY J. SIGMAN
 KOREY J. SILKNITTER
 FRANCISCO E. SILVA
 JUSTIN LEE SILVA
 ANGELICA R. SILVA GARZA
 WILLIANA V. SIMMONS
 DAVID M. SIMON
 FRANK Z. SIMON
 CHRISTOPHER J. SIMPSON
 MICHAEL J. SIMPSON
 HENRY L. SIMS, JR.
 ZACHERY B. SINGER
 CODY R. SINGLETARY
 ANDREW E. SINGLETON
 JOSHUA B. SINKLER
 RYAN D. SIVERTSEN
 TIMOTHY J. SIX
 RENE A. SKELTON
 SHAUN M. SKORLICH
 DANE PAUL SKOUSEN
 DYLAN THOMAS SLAGLE

DOUGLAS J. SLATER, JR.
 RICHARD A. SLATER
 WILLIAM J. SLATER
 DAVID A. SLEASMAN
 RYAN D. SLEETER
 SEAN M. SLETTEN
 BENN W. SLIKKER
 MATTHEW J. SLOANE
 MICHAEL D. SLOTTEN
 ANDREW J. SMALL
 CARRIE M. SMART
 ALEXANDER P. SMITH
 ANDREW M. SMITH
 BRENNON J. SMITH
 BRENT A. SMITH
 CLARK W. SMITH
 DANIEL R. SMITH
 DANIEL T. SMITH
 ELLIOT T. SMITH
 JERED M. SMITH
 JILLIAN L. SMITH
 MARK A. SMITH
 MATTHEW C. SMITH
 MICHAEL W. SMITH
 NATHAN C. SMITH
 NATHAN R. SMITH
 ROBERT C. SMITH
 ROBERT J. SMITH
 RUSSELL C. SMITH
 STEVEN Z. SMITH
 THOMAS A. SMITH
 MICHELLE SNOW
 DURHAM J. SNUFFIN
 ALAN J. SNYDER
 MATTHEW J. SOBEY
 BENJAMIN D. SOIFER
 JOSHUA P. J. SOLLEE
 BENJAMIN J. SONG
 SOLOMON Y. SONYA
 RALPH A. SOTO
 BRYN E. SOWA
 CHRISTOPHER A. SPACH
 MICHAEL M. SPANOGLE
 CHRISTOPHER M. SPARKES
 MATTHEW C. SPARTA
 BLAINE J. SPEAR
 LANCE J. SPEED
 DANIEL F. SPENCER
 JUSTIN P. SPENCER
 JASON T. SPICER
 NATHAN T. SPIERO
 SARAH A. SPIES
 JOSEPH D. SPITZ
 MATTHEW W. SPOMER
 SANDRA E. SPOON
 RYAN S. SPRINGER
 WILLIAM W. SPURLING
 BENTON P. STAAB II
 GREGORY A. STAFFORD
 MATTHEW S. STALFORD
 DANIEL J. STANCIN
 KENNETH C. STANFORD
 NICOLE J. STANLEY
 BRYON A. STARK
 KENNETH D. STARKS III
 ANDREW A. STATON
 CORY A. STAUDINGER
 ANDREW K. STAUFFER
 RYAN J. STEC
 MATTHEW W. STEELE
 JOSEPH M. STEFFES
 JOHN R. STEINER
 JESSICA M. STEINHOF
 COREY A. STEINKOENIG
 DAVID H. STEINOUR
 FREDDIE L. STEPHENS II
 ROBERT A. STEPHENSEN
 DAVID S. STERNBERG
 LARRY D. STEVENS, JR.
 BLAINE L. STEWART
 KRISTIN L. STEWART
 PATRICK D. STEWART
 STEVEN D. STEWART
 HEATHER M. STICKNEY
 JASON R. STICKNEY
 JOSHUA J. STILL
 MUSETTE M. STINNETT
 JEREMY M. STOBBER
 JOSHUA B. STOCKHAM
 MATTHEW A. STOECHNER
 CHAD WAYNE STOLL
 RAYMOND T. STONE
 JUSTIN J. STORM
 KYLE L. STOVER
 JAMES M. STRANGE
 GARRETT L. STRASSLER
 KYLE V. STRATHMAN
 PRZEMYSŁAW STREKOWSKI
 WILLIAM D. STRELKE
 JENNIFER L. STRETCH
 CLAYTON S. STRICKLAND
 GENE T. STRICKLAND
 SARAH B. STRICKLAND
 DANIEL J. STRISHOCK
 WALTER B. STUDLEY
 JETHA L. STUGER
 KENNETH J. STURGIS
 ALTON N. STURON
 DARSHAN R. SUBRAMANIAN
 ADAM J. SUGALSKI
 BRANDON M. SULLIVAN
 ERIC R. SULLIVAN
 JESSE L. SULLIVAN
 SEAN M. SULLIVAN
 KYLE S. SULTEMEIER
 LACEY M. SUPINGER
 DANIEL M. SURRENCY

