



Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR): Votes and Legislative Actions Since the 95th Congress

(name redacted)

Specialist in Natural Resources Policy

(name redacted)

Information Research Specialist

March 28, 2012

Congressional Research Service

7-....

www.crs.gov

RL32838

Summary

Current law forbids the federal government from offering energy leases or from allowing activities leading to energy development in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) in northeastern Alaska. For several decades, a major energy debate has been whether to approve energy development in ANWR, and if so, under what conditions; or whether to continue to prohibit development to protect the area's biological resources. ANWR is rich in fauna, flora, and commercial oil potential. Its development has been debated for over 40 years, and the level of debate fluctuates with gasoline and natural gas prices, terrorist attacks, infrastructure damage from hurricanes, and turmoil in the Middle East.

This report provides a summary of legislative attempts to address issues of energy development and preservation in the Refuge from the 95th Congress (1977-1978) through March 2012 in the 112th Congress, with emphasis on the 108th through 112th Congresses. (The substance of the issue is covered in other CRS reports.) There were several periods of active congressional consideration, punctuated by periods of less activity and debate. In the 96th Congress (1979-1980), multiple floor votes occurred in the House and Senate, leading ultimately to the passage of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (P.L. 96-487). In the 104th Congress (1995-1996), there were also floor votes in both bodies; these related to ANWR development measures contained in budget reconciliation bills. These led, eventually, to a presidential veto. The 107th Congress (2001-2002) saw votes in both bodies in the context of measures to address energy resources. Ultimately, no ANWR provisions were approved. In the 108th and 109th Congresses (2003-2006), there were multiple floor votes in both the House and Senate, in some cases over amendments that were identical in each Congress. The ANWR development provisions were considered as parts of bills concerning energy programs, budget resolutions, and defense authorization.

While there were no floor votes in the House or the Senate on the Refuge during the 111th Congress, in the 112th Congress, the House approved H.R. 3408 on February 16, 2012. The measure includes a provision to open the 1.5 million acre Coastal Plain to energy development. On March 13, 2012, the Senate rejected S.Amdt. 1826 to S. 1813 that would have expanded drilling into areas including the ANWR Coastal Plain.

Contents

Background and Analysis	1
Legislative History of the Refuge, 1957-2000	5
The Early Years	5
The 1970s	5
The 1980s	5
From 1990 to 2000	6
Legislative History of the Refuge, 2001-2002	7
Legislative History of the Refuge, 2003-2004	8
FY2004 Reconciliation	8
Comprehensive Energy Legislation	9
Legislative History of the Refuge, 2005-2006	10
Budget Resolutions and Reconciliation Bills	10
ANWR in the Defense Appropriations Bill	11
Omnibus and Other Energy Legislation	11
Legislative History of the Refuge, 2007-2008	12
Legislative History of the Refuge, 2009-2010	12
Legislative History of the Refuge, 2011-2012	12
Selected Legislation in the 108 th Congress	13
Selected Legislation in the 109 th Congress	14
Selected Legislation in the 110 th Congress	15
Selected Legislation in the 112 th Congress	16
For Additional Reading	16
CRS Reports	16
Other Reports	17

Tables

Table 1. Votes in the House of Representatives on Energy Development Within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge	2
Table 2. Votes in the Senate on Energy Development Within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge	3

Contacts

Author Contact Information	18
----------------------------------	----

Background and Analysis

The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) consists of 19 million acres in northeast Alaska. It is administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) in the Department of the Interior (DOI). Its 1.5 million acre Coastal Plain on the North Slope of the Brooks Range is currently viewed by industry as one of the more likely undeveloped U.S. onshore oil and gas prospects.¹ In its last economic assessment in 2005, USGS estimated that, at \$55/barrel (bbl) in 2003 dollars (\$63.35 in 2011 dollars), there is a 95% chance that 4.0 billion bbl or more could be economically recovered and a small (5%) chance of 10.9 billion bbl or more on the federal lands in the Coastal Plain; the mean was 7.3 billion bbl.² (For comparison, annual U.S. oil consumption from all domestic sources was about 7.0 billion bbl in 2010.) There is a small chance that, taken together, the fields on this federal land could hold as much economically recoverable oil as the giant field at Prudhoe Bay, found in 1967 on the coastal plain west of ANWR.³ That state-owned portion of the coastal plain is now estimated to have held 11 billion to 13 billion barrels of oil at the time.

At the same time, the Refuge, and especially its coastal plain, is home to a wide variety of plants and animals. The presence of caribou, polar bears, grizzly bears, wolves, migratory birds, and many other species in a nearly undisturbed state has led some to call the area “America’s Serengeti.” The Refuge and two neighboring parks in Canada have been proposed for an international park, and several species found in the area (including polar bears, caribou, migratory birds, and whales) are protected by international treaties or agreements.

The analysis below covers the history of congressional actions on this issue, with a focus on those in the 107th Congress through the 112th Congress. See **Table 1** and **Table 2** for votes in the House and Senate from the 96th Congress through the 112th Congress.

The conflict between potentially large oil deposits and nearly pristine nature creates a dilemma: should Congress open the area for oil and gas development, or should the area’s ecosystem be given permanent protection from development? What factors should determine whether to open the area? If it is opened, how can damages be avoided, minimized, or mitigated? To what extent should Congress legislate special management of the area (if it is developed), and to what extent should federal agencies be allowed to manage it under existing law? If Congress takes no action, the Refuge remains closed to energy development, as provided in Section 1003 of P.L. 96-487.

¹ This report will use the term “Coastal Plain” to refer to land legally designated under the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA, P.L. 96-487) and under subsequent executive branch rulings. In lower case (“coastal plain”), the term will be used in the geographic sense, i.e., the area north of the foothills of the Brooks Range. For more on the distinction, see the report section on “The 1980s.”

² USGS, *Economics of 1998 U.S. Geological Survey’s 1002 Area Regional Assessment: An Economic Update*, Open-File Report 2005-1217 (Washington, DC: 2005). See Table 4. The three figures shown here include very minor amounts of natural gas liquids, which would be produced along with any oil. Also, see CRS Report RL33872, *Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR): A Primer for the 112th Congress*, by (name redacted), (name redacted), and (name redacted), for a discussion of the effects of oil prices on the economics of an oil field.