STEPHEN J. SUTARA III
 TONY R. SUTPHIN
 BRADLEY E. SUTTON
 DOUGLAS P. SUTTON
 MATTHEW L. SUTTON
 ERIK L. SVENDSEN
 ASHLEY L. SWANSINGER
 CODY J. SWEATT
 KEVIN M. SWEET
 THOMAS M. SYNOVEC
 JOSEPH J. SYSKO
 JONATHAN R. SZUL
 TIFFANY M. SZUMILA
 EDWARD A. TABBUTT
 PELENATO TAGOAI
 ERIC R. TALBOT
 TAYLOR M. TALLY
 ALESSANDRO L. TAMAYO, JR.
 RYAN E. TAMEZ
 YANCY Y. TANG
 RYLAN P. TANNER
 EDWARD L. TARALA, JR.
 JUSTIN M. TARR
 KIMBERLY M. TAT
 CHRISTOPHER S. TAYLOR
 DAVIEN G. TAYLOR
 JARED B. TAYLOR
 JARED T. TAYLOR
 JASON R. TAYLOR
 LIAM R. TAYLOR
 RUSNEISHA L. TAYLOR
 STEPHANIE D. TAYLOR
 ANDREW L. TEAGUE
 MATTHEW T. TEGELER
 CHRISTOPHER S. TEGTMEYER
 STEPHEN J. TELANO
 RYAN J. TELL
 ALISHA R. TEMPLES
 MERCY S. TEO
 KAZ I. TEOPE
 FRANK J. TERRANOVA
 CAROLINE J. TETRICK
 DERRICK G. TETZMAN
 TIMOTHY A. THACKABERRY
 ASHLEY A. THOMAS
 DENZIL R. THOMAS III
 ERIC J. THOMAS
 HAWKINS B. THOMAS II
 JACOB M. THOMAS
 JASON W. THOMAS
 JOSHUA C. THOMAS
 MATTHEW G. THOMAS
 RONNIE L. THOMAS
 FLEMING R. THOMPSON
 HOLLY K. THOMPSON
 JEREMY A. THOMPSON
 SEAN E. THOMPSON
 ZACHARY E. THOMPSON
 NATHAN J. THOMSEN
 DAVID L. THOMSON
 JARRAD F. THORLEY
 MARK R. THORLEY
 JUSTIN R. THORNTON
 AMANDA A. THORSEN
 KYLE R. THURMOND
 DAVID B. TILLER
 NATHAN F. TILTON
 PATRICK L. TINS
 JOHN R. TINER
 EDWARD E. TISON
 AARON M. TISSOT
 JOHN D. TOBIN
 JOSHUA K. TOBITT
 MATTHEW P. TOLENTINO
 PAOLO C. TOLENTINO
 BENJAMIN F. TOLER
 JONATHAN C. TOLMAN
 JOSEPH R. TOMCZAK
 MEYLIANA H. TONGKO
 RAFAEL F. TORO QUINONES
 BENJAMIN A. TORRES
 FRANCISCO J. TORRES
 CHRISTOPHER J. TOTTORICA
 JOEL M. TOURIGNY
 CHRISTOPHER Y. TOVAR
 BRYAN S. TOWNSEND
 MACLANE A. TOWNSEND
 TOSHIRO J. TOYAMA
 THOMAS J. TRADUP
 JESSICA R. TRAN
 ALEXANDRA L. TRANA
 SETH Q. TRAUTMAN
 JOSHUA C. TRAYERS
 JORDAN S. TRIBBLE
 DAVID A. TRONE
 HARRY J. TROSBCH IV
 CHRISTOPHER B. TRUETOVE
 LEONARD D. TRUJILLO
 WESLEY C. TUBMAN
 JARED D. TUINSTR
 CHRISTOPHER F. TULK
 BRETT F. TURNER
 JEFFREY E. TURNER, JR.
 ALEX E. TURTON
 ALEKSEY TYABUS
 BORI SITHA UM
 FORREST J. UNDERWOOD
 NICHOLAS S. UNDERWOOD
 CAMERON C. UNTERBERGER
 BRADY A. URBANOVSKY
 CHRISTOPHER J. URSINO
 CHRISTOPHER E. VAIL
 KELLY MACKAY VAIL
 MIGUEL F. H. VALENZUELA
 MIGUEL A. VALLEJO
 MICHAEL J. VALLONE
 ANDREW T. VAN HISE

CODY J. VANCISE
ERIC M. VANDER WYST
HEATHER A. F. VANDER WYST
CHAD B. VANDERHORST
MICHAEL J. VANDERLAAN
JAMES R. VANDERNECK
CODY A. VANDERPOL
ALEXANDER W. VANE
NICHOLAS T. VARNUM
ALBERT R. VASSO
ROBERT C. VASTA
ALAN N. VAUGHN
SCOTT A. VAUGHN
FRANCISCO VAZQUEZ
TIMOTHY H. VEDRA
ANDREW Y. VEERATHANONGDECH
NICOLAS A. VELATI
DANIEL A. VELO
JENNIFER M. VELO
PHILIP M. VELTRE
EDWIN VENTURA
ANNAMARIA L. VESELY
ASHLEY N. VETEK
DAVID F. VILELA
ANDREW N. VOGEL
JOHN S. VOGEL
CHRISTOPHER R. VON ALMEN
KYLE W. VONNAHMEN
JACOB L. WADDY
CAHN J. WADHAMS
JOSEPH B. WAECHTER
MATHEW C. WAGGONER
MICHAEL D. WAGNER
RESHARD E. WAGSTAFF
ARLEN B. WALKER
BENJAMIN R. WALKER
DAVID L. WALKER
DIAUNDR A. WALKER
JEREMY A. WALKER
KRIS D. WALKER
RANDY R. WALKER
MICAH A. WALLER
ALEX M. WALLIS
CLINTON T. WALLS
CHRISTOPHER D. WALSH
WESLEY M. WALSH
SANDIETTA S. WALTER
JIMI WANG
STEVEN S. WANG
TIMMY T. WANG
DANIEL S. WANGELIN
BRADLEY S. WARD
SCOTT R. WARD
PATRICK H. WARFEL
AARON M. WARREN
CHRISTOPHER A. WARREN
NICHOLAS W. WARREN
ANDREW W. WASHER
JONATHAN L. WATFORD
LASHAUN M. WATKINS
CHERILYN J. WATLER SPEIGHT
JASON P. WATSON
SHANE D. WAITS
CHRISTOPHER T. WATZ
JUSTIN C. WEAVER
ALEXANDER L. WEBB
DANIEL J. WEBER
CHASE M. WEBSTER
CHRISTOPHER R. WEED
TYLER C. WEEKS
BRIAN L. WEHRY
JUSTIN M. WEILER
SARA E. WEIMAR
ALEXANDER I. WEINER
LEAH K. WEIS
JOSHUA R. WELCH
ERIC M. WELLS
FELICIA R. WELLS
RICHARD A. WELLS
SCOTT K. WELSHINGER
JOSHUA R. WENTA
NIKITA C. WERLING
ANDREW L. WEST
ADAM J. WESTCOTT
WILLIAM L. WESTCOTT, JR.
KATHLEEN J. WESTRICK
SEAN T. WESTRICK
BRENDEN A. WETZBARGER
CHRISTOPHER P. WEYERS
LUKE E. WEYHMULLER
AMANDA R. WHALEN
DANIEL P. WHALEN
HARVEY M. WHITE
JESSE D. WHITE
JONATHAN B. WHITE
ROMEO P. WHITE
RYAN C. WHITEHEAD
PAUL B. WHITTAKER
TRAVIS J. WHITTEMORE
TRAVIS J. WHITTON
MATTHEW E. WICHMANN
TRAVIS C. WIDMAN
TIMOTHY K. WILDE
SPENCER H. WILE
CHRISTOPHER M. WILINSKI
PHILLIP A. WILKERSON
JOSHUA P. WILKERSONBIENICK
ABIGAIL M. WILKINS
KENNETH D. WILKINS
MATTHEW D. WILLEY
ALEXANDRA WILLIAMS
BRIAN P. WILLIAMS
DONALD WILLIAMS
ELLEN M. WILLIAMS
JAMES A. WILLIAMS
JASON B. WILLIAMS, JR.
JOSEPH L. WILLIAMS