³ See U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey, *The Oil and Gas Resource Potential of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge 1002 Area, Alaska*, 1999, 2-CD set, USGS Open File Report 98-34; and U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey, *Economics of 1998 U.S. Geological Survey’s 1002 Area Regional Assessment: An Economic Update*, USGS Open File Report 2005-1359, Washington, DC, 2005. Note that on-site research on any oil resources in the 1002 area has not been carried out since the mid-1980s, in light of the fact that development and activities leading to development are currently illegal. (However, some additional modeling of older data, aided by results from exploration on nearby onshore or offshore tracts, has produced a few new interpretations from time to time.) In consequence, many older publications are the best available.

**Table I. Votes in the House of Representatives on
Energy Development Within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge**

Congress	Date	Voice/ Roll Call	Brief Description
95 th			No floor votes.
96 th	5/16/79	#152	Udall-Anderson substitute for H.R. 39 adopted by House (268-157); included provisions designating all of ANWR as wilderness.
	5/16/79	#153	H.R. 39 passed House (360-65).
	11/12/80	voice (unan- imous)	Senate version (leaving 1002 area development issue to a future Congress) of H.R. 39 passed House.
97 th			No floor votes.
98 th			No floor votes.
99 th			No floor votes.
100 th			No floor votes.
101 st			No floor votes.
102 nd			No floor votes.
103 rd			No floor votes.
104 th	11/17/95	#812	House agreed (237-189) to conference report on H.R. 2491 (H.Rept. 104-350), FY1996 budget reconciliation (a large bill that included 1002 area development provisions).
105 th			No floor votes.
106 th			No floor votes.
107 th	8/1/01	#316	House passed Sununu amendment to H.R. 4 to limit specified surface development of 1002 area to a total of 2,000 acres (228-201).
	8/1/01	#317	House rejected Markey-Johnson (CT) amendment to H.R. 4 to strike 1002 area development title (206-223).
	8/2/01	#320	H.R. 4, an omnibus energy bill, passed House (240-189). Title V of Division F contained 1002 area development provisions.
108 th	4/10/03	#134	House passed Wilson (NM) amendment to H.R. 6 to limit certain features of 1002 area development to a total of 2,000 acres (226-202).
	4/10/03	#135	House rejected Markey-Johnson (CT) amendment to H.R. 6 to strike 1002 area development title (197-228).
	4/11/03	#145	House passed H.R. 6, a comprehensive energy bill (247-175); Division C, Title IV would have opened the 1002 area to energy development.
109 th	3/17/05	#88	House adopted (218-214) the concurrent budget resolution, H.Con.Res. 95, which included spending targets that would be difficult to achieve unless ANWR development legislation was passed.
	4/20/05	#122	House rejected (200-231) Markey amendment to strike the ANWR provision in its omnibus energy bill (H.R. 6) allowing leases for exploration, development, and production in ANWR.
	4/21/05	#132	House passed an omnibus energy bill (H.R. 6) with an ANWR development title (249-183).

Congress	Date	Voice/ Roll Call	Brief Description
	4/28/05	#149	House adopted (214-211) the conference report on the concurrent budget resolution, H.Con.Res. 95; it contained assumptions predicated on ANWR development.
	12/18/05	#669	House adopted (308-106) the conference report on the Defense appropriations bill (H.R. 2863), which would have allowed oil and gas leasing in ANWR.
	12/22/05	voice	House passed S.Con.Res. 74, which corrected the enrollment of H.R. 2863, removing the ANWR development provision.
	5/25/06	#209	House passed H.R. 5429 to open ANWR to development (225-201).
110 th	8/4/07	#831	House rejected motion to recommit H.R. 3221 to the Energy and Commerce Committee with instructions to report back with language authorizing ANWR development (169-244).
	5/14/08	#321	House rejected motion to instruct conferees for S.Con.Res. 70 to adjust budget levels to assume increased revenues from opening ANWR to development (185-229).
111 th			No floor votes.
112 th	2/16/12	#71	House passed H.R. 3408, which included a provision to open up a portion of ANWR to oil and gas exploration and production and expand lease sales (237-187). See text.

Table 2. Votes in the Senate on Energy Development Within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge

Congress	Date	Voice/ Roll Call	Brief Description
95 th			No floor votes.
96 th	7/22- 23/80	#304	Motion to table Tsongas amendment in the nature of a substitute (which included a title to designate all of ANWR as wilderness) to H.R. 39 defeated (33-64).
	8/18/80	#354	Senate adopted cloture motion on H.R. 39 (63-25).
	8/19/80	#359	Senate passed Tsongas-Roth-Jackson-Hatfield substitute to H.R. 39 (78-14); this bill is current law, and leaves decision about any 1002 area development for a future Congress.
97 th			No floor votes.
98 th			No floor votes.
99 th			No floor votes.
100 th			No floor votes.
101 st			No floor votes.
102 nd	11/1/91	#242	Cloture motion on S. 1220 failed; one title would have opened 1002 area to development (50-44).
103 rd			No floor votes.
104 th	5/24/95	#190	Senate voted to table Roth amendment to strip 1002 area revenue

Congress	Date	Voice/ Roll Call	Brief Description
			assumptions from S.Con.Res. 13 (56-44).
	10/27/95	#525	Senate voted to table Baucus amendment to strip 1002 area development provisions in H.R. 2491 (51-48).
105 th			No floor votes.
106 th	4/6/00	#58	Senate voted to table Roth amendment to strip 1002 area revenue assumptions from the FY2001 budget resolution (S.Con.Res. 101) (51-49).
107 th	12/3/01	#344	Lott-Murkowski-Brownback amendment to Daschle amendment to H.R. 10 included 1002 area development title in H.R. 4, as passed by the House. A cloture motion on the amendment failed (1-94).
	4/18/02	#71	Senate failed to invoke cloture on Murkowski amendment to S. 517, an omnibus energy bill. It contained ANWR development language similar to that in the House-passed version of H.R. 4 (46-54).
108 th	3/19/03	#59	Senate passed Boxer amendment to delete certain revenue assumptions from S.Con.Res. 23, the FY2004 budget resolution; floor debate indicated that the amendment was clearly seen as a vote on developing the 1002 area (52-48).
109 th	3/16/05	#52	Senate voted to reject Cantwell amendment to strike revenue assumptions from its FY2006 budget resolution (S.Con.Res. 18) that would have given procedural protection to legislation authorizing oil drilling in part of ANWR (49-51).
	11/3/05	#288	Senate voted to reject Cantwell amendment to its FY2006 budget reconciliation bill (S. 1932) that would have deleted the provision establishing an oil and gas leasing program in ANWR (48-51).
	12/21/05	#364	Senate failed to invoke cloture on the conference report on the FY2006 Defense appropriations bill (H.R. 2863), which included provisions to open ANWR to development (56-44).
	12/21/05	#365	Senate adopted a concurrent resolution (S.Con.Res. 74) that instructed the Clerk of the House to strike provisions from the conference report to H.R. 2863 that would have allowed oil drilling in ANWR (48-45).
	3/16/06	#74	Senate passed the FY2007 budget resolution (S.Con.Res. 83) with a reconciliation instruction (§201) directing the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources to reduce budget authority by an amount equal to assumed revenues from development in ANWR (51-49).
110 th	5/13/08	#123	Senate rejected (42-56) McConnell amendment (S.Amdt. 4720) to S. 2284 to open ANWR to energy development; earlier unanimous consent agreement had raised majority for adoption of amendment to 60 votes.
111 th			No floor votes.
112 th	3/13/12	#38	Senate rejected (41-57) Roberts S.Amdt. 1826 (60-vote threshold) to S. 1813, which would have opened Coastal Plain of ANWR to oil and gas drilling.