KEITH B. WILLIAMS
MATTHEW S. WILLIAMS
MCKAY D. WILLIAMS
MICHELLE Y. WILLIAMS
ZACHARY L. WILLIAMS
DOMINIQUE D. WILLIS
ABEL B. WILSON
KARL A. WILSON
LAWRENCE M. WILSON
LAYNE W. WILSON
LINDSAY K. WILSON
MARK A. WILSON
PHILLIP W. WILSON
SEAN S. WILSON
SHARI E. WILSON
CODY J. WILTON
ZACHARY A. WINDHORST
BRANDON J. WINGERT
CORY A. WINSLOW
TIMOTHY M. WINTCH
JEFFREY M. WINTER
DALE L. WINTERS
CHRISTY M. WISE
CHRISTOPHER C. WITTWER
ROSS W. WOHLFAHRT
CLARK L. WOLFE
KRISTEN J. WOLVERTON
ARMAND WONG
JONATHAN R. WOOD
MAX WOOD
SHAWN WOODALL, JR.
DIONDRA R. WOODERT
PHILLIP J. WOODHULL
ROBERT WOODS
MARK D. WRAY
DALLAS M. WRIGHT
GREGORY A. WYMAN
REBECCA L. WYNN
ALEXANDRE P. WYRICK
RONI YADLIN
EDWARD E. YANG
JOHN A. YATES
JONATHAN M. YATES
ASHLEE M. YEHLER
TODD M. YEHLER
CATHRYN J. YERAGE
EDWARD L. YERAGE
WILLIAM T. YETMAN
NICHOLAS Y. YEUNG
STUART V. YODER
ANDREW N. YORK
ALBERT C. YOUNG
ALEXANDER L. YOUNG
JOSHUA B. YOUNG
OYUNCHIMEG YOUNG
STEPHANIE C. YSEBAERT
MARK K. ZAKNER
LEE M. ZANIEWSKI
JOSHUA J. ZATTLER
DAVID S. ZEIGLER
PAUL B. ZEIGLER
JESSICA M. ZEMBEK
PETER T. ZEVETCHIN
RAYMOND P. ZHANG
CAROLYN F. ZIAJA
SARAH E. ZIAJA
DREW M. ZIMMER
NICOLAS H. ZIMMERMAN
JAMIE T. ZIMMERMANN
CELINE M. ZIOBRO
MATTHEW S. ZIPPER
JOSEPH R. ZUJUS
STEVEN D. ZUMWALDE
CARL A. ZUNKER
ISAIAH S. ZYDUCK

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

BENJAMIN E. SOLOMON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

WILLIAM J. NELS

To be major

AARON J. FINLAY
SANG M. LEE
KELLIE A. WHITTLINGER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

VENDECK M. DAVIS

To be major

RYAN G. LAVOIE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 624:

To be colonel

HARRY A. HORNBUCKLE
MICHAEL J. KIMBALL

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

TRAVIS A. MONTPLAISIR

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

ARIANA P. BENSUSAN

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 28, 2018:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

TARA SWEENEY, OF ALASKA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ROBIN S. BERNSTEIN, OF FLORIDA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC.

JOSEPH N. MONDELLO, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO.

GORDON D. SONDLAND, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE EUROPEAN UNION, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.

HARRY B. HARRIS, JR., OF FLORIDA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA.

RONALD GIDWITZ, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF BELGIUM.

BRIAN A. NICHOLS, OF RHODE ISLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF ZIMBABWE.

TIBOR PETER NAGY, JR., OF TEXAS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (AFRICAN AFFAIRS).