Basic information on the Refuge can be found in CRS Report RL33872, *Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR): A Primer for the 112th Congress*, by (name redacted), (name redacted), and (name redacted); and at the FWS website, <http://arctic.fws.gov/>.⁴ A presentation of some arguments in favor of development can be found at <http://www.anwr.org>, sponsored by Arctic Power, a nonprofit coalition supporting ANWR energy development. Some opponents' arguments

⁴ This website and the others listed in this paragraph were last visited on March 26, 2012.

can be found at <http://www.protectthearctic.com/>, supported by the National Audubon Society; or <http://wilderness.org/content/protecting-arctic-refuge>, supported by the Wilderness Society. Maps of the coastal plain showing existing oil development areas on state land can be found at <http://dog.dnr.alaska.gov/GIS/Maps.htm>.

Legislative History of the Refuge, 1957-2000

The Early Years

The energy and biological resources of northern Alaska have raised controversy for decades, from legislation in the 1970s, to a 1989 oil spill, to more recent efforts to use ANWR resources to address energy needs or to help balance the federal budget. In November 1957, DOI announced plans to withdraw lands in northeastern Alaska to create an “Arctic National Wildlife Range.” The first group actually to propose to Congress that the area become a national wildlife range, in recognition of the many game species found in the area, was the Tanana Valley (Alaska) Sportsmen’s Association in 1959. On December 6, 1960, after statehood, the Secretary of the Interior issued Public Land Order 2214 reserving the 9.5 million-acre area as the Arctic National Wildlife Range.

The 1970s

In 1971, Congress enacted the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA, P.L. 92-203, 85 Stat. 688) to resolve all Native aboriginal land claims against the United States. ANCSA provided for monetary payments and also created Village Corporations that received the surface estate to approximately 22 million acres of lands in Alaska. Village selection rights included the right to choose the surface estate (surface rights, as opposed to rights to exploit any energy or minerals beneath the surface) in a certain amount of lands within the National Wildlife Refuge System. Under §22(g) of ANCSA, the chosen lands were to remain subject to the laws and regulations governing use and development of the particular refuge. Kaktovik Inupiat Corporation (KIC, the local Native corporation created under ANCSA, and headquartered within ANWR) received rights to three townships along the coast of ANWR. ANCSA also created Regional Corporations, which could select subsurface rights to some lands and full title to others. Subsurface rights in national wildlife refuges were not available, but in-lieu selections to substitute for such lands were provided.

The 1980s

In 1980, Congress enacted the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA, P.L. 96-487, 94 Stat. 2371), which included several sections about ANWR. The Arctic Range was renamed the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, and was expanded, mostly southward and westward, to include an additional 9.2 million acres.⁵ Section 702(3) of ANILCA designated much of the original range as a wilderness area, but did not include the coastal plain.⁶ ANILCA defined the *Coastal Plain* as the lands on a specified map—language that was interpreted as

⁵ Additional land was added in later years, bringing the current total to 19.3 million acres. Portions of the Refuge added in 1980 and later were not included in the wilderness system.

⁶ For more on wilderness designation, see CRS Report RL31447, *Wilderness: Overview and Statistics*, by (name redacted).

excluding most Native lands, even though these lands are *geographically* part of the coastal plain.⁷ Section 1002 of ANILCA directed that a study of the Coastal Plain (which therefore is often referred to as the *1002 area*) and its resources be completed within five years and nine months of enactment. The resulting 1987 report was called the *1002 report* or the Final Legislative Environmental Impact Statement (FLEIS).

Section 1003 of ANILCA prohibited oil and gas development in the entire Refuge, or “leasing or other development leading to production of oil and gas from the range” unless authorized by an act of Congress.⁸

From 1990 to 2000

There were several attempts to authorize opening ANWR to energy development in the 1990s. In the 104th Congress, the FY1996 budget reconciliation bill (H.R. 2491, §§5312-5344) would have opened the 1002 area to energy development, but the measure was vetoed, as many observers had expected. President Clinton cited the ANWR sections as one of his reasons for the veto.

While bills were introduced, the 105th Congress did not debate the ANWR issue. In the 106th Congress, bills to designate the 1002 area of the Refuge as wilderness and others to open the Refuge to energy development were introduced. Revenue assumptions about ANWR were included in the FY2001 budget resolution (S.Con.Res. 101) reported by the Senate Budget Committee on March 31, 2000. An amendment to remove this language was tabled. However, conferees rejected the language. The conference report on H.Con.Res. 290 did not contain this assumption, and the report was passed by both chambers on April 13. S. 2557 was introduced May 16, 2000; it included a title to open the Refuge to development. Hearings were held on the bill, but a motion to proceed to consideration of the bill on the Senate floor did not pass.

Only three recorded votes relating directly to ANWR development occurred from the 101st through 106th Congresses. All were in the Senate:

- In the 104th Congress, on May 24 1995, a motion to table an amendment that would have stripped ANWR development titles from the Senate version of H.R. 2491 passed (Roll Call #190). (See above.)
- In the same Congress, on October 27, 1995, another motion to table a similar amendment to H.R. 2491 also passed (Roll Call #525).
- In the 106th Congress, the vote to table an amendment to strip ANWR revenue assumptions from the budget resolution (S.Con.Res. 101; see above) was passed (April 6, 2000; Roll Call #58).

⁷ This report uses “Coastal Plain” to refer to the land legally designated under ANILCA and under subsequent executive branch rulings. In lower case (“coastal plain”), the term is used in the geographic sense, i.e., the area north of the foothills of the Brooks Range. It stretches from the Canadian border west to Bering Strait. Its width varies from about 10 miles (at the Canadian border) to over 100 miles south of Barrow.