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. PAUL A. FRIEDRICHS

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. MICHAEL T. MORAN

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. MARK H. BERRY

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. MARK J. MOURISKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. EILEEN H. LAUBACHER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. ANN H. DUFF

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN W. KORCA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. NANCY S. LACORE
CAPT. THEODORE P. LECLAIR
CAPT. ERIC C. RUTTENBERG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) MARY C. RIGGS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) ALAN D. BEAL
REAR ADM. (LH) BRIAN S. HURLEY
REAR ADM. (LH) ANDREW C. LENNON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. ROBERT T. CLARK

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL F. FAHEY III
BRIG. GEN. HELEN G. PRATT

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. SCOTT A. HOWELL

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. AUSTIN S. MILLER

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. ERIC M. SMITH

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. RICHARD M. CLARK

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. DARRYL A. WILLIAMS

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS STAFF JUDGE ADVOCATE TO THE COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS AND FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10 U.S.C., SECTION 5046:

To be major general

COL. DANIEL J. LECCE

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. CHARLES Q. BROWN, JR.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. NARCISO CRUZ
COL. MARK K. MIERA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN

THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JOSEPH F. JARRARD
BRIG. GEN. TRACY R. NORRIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. LAUREL J. HUMMEL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. TOMMY H. BAKER
BRIG. GEN. GREGORY S. BOWEN
BRIG. GEN. SCOTT A. CAMPBELL
BRIG. GEN. JAMES D. CRAIG
BRIG. GEN. GORDON L. ELLIS
BRIG. GEN. JOHN M. EPPERLY
BRIG. GEN. TIMOTHY E. GOWEN
BRIG. GEN. PAUL F. GRIFFIN
BRIG. GEN. KENNETH S. HARA
BRIG. GEN. CHRISTOPHER F. LAWSON
BRIG. GEN. JAMES E. PORTER, JR.
BRIG. GEN. RAFAEL A. RIBAS
BRIG. GEN. TIMOTHY J. SHERIFF
BRIG. GEN. THOMAS F. SPENCER
BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL D. TURIELLO
BRIG. GEN. SUZANNE P. VARIS-LUM
BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM J. WALKER
BRIG. GEN. RONALD A. WESTFALL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. MIGUEL AGUILAR
COL. EUGENE S. ALKIRE
COL. MARK J. BERGLUND
COL. RONALD W. BURKETT II
COL. ROBERT F. CHARLESWORTH
COL. NICK DUCICH
COL. ROBERT D. FERGUSON
COL. ADAM R. FLASCH
COL. KEVIN W. GALLAGHER
COL. JOHN T. GENTRY, JR.
COL. BRYAN J. GRENON
COL. JOHN D. HAAS
COL. EDWARD H. HALLENBECK
COL. JOE D. HARGETT
COL. ROBERT F. HEPNER, JR.
COL. CHARLES G. KEMPER IV
COL. STEVEN T. KING
COL. MICHAEL J. LEENEY
COL. ROY J. MACARAEG
COL. JOANNE E. MACGREGOR
COL. MARIE M. MAHONEY
COL. SHAWN P. MANKE
COL. JAMES G. MCCORMACK
COL. MIGUEL A. MENDEZ
COL. NEAL S. MITSUYOSHI
COL. SHARON D. MOORE
COL. MICHAEL J. OSTER
COL. GREGORY C. PARKER
COL. SCOTT T. PETRIK
COL. JERRY F. PROCHASKA
COL. JAVIER A. REINA
COL. YESENIA R. ROQUE
COL. LEO A. RYAN
COL. MICHAEL J. SCHLORHOLTZ
COL. SCOTT M. SHERMAN
COL. TYLER B. SMITH
COL. WALTER B. STUREK, JR.
COL. JOHN F. TAYLOR, JR.
COL. THOMAS E. VERN, JR.
COL. DAMIAN K. WADDELL
COL. ROBERT F. WEIR
COL. KATHERINE E. WHITE
COL. JAMES C. WILKINS
COL. TIMOTHY J. WINSLOW

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 156:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. CHRISTOPHER C. FRENCH

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. CARL E. MUNDY III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. LORETTA E. REYNOLDS

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. GIOVANNI K. TUCK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JOSEPH T. GUASTELLA, JR.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. ROBERT G. CARRUTHERS III
COL. QUVATOR R. GORE
COL. ADAM L. ROBINSON
COL. KEVIN L. VINES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. STEPHEN M. RUTNER

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) MARCUS A. HITCHCOCK

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JOHN K. LOVE

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JOHN C. THOMSON III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. JOSEPH R. BALDWIN