⁸ For more history of legislation on ANWR and related developments, see CRS Report RL33872, *Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR): A Primer for the 112th Congress*, by (name redacted), (name redacted), and (name redacted); and CRS Report RL31115, *Legal Issues Related to Proposed Drilling for Oil and Gas in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR)*, by (name redacted).

Legislative History of the Refuge, 2001-2002

In the 107th Congress, action on ANWR development followed a complex legislative path, with similar or identical language appearing multiple times in different bills. H.R. 4, an omnibus energy bill containing ANWR development provisions, passed the House on August 2, 2001 (yeas 240, nays 189; Roll Call #320). The text of H.R. 2436 (H.Rept. 107-160, Part I) was incorporated in H.R. 4 as Title V, Division F. The measure would have opened ANWR to exploration and development. The previous day, an amendment by then Representative Sununu to limit specified surface development to a total of 2,000 acres was passed (yeas 228, nays 201; Roll Call #316). Representatives Markey and Johnson (CT) offered an amendment to strike the title; this was defeated (yeas 206, nays 223; Roll Call #317). The House appointed conferees on June 12, 2002. (See below for action after Senate passage of H.R. 4.)

Meanwhile, in the first session, Senator Lott (on behalf of himself and Senators Murkowski and Brownback) offered an amendment (S.Amdt. 2171) to an amendment on pension reform (S.Amdt. 2170) to H.R. 10, a bill also on pension reform. Their amendment included, among other energy provisions, the ANWR development title in H.R. 4, as passed by the House. Their amendment also included provisions prohibiting cloning of human tissue. A cloture motion was filed on the Lott amendment, and the Senate failed to invoke cloture (yeas 1, nays 94; Roll Call #344) on December 3, 2001. Instead, the Senate voted the same day in favor of invoking cloture on the underlying amendment (S.Amdt. 2170), (yeas 81, nays 15; Roll Call #345). Because cloture was invoked on the underlying amendment, Senate rules required that subsequent and pending amendments to it be germane. The Senate's presiding officer subsequently sustained a point of order against the Lott amendment, which was still pending, on the grounds that it was not germane to the underlying amendment on pension reform, and thus the amendment fell.

The next vehicle for Senate floor consideration was S. 517, which concerned energy technology development. On February 15, 2002, Senator Daschle offered an amendment (S.Amdt. 2917), an omnibus energy bill. It did not contain provisions to develop the Refuge, but two amendments (S.Amdt. 3132 and S.Amdt. 3133) to do so were offered by Senators Murkowski and Stevens, respectively, on April 16. The language of the two amendments was, in most sections, identical to that of H.R. 4 (Division F, Title V). Key differences included a requirement for a presidential determination before development could proceed, an exception to the oil export prohibition for Israel, and a number of changes in allocation of any development revenues, as well as allowing some of those revenues to be spent without further appropriation. On April 18, the Senate essentially voted to prevent drilling for oil and gas in the Refuge. The defeat came on a vote of 46 yeas to 54 nays (Roll Call #71) on a cloture motion to block a threatened filibuster on Senator Murkowski's amendment to S. 517, which would have ended debate and moved the chamber to a direct vote on the ANWR issue.

Lacking a provision to develop ANWR, the text of S. 517, as amended, was substituted for the text of the House-passed H.R. 4, and passed the Senate (yeas 88, nays 11; Roll Call #94) on April 25, 2002. Conferees attempted to iron out the substantial differences between the two versions in the time remaining in the second session. The conference committee chairman, Representative Tauzin, indicated that the ANWR issue, as one of the most controversial parts of the bill, would be considered toward the end of the conference, after less controversial provisions. Press reports at the time indicated that conferees were likely to drop provisions to develop the Refuge. Interior Secretary Norton was quoted as stating that she would recommend veto of a bill lacking ANWR

development provisions.⁹ In the end, no conference agreement was reached, and H.R. 4 died at the end of the 107th Congress.

Legislative History of the Refuge, 2003-2004

Work began on FY2003 Appropriations for Interior and Related Agencies in the 107th Congress but was not completed until the 108th Congress. (A series of continuing resolutions provided funding for DOI into the 108th Congress.) In the 107th Congress, for the FY2003 Interior appropriations bill, the House Committee on Appropriations had agreed to report language on the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) energy and minerals program in general, and stated that no funds were included in the FY2003 funding bill “for activity related to potential energy development within [ANWR]” (H.Rept. 107-564, H.R. 5093). But §1003 of ANILCA prohibited “development leading to production of oil and gas” unless authorized by Congress. Thus, the committee’s report language was viewed by some as barring the use of funds for pre-leasing studies and other preliminary work related to oil and gas drilling in ANWR. The report of the Senate Committee on Appropriations did not contain this prohibition.

Conferees on the FY2003 Consolidated Appropriations Resolution (P.L. 108-7), which incorporated Interior appropriations, included language in the joint explanatory statement stating that they “do not concur with the House proposal concerning funding for the [BLM] energy and minerals program.” This change from the House report language was interpreted by some as potentially making available funds for preliminary work for development in ANWR. However, as noted, the prohibition contained in ANILCA remains in effect, so the ability to use money in the bill for particular pre-leasing activities was not clear.

FY2004 Reconciliation

During the 108th Congress, development proponents sought to move ANWR legislation through the FY2004 budget reconciliation process to avoid a possible Senate filibuster later in the session.¹⁰ The House agreed to the FY2004 budget resolution (H.Con.Res. 95) on March 21 (yeas 215, nays 212; Roll Call #82). The resolution contained reconciliation instructions to the House Resources Committee for reductions, but did not specify the expected source of the savings. If the House language had been adopted, ANWR development language might have been considered as part of a reconciliation measure to achieve the savings. S.Con.Res. 23, as reported by the Senate Budget Committee, stated:

The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources shall report a reconciliation bill not later than May 1, 2003, that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to decrease the total level of outlays by \$2,150,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

To meet this directive, the committee would have to choose between cuts of that magnitude or reporting legislation to open ANWR to development. On March 19, 2003, Senator Boxer offered

⁹ Tom Doggett “Interview—Norton wants energy bill veto if no ANWR drilling,” Reuters News Service (September 19, 2002).

¹⁰ Reconciliation bills in the Senate are considered under special rules that do not permit filibusters. See CRS Report 98-814, *Budget Reconciliation Legislation: Development and Consideration*, by (name redacted), and CRS Report RL30862, *The Budget Reconciliation Process: The Senate’s “Byrd Rule”*, by (name redacted)

S.Amdt. 272 to delete this provision. Floor debate indicated that the Boxer amendment was clearly seen as a vote on whether to develop ANWR. The amendment passed (yeas 52, nays 48; Roll Call #59.) The amended Senate version of the resolution was ultimately accepted by both House and Senate. As a result, while the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources could still report legislation to authorize opening the Refuge, such legislation would not have been eligible for inclusion in a reconciliation bill. Without the procedural protections associated with reconciliation, a filibuster could have been used to prevent a vote on an authorization bill.¹¹ In the end, the conferees on the budget resolution included no instructions to the House Resources and Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committees.

Comprehensive Energy Legislation

The House passed H.R. 6, a comprehensive energy bill, on April 11, 2003. Division C, Title IV would have opened the 1002 area to energy development. On April 10, the House had passed the Wilson (NM) amendment to H.R. 6 to limit certain features of development to a total of 2,000 acres (yeas 226, nays 202; Roll Call #134), without restricting the total number of acres that could be leased. As in the 107th Congress, Representatives Markey and Johnson (CT) offered an amendment to strike the title; this was defeated (yeas 197, nays 228; Roll Call #135). H.R. 4514 was identical to the ANWR title of the House version of H.R. 6 except in one provision on revenue disposition. In addition, one bill (H.R. 39) was introduced to open the 1002 area to development, and two bills (H.R. 770 and S. 543) were introduced to designate the 1002 area as wilderness.

The initial version of the Senate energy bill (S. 14) had no provision to open the Refuge, and Chairman Domenici stated that he did not plan to include one. After many weeks of debate in the Senate, as prospects of passage seemed to be dimming, Senators agreed to drop the bill they had been debating and to go back to the bill passed in the Senate of the 107th Congress, when the Senate was under control of the other party. On July 31, 2003, they substituted the language of that bill for that of the House-passed H.R. 6. There was widespread agreement that the unusual procedure was a means of getting the bill to conference. Members, including Chairman Domenici, indicated at the time their expectation that the bill that emerged from conference would likely be markedly different from the version of H.R. 6 that had just been passed by the Senate. One of the key differences between the two bills was the presence of ANWR development language in the House version, and its absence in the Senate version. Conference Chairman Domenici included the House title on ANWR in his working draft, but in the end, the conference committee deleted ANWR development features in the conference report (H.Rept. 108-375); the conference report was agreed to by the House on November 18, 2003 (yeas 246, nays 180; Roll Call #630); the Senate considered the measure, but a cloture vote failed (57 yeas, 40 nays; Roll Call #456) on November 21, 2003.

In the second session, the Senate turned to a more narrowly focused energy bill (S. 2095) that might have then gone to a second conference with the House; like the Senate's version of H.R. 6, this new bill did not contain ANWR development provisions. In any event, no scenario for energy legislation that was discussed publicly included provisions that would have opened the Refuge to development. However, the President's proposed FY2005 budget assumed legislation would be passed that would open the Refuge and would therefore produce revenues. The President's

¹¹ See CRS Report RS20368, *Overview of the Congressional Budget Process*, by (name redacted)

proposal would have assisted efforts to assume ANWR revenues in a budget resolution, and therefore aided its inclusion in a reconciliation package, as was attempted in the first session.

Legislative History of the Refuge, 2005-2006

As explained below, the ANWR debate took two basic legislative routes in the 109th Congress: (1) budget resolutions and reconciliation bills (S.Con.Res. 18, H.Con.Res. 95, S. 1932, H.R. 4241, S.Con.Res. 83, and H.Con.Res. 376), which cannot be filibustered; and (2) other bills (H.R. 6, an omnibus energy bill; H.R. 2863, Defense appropriations; and H.R. 5429, a bill in the second session to open the Refuge to development), which can be subject to filibusters. In none of these measures did Congress reach agreement to allow development.

Budget Resolutions and Reconciliation Bills

The budget resolution and reconciliation were a focus of attention, particularly in the Senate.¹² The FY2006 Senate budget resolution (S.Con.Res. 18) passed by the Senate Budget Committee included instructions to the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources to “report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce outlays by \$33,000,000 in FY2006, and \$2,658,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.” The resolution assumed that the committee would report legislation to open ANWR to development, and that leasing would generate \$2.5 billion in revenues for the federal government over five years. Senator Cantwell offered a floor amendment (S.Amdt. 168) on March 16, 2005, to remove these instructions. The amendment was defeated (yeas 49, nays 51; Roll Call #52). The FY2006 House budget resolution (H.Con.Res. 95, H.Rept. 109-17), while instructing the House Resources Committee to provide somewhat smaller reductions in outlays, did not include specific assumptions about ANWR revenues.

In the end, the conference agreement (H.Con.Res. 95, H.Rept. 109-62) approved by the House and Senate on April 28, 2005, contained reductions in spending targets of \$2.4 billion over FY2006 to FY2010 for the House Resources and Senate Energy Committees that would have been difficult to achieve unless ANWR development legislation were passed. The inclusion of the Senate target particularly set the stage for including ANWR development legislation in a reconciliation bill, since reconciliation bills cannot be filibustered (i.e., they require only a simple majority, rather than 60 votes to stop a filibuster).

Under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (CBA, Titles I-IX of P.L. 93-344, as amended, 2 U.S.C. §§601-688), while the target reductions of the budget resolutions are binding on the committees, the associated assumptions are not. The Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee chose to meet its target by recommending ANWR legislation, and the Budget Committee incorporated the recommendation as Title IV of S. 1932, the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005. There was some question procedurally as to whether Senate rules would permit ANWR legislation to be part of a reconciliation bill.¹³ The House Resources Committee included ANWR

¹² For more on the budget process and budget enforcement, see CRS Report RS20368, *Overview of the Congressional Budget Process*, by (name redacted) and CRS Report 98-81 *Budget Resolution Enforcement*, by (name redacted) For more on ANWR and reconciliation, see CRS Report RS22304, *ANWR and FY2006 Budget Reconciliation Legislation*, by (name redacted) and (name redacted).

¹³ See CRS Report RL30862, *The Budget Reconciliation Process: The Senate’s “Byrd Rule”*, by (name redacted)

development legislation, and other spending reductions and offsetting collections, thereby more than meeting the Committee's targets. These measures were incorporated by the House Budget Committee into an omnibus reconciliation bill (H.R. 4241). However, before the House bill came to the floor, considerable opposition to the ANWR provision developed among a number of Republicans, 24 of whom signed a letter to the Speaker opposing its inclusion. The provision was removed before floor consideration; S. 1932 (with the text of H.R. 4241 inserted in lieu—i.e., minus an ANWR provision) passed the House on November 18, 2005 (yeas 217, nays 215; Roll Call #601). ANWR was a major issue in conference. In the end, the conference report (H.Rept. 109-362) omitted ANWR development provisions. The President signed the measure on February 8, 2006 (P.L. 109-171).

The Senate passed the FY2007 budget resolution (S.Con.Res. 83; yeas 51, nays 49; Roll Call #74; no written report) on March 16, 2006. Its sole reconciliation instruction (§201) directed the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources to reduce budget authority by an amount equal to predicted bonus bids, royalties, and rental revenues from ANWR development. According to press reports, some Senators hoped that if the final budget resolution had such instructions—on this topic alone—there would be (1) a FY2007 reconciliation bill on ANWR alone; and (2) sufficient bipartisan support for this single-purpose reconciliation bill in the House to counterbalance opposition of the 24 Republican Members who opposed its inclusion in a much larger FY2006 reconciliation measure in the first session. The FY2007 budget resolution as passed by the House on May 18, 2006, did not include any such instruction (H.Con.Res. 376, H.Rept. 109-402; yeas 218, nays 210; Roll Call #158). The Senate and House, however, did not complete action on the FY2007 budget resolution, and therefore, neither chamber developed or considered any subsequent reconciliation legislation.

ANWR in the Defense Appropriations Bill

As Congress moved toward the December recess, and the chance of an agreement on reconciliation with an ANWR provision seemed to fade, Senator Stevens (Chair of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee) added an ANWR development title to the “must-pass” FY2006 Defense appropriations bill (H.R. 2863) during conference. Senators opposing ANWR faced a choice between filibuster of the popular measure or acquiescing to opening the Refuge. Members began a filibuster, and a cloture motion failed (yeas 56, nays 44; Roll Call #364). While the conference report was approved, the relevant two Divisions (C and D) were removed through House and Senate passage of S.Con.Res. 74, correcting the enrollment of the bill (P.L. 109-148).

Omnibus and Other Energy Legislation

The House Resources Committee considered and marked up its portion of the omnibus energy bill on April 13, 2005, before the bill was introduced. The provisions, including an ANWR development title, were approved by the committee and incorporated into the House version of H.R. 6 and introduced by Representative Barton (Chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee) on April 18. During House consideration on April 20, Representatives Markey and Johnson offered an amendment (H.Amdt. 73) to strike the title; it was rejected (yeas 200, nays 231; Roll Call #122). The House passed H.R. 6 on April 21 (yeas 249, nays 183; Roll Call #132). The Senate passed its version of H.R. 6 on June 28, 2005 (yeas 85, nays 12; Roll Call #158). The Senate bill contained no ANWR development provisions. The ANWR title was omitted in the final measure (P.L. 109-58).

On May 25, 2006, the House passed H.R. 5429, to open ANWR to development (yeas 225, nays 201; Roll Call #209). In nearly all respects, the bill was similar to the ANWR title in the House version of H.R. 6. The bill was not taken up by the Senate.

Legislative History of the Refuge, 2007-2008

The President's FY2008 budget proposed enacting legislation to open the Coastal Plain in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) to oil and gas exploration and development.¹⁴ The budget proposed that the first lease sale be held in FY2009. Under the proposal, this and subsequent sales were estimated to generate \$7.0 billion in revenues over the following five years, to be divided evenly between the U.S. Treasury and the state of Alaska.

As in the 109th Congress, there was an effort in the second session to assume ANWR revenues in the budget resolution (S.Con.Res. 70). The vehicle was a motion to adjust budget levels to assume increased revenues from opening ANWR to leasing and exploration. However, on May 14, 2008, the House rejected the motion (yeas 185, nays 229; Roll Call #321). In the Senate, during debate on S. 2284 (a bill originally concerning flood insurance) on May 13, 2008, the Senate rejected the McConnell amendment (S.Amdt. 4720) to open ANWR to energy development (yeas 42 - nays 56; Roll Call #123). In addition, rising gasoline prices during 2008 intensified interest in opening ANWR to development, and a number of bills to open the Coastal Plain to development were introduced during the second session. As the session closed, falling energy prices tended to reduce interest.

Legislative History of the Refuge, 2009-2010

No bills on the Arctic Refuge received floor consideration in the 111th Congress in either the House or the Senate.

Legislative History of the Refuge, 2011-2012¹⁵

In the 112th Congress, House consideration of ANWR legislation has been unusually complex from a parliamentary standpoint. First, the Committee on Natural Resources reported its version of H.R. 3407, providing for oil drilling on the Coastal Plain, on February 9, 2012. Then, on February 15, the House adopted H.Res. 547, a complex special rule proposed by the Committee on Rules to specify how the House would consider the proposals embodied in H.R. 3407 and several other bills. The resolution provided that the House would first take up H.R. 3408 (on development of shale oil resources), as amended with a substitute for the entire text of the measure, in advance of floor consideration. The substitute, specified by the Committee on Rules, included not only H.R. 3408 itself as reported by the Committee on Natural Resources, but also a version of H.R. 3407 (on ANWR development); H.R. 3410 (on the further development of outer

¹⁴ U.S. Office of Management and Budget, *Analytical Perspectives, Budget of the U.S. Government, Fiscal Year 2008* (Washington, DC), p. 279. The proposed authorization for exploration and development would be separate legislation, rather than part of the Interior appropriations bill. (The proposal was not part of the FWS Budget Justification for FY2008.)

¹⁵ This section was prepared with the assistance of (name redacted), CRS Specialist on Congress and the Legislative Process, ([redacted]@crs.loc.gov, 7-....).

continental shelf oil and gas); and H.R. 3548 (authorizing the Keystone XL pipeline, from the Committee on Energy and Commerce).¹⁶

After adopting H.Res. 547, the House proceeded to consider H.R. 3408 in the form specified by the resolution (which included ANWR development), and on February 16, after considering several floor amendments, passed it (yeas 237, nays 187; Roll Call #71). Pursuant to additional provisions of H.Res. 547, however, the House did not transmit its version of H.R. 3408, as amended (with the provisions on ANWR development and other subjects), to the Senate for action. Instead, H.Res. 547 provided that the House would first consider a version of H.R. 3813 (increasing the contributions of federal employees to their retirement program), and then a version of H.R. 7 (reauthorizing federal highway and transportation programs, as amended by inclusion of a version of H.R. 3864, which would fund the programs through revenues from, among other things, offshore leasing and any federal share of ANWR revenues). H.Res. 547 does not provide for final action by the House on H.R. 7. Action on H.R. 7 would presumably have to occur under some future special rule, to be adopted later. H.Res. 547 does provide, however, that if the House ultimately passes H.R. 3813 and H.R. 7, as well as H.R. 3408, the provisions of all three bills as passed would be incorporated into H.R. 7, which would then be transmitted to the Senate in that form. As of this writing, the House has not taken up H.R. 3813 or H.R. 7 under the provisions of H.Res. 547. As a result, H.R. 3408 (including the ANWR development provisions and other matters), still awaits the further action of the House before it can move forward.

On March 13, 2012, the Senate rejected S.Amdt. 1826 (Roberts, Kansas) to S. 1813 that would have opened up the Coastal Plain of ANWR to oil and gas drilling. The amendment was rejected (yeas 41, nays 57; Roll Call #38). Under the Senate agreement of March 7, 2012, approval of the amendment would have required 60 votes in the affirmative.¹⁷

Selected Legislation in the 108th Congress

The bill below is the only ANWR bill from the 108th Congress that was reported from a committee, received floor consideration, or became law.

H.R. 6 (Tauzin)

Title IV, Division C, to repeal current prohibition against ANWR development, create energy leasing program, and provide for distribution of revenues. Introduced April 7, 2003; referred to eight committees, including Committee on Resources. April 10, 2003, House passed Wilson (NM) amendment to limit specified surface development to 2,000 acres (yeas 226, nays 202; Roll Call #134) and defeated Markey-Johnson (CT) amendment to strike Title IV, Division C (yeas 197, nays 228; Roll Call #135). Passed House April 11, 2003 (yeas 247, nays 175; Roll Call

¹⁶ The text of all the bills covered by H.Res. 547, as the Committee on Rules proposed for them to be considered by the House, was specified by Committee's print no. 112-14, available as of March 20, 2012, on the website of the Committee on Rules at <http://docs.house.gov/billsthisweek/20120213/CPRT-112-HPRT-RU00-HR7RCP.pdf>. The Committee on Rules stated that the pertinent provisions of its substitute were substantially similar to the bills as reported by the committees. One purpose of linking H.R. 3407 on ANWR and H.R. 7 on surface transportation was to provide a non-tax revenue source to supplement other revenues supporting transportation programs. For a press report of this linkage, see, for example, *Energy and Environment Daily*, February 19, 2012, available at <http://www.eenews.net/EEDaily/2012/02/09/2>.

¹⁷ S. 1813, without any ANWR provisions, passed the Senate on March 14, 2012 (yeas 74, nays 22; Roll Call #48).

#145). Passed Senate (amended, no ANWR development provisions) July 31, 2003 (yeas 84, nays 15; Roll Call #317). Conference report (H.Rept. 108-375) filed November 18, 2003. Conference report agreed to in House November 18, 2003 (yeas 246, nays 180; Roll Call #630). Cloture motion failed in Senate November 21, 2003 (yeas 57, nays 40; Roll Call #456).

Selected Legislation in the 109th Congress

The bills below are those that were reported from a committee, received floor consideration, or became law.

P.L. 109-58 (H.R. 6, Barton)

An omnibus energy act; Title XXII to open ANWR Coastal Plain to energy development. Introduced April 18, 2005; considered and marked up by Committee on Resources April 13, 2005 (no report). Considered by House April 20-21, 2005. Markey/Johnson amendment (H.Amdt. 73) to strike ANWR title rejected (yeas 200, nays 231; Roll Call #122) April 20. Passed April 21, 2005 (yeas 249, nays 183; Roll Call #132). Passed Senate, with no ANWR development provision, June 28, 2005 (yeas 85, nays 12; Roll Call #158). Conference agreement omitted ANWR title; signed by President, August 8, 2005.

P.L. 109-148 (H.R. 2863)

Provided for Defense appropriations. Conference report (H.Rept. 109-359) filed December 18, 2005 (Division C & D provided for ANWR development and revenue disposition). Cloture motion on filibuster on ANWR provision failed December 21, 2005 (yeas 56, nays 44; Roll Call #364). S.Con.Res. 74 corrected enrollment of the bill to delete Divisions C and D. Passed Senate December 21, 2005 (yeas 48, nays 45; Roll Call #365). Passed House December 22, 2005 on voice vote. Signed by President, December 30, 2005.

P.L. 109-171 (S. 1932)

Omnibus budget reconciliation; Title IV to provide for ANWR development. Introduced, referred to Committee on Budget, and reported October 27, 2005 (no written report). Passed Senate November 3, 2005 (yeas 52, nays 47; Roll Call #303). Passed House (amended) November 18, 2005. (For House action, see also H.R. 4241.) Title IV dropped in conference. House approved conference report (H.Rept. 109-362; yeas 212, nays 206; Roll Call #670). Senate approved report with an amendment (yeas 51, nays 50; Roll Call #363), December 21, 2005. House agreed to Senate amendment (yeas 216, nays 214; Roll Call #4), February 1, 2006. Signed by President, February 8, 2006.

H.Con.Res. 95 (Nussle)

FY2006 budget resolution, included spending targets for Committee on Resources. Introduced, referred to Committee on Budget, and reported March 11, 2005 (H.Rept. 109-17). Passed House March 17, 2005 (yeas 218, nays 214; Roll Call #88). Passed (amended) Senate in lieu of S.Con.Res. 18 (no report). April 28, 2005, House approved conference report (H.Rept. 109-62; yeas 214, nays 211; Roll Call #149), and Senate approved conference report (yeas 52, nays 47; Roll Call #114).

H.Con.Res. 376 (Nussle)

FY2007 budget resolution, to set spending targets including those for Committee on Resources. Introduced, referred to Committee on Budget, and reported March 31, 2006 (H.Rept. 109-402). Passed House May 18, 2006 (yeas 218, nays 210; Roll Call #158).

H.R. 4241 (Nussle)

FY2006 budget reconciliation. Title to open ANWR struck before floor consideration. Introduced November 7, 2005; passed House November 18, 2005 (yeas 217, nays 215; Roll Call #601). Inserted in lieu of the text of S. 1932.

H.R. 5429 (Pombo)

To create a leasing program to open ANWR to energy development. Introduced May 19, 2006; referred to Committee on Resources; passed House May 25, 2006 (yeas 225, nays 201; Roll Call #209).

S.Con.Res. 18 (Gregg)

FY2006 budget resolution; to set spending targets including those for Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. Introduced January 31, 2005; referred to Committee on Budget. Reported March 10, 2005 (no written report). Cantwell amendment (S.Amdt. 168, relating to ANWR) defeated March 16, 2005 (yeas 49, nays 51; Roll Call #52). Passed Senate March 17, 2005 (yeas 51, nays 49; Roll Call #81). Senate incorporated measure in H.Con.Res. 95 as an amendment; passed H.Con.Res. 95 in lieu.

S.Con.Res. 74 (Cantwell)

Corrected enrollment of the bill H.R. 2863 (P.L. 109-148) to delete Divisions C and D. Passed Senate December 21, 2005 (yeas 48, nays 45; Roll Call #365). Passed House December 22, 2005, on voice vote.

S.Con.Res. 83 (Gregg)

FY2007 budget resolution; providing direction for cuts in mandatory spending targets only for Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. Introduced and reported by Committee on Budget on March 10, 2006 (no written report). Passed Senate March 16, 2006 (yeas 51, nays 49; Roll Call #74).

Selected Legislation in the 110th Congress

The bills below are those that were reported from a committee, received floor consideration, or became law.

S. 2973 (Domenici)

Title I, Subtitle B, to open ANWR Coastal Plain to development. Introduced May 2, 2008; placed on Senate Legislative Calendar under General Orders, May 6, 2008.

S. 2284 (Dodd)

Original bill affected flood insurance. Introduced November 1, 2007. S.Amdt. 4720 (McConnell) contained Title I, Subtitle B, to open ANWR Coastal Plain to development. Amendment submitted May 7, 2008; pursuant to a unanimous consent agreement requiring 60 votes for passage, the amendment was not agreed to (yeas 42, nays 56; Roll Call #123), May 13, 2008.

(Note: No bills relating to the Arctic Refuge were reported from a committee, received floor consideration, or became law in the 111th Congress.)

Selected Legislation in the 112th Congress

The bills below are those that were reported from a committee, received floor consideration, or became law.

H.R. 3407 (Hastings)

Opens ANWR Coastal Plain to development. Introduced November 14, 2011; placed on the Union Calendar, February 9, 2012.

H.R. 3408 (Lamborn)

As introduced, promotes oil shale development. Introduced November 14, 2011; pursuant to H.Res. 547, amended to include text of H.R. 3407. Placed on the Union Calendar, February 9, 2012. See “Legislative History of the Refuge, 2011-2012” for further discussion.

S. 1812 (Boxer)

As introduced, affects surface transportation programs. S.Amdt. 1826 (Roberts, KS) would have opened Coastal Plain of ANWR to oil and gas drilling, among other things. Pursuant to a unanimous consent agreement requiring 60 votes for passage, amendment not agreed to (yeas 41, nays 57; Roll Call #38).

For Additional Reading

On-site research on any oil resources in the 1002 area has not been carried out since the mid-1980s, in light of the fact that development and activities leading to development are currently illegal. (However, some additional modeling of older data, aided by results from exploration on nearby onshore or offshore tracts, has produced a few new interpretations from time to time.) And the legal environment has scarcely changed over the years. In consequence, many older publications remain useful.

CRS Reports

CRS Report RL33872, *Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR): A Primer for the 112th Congress*, by (name redacted), (name redacted), and (name redacted).

CRS Report RS22304, *ANWR and FY2006 Budget Reconciliation Legislation*, by (name redacted) and (name redacted).

CRS Report RL31278, *Arctic National Wildlife Refuge: Background and Issues*, by (name redacted) et al.

CRS Report RL31022, *Arctic Petroleum Technology Developments*, by (name redacted).

CRS Report 98-814, *Budget Reconciliation Legislation: Development and Consideration*, by (name redacted)

CRS Report RL30862, *The Budget Reconciliation Process: The Senate's "Byrd Rule"*, by (name redacted)

CRS Report 98-815, *Budget Resolution Enforcement*, by (name redacted)

CRS Report RL31033, *Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Fuel Equivalents to Potential Oil Production from the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR)*, by (name redacted).

CRS Report RL31115, *Legal Issues Related to Proposed Drilling for Oil and Gas in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR)*, by (name redacted).

CRS Report RS22326, *Legislative Maps of ANWR*, by (name redacted).

CRS Report RL32108, *North Slope Infrastructure and the ANWR Debate*, by (name redacted).

CRS Report RS22143, *Oil and Gas Leasing in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR): The 2,000-Acre Limit*, by (name redacted) and (name redacted).

CRS Report RS20368, *Overview of the Congressional Budget Process*, by (name redacted)

CRS Report RS20602, *Presidential Authority to Create a National Monument on the Coastal Plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, and Possible Effects of Designation*, by (name redacted).

CRS Report RL31447, *Wilderness: Overview and Statistics*, by (name redacted).

Other Reports

(See above comment on older reports.)

National Academy of Sciences. *Cumulative Environmental Effects of Oil and Gas Activities on Alaska's North Slope*. March 2003. 452p. <http://www.nas.edu/>.

Nelleman, C. and R. D. Cameron. "Cumulative Impacts of an Evolving Oil-field Complex on the Distribution of Calving Caribou." *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, 1998, Vol. 76, p. 1425.

U.S. Department of the Interior. Bureau of Land Management. *Overview of the 1991 Arctic National Wildlife Refuge Recoverable Petroleum Resource Update*. Washington, DC, April 8, 1991. 8 p., 2 maps.

U.S. Department of the Interior. Fish and Wildlife Service, Geological Survey, and Bureau of Land Management. *Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska, Coastal Plain Resource Assessment. Report and Recommendation to the Congress of the United States and Final Legislative Environmental Impact Statement.* Washington, DC, 1987. 208 p.

U.S. Department of the Interior. Geological Survey. *The Oil and Gas Resource Potential of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge 1002 Area, Alaska.* 1999. 2 CD set. USGS Open File Report 98-34.

U.S. Department of the Interior. Geological Survey. *Arctic Refuge Coastal Plain Terrestrial Wildlife Research Summaries.* Biological Science Report USGS/BRD/BSR-2002-0001.

U.S. Department of the Interior. Geological Survey. "Evaluation of additional potential development scenarios for the 1002 Area of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge." Memorandum from Brad Griffith, Assistant Leader, Alaska Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, to Charles D. Groat, Director, U.S. Geological Survey. April 4, 2002.

U.S. Department of the Interior. Geological Survey. *Economics of 1998 U.S. Geological Survey's 1002 Area Regional Assessment: An Economic Update.* USGS Open File Report 2005-1359. Washington, DC, 2005.

U.S. General Accounting Office