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. WILLIAM P. PENNINGTON

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. THOMAS W. BERGESON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JAMES C. SLIFE

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL OF THE NAVY AND FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE SERVING AS THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 5148:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. JOHN G. HANNINK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED

WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. JAMES J. MALLOY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. ANDREW L. LEWIS

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JOHN M. JANSEN

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF KOURTNI L. STARKEY, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF HERMANN F. HINZE, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JOSEPH B. RYAN, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL FRANCIS ADAMITIS AND ENDING WITH LESLIE ANN ZYDAMARTIN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 24, 2018.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BARBARA B. ACEVEDO AND ENDING WITH CHRISTY L. ZAHN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 24, 2018.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WILLIAM P. MORSE AND ENDING WITH NICHOLAS M. STRELCHUK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2018.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WADE B. ADAIR AND ENDING WITH JAY W. VEEDER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 18, 2018.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES D. ATHNOS AND ENDING WITH SARAH MONROE WHITSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 18, 2018.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JULIE LALEH ADAMS AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER THOMAS ZONA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 18, 2018.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ERIC T. ASHLEY AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL J. RYHN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 6, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GILBERT AIDINIAN AND ENDING WITH D011955, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 6, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DIANE M. ARM-BRUSTER AND ENDING WITH LELAND T. SHEPHERD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 17, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DONALD C. BREWER III AND ENDING WITH CHARLES F. WALLACE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 17, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JAMES D. SPENCER II, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER A. BASSETT AND ENDING WITH SCOTT E. BOYD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 17, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JULIE A. CRAIG, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CHARLES G. BLAKE, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF THOMAS A. URQUHART, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF PATRICIA YOUNG, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DIEGO L. BECERRA III AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL E. ZELLOUS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 24, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PATRICK M. ABELL AND ENDING WITH ALBERT F. YONKOWITZ, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 24, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GEORGE R. K. ACREE AND ENDING WITH ARTHUR E. ZEGERS IV, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 24, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MELISSA K. G. ADAMSKI AND ENDING WITH JAMES YI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 24, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DENNIS R. BELL AND ENDING WITH BRETT J. TAYLOR, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 4, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH THEODORE W. CROY III AND ENDING WITH BILL A. SOLIZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 4, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH EDGAR G. ARROYO AND ENDING WITH G010491, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 4, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEFFREY M. ALLERDING AND ENDING WITH VANESSA WORSHAM, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 4, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATION OF BRIAN F. SAYLER, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WILLIAM B. MURPHY AND ENDING WITH DAVID M. SOLORZANO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 4, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ERIC N. HATCH AND ENDING WITH YANNICK N. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 4, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANTHONY HALL AND ENDING WITH CHRISTINA M. WRIGHT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 4, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATION OF MICHAEL G. MOURITSEN, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF DAVID E. ROBERTS, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF PETER R. PURRINGTON, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CHAD K. BRINTON, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER K. JAMES, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF TONY J. WOODRUFF, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JONATHAN M. FAUST AND ENDING WITH CARLOS M. POVENTUDESTRADE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 11, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRENDAN E. BELL AND ENDING WITH JAYLON L. WAITE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 18, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DOUGLAS R. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH LAURI M. ZIKE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 18, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATION OF LESLIE M. LATIMORELORFILS, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF ANGEL M. SANCHEZ, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF FREDRICO MCCURRY, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JIMMIE A. HILTON, JR., TO BE COLONEL.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF BRETT M. MCCORMICK, TO BE MAJOR.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF JONATHAN M. PICKUP, TO BE MAJOR.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN R. BUSH AND ENDING WITH HOLLY B. SHOGER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ERIK E. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH MATTHEW L. TARDY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRADFORD W. BAKER AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL P. OHARA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DERRICK E. BLACKSTON AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL G. WHEELER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID J. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH DAVID M. ZIELINSKI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARK R. ALEXANDER AND ENDING WITH ANDREW T. NEWSOME, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JILLEN M. BUSHNELL AND ENDING WITH MICAH A. WELTMER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ENID S. BRACKETT AND ENDING WITH JOSHUA P. TAYLOR, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN E. GAY AND ENDING WITH WILLIAM H. SPEAKS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH FRANKLIN W. BENNETT AND ENDING WITH MATTHEW T. WILCOX, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CARVIN A. BROWN AND ENDING WITH MARK W. YATES, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER R. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH DAVID P. WOLYNSKI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARC A. ARAGON AND ENDING WITH ROBERT A. YEE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DOUGLAS A. BECK AND ENDING WITH STEVEN W. TOPPEL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 15, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATION OF ROBERT A. VITA, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DARIN E. MARVIN AND ENDING WITH ERIC E. PERCIVAL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 15, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN J. DOHERTY AND ENDING WITH WILLIAM ORTIZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 15, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATION OF DAVID A. FORD, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RICHARD S. ARDOLINO AND ENDING WITH ANDREW C. SMITH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 15, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHERYL D. DANDREA AND ENDING WITH JOHN C. HAZLETT II, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 15, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RICHARD E. BOUCHER AND ENDING WITH CINDY L. RHODES, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 15, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEFFREY W. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH RICHARD B. WILDERMAN, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 15, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CLIFFORD J. ALLEN AND ENDING WITH ABRAHAM N. YOUNCE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 15, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARK S. COLLINS AND ENDING WITH THOMAS W. TREFNY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 15, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JONAS B. E. GIL AND ENDING WITH CHRISTIE M. RUSHING, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 15, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JONATHAN E. BUSH AND ENDING WITH JAMES C. WILTRAUT, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 15, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATION OF MELISSA M. FORD, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF MATTHEW H. ROBINSON, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT L. ANDERSON II AND ENDING WITH DANIELLE M. WOOTEN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 17, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATION OF HAROLD C. BARNES, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PAUL R. ALLEN AND ENDING WITH KIM T. ZABLAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 17, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON W. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH LAGENA K. G. YARBROUGH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 17, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PAUL C. CHAN AND ENDING WITH NATHANIEL R. STRAUB, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 17, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PHILIP B. BAGROW AND ENDING WITH DAVID S. YANG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 17, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH HUGH BURKE AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER M. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 17, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ZACHARY M. ALEXANDER AND ENDING WITH MARK L. WOODBRIDGE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 17, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RENE J. ALOVA AND ENDING WITH STEPHEN S. YUNE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 17, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATION OF ADRAIN D. FELDER, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF ASHLEY D. GIBBS, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF REYNALDO A. JORNACION, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAY D. LUTZ AND ENDING WITH MARC F. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEROME R. CAYANGYANG AND ENDING WITH TIMOTHY J. LONEY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATION OF DONNA M. JOHNSON, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KEVIN M. CORCORAN AND ENDING WITH SUNG H. YI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DEBRA A. BRENDLEY AND ENDING WITH CYNTHIA M. SCHWARTZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER C. BURRIS AND ENDING WITH JASON L. WEISSMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL R. BASSO AND ENDING WITH DONALD H. YAGER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEVEN A. BLAUSTEIN AND ENDING WITH SONJA A. CARL, WHICH

NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES G. COX AND ENDING WITH DARYL S. WONG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RICHFIELD F. AGULLANA AND ENDING WITH JERICHO B. TIMOG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SARAH E. ABOTT AND ENDING WITH JUSTIN R. WIESEN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW R. ARGENZIANO AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL A. WOODS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEANINE F. BENJAMIN AND ENDING WITH SAVANNA S. STEFFEN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHARLES B. ABOTT AND ENDING WITH STEVEN ZIELECHOWSKI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH HASAN ABDULMUTAKALLIM AND ENDING WITH STANLEY C. WARE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRADLEY H. ABRAMOWITZ AND ENDING WITH CORNELL A. WOODS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH FRANCIS J. CARMODY III AND ENDING WITH MATTHEW N. WATTS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LUCAS G. BARLOW AND ENDING WITH CHRISTINA J. WONG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KATHARINE M. CEREZO AND ENDING WITH JOE M. VASQUEZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KEVIN J. ALTEMARA AND ENDING WITH JACOB E. WILSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PATRICK A. BATISTE AND ENDING WITH ROBERT J. WRENN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATION OF DOUGLASS R. WEISS, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF LEROME S. SNAER, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF DANIEL J. RIZZO, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

FOREIGN SERVICE

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GEORGE EUGENE ADAIR AND ENDING WITH BRIAN J. MCKENNA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2018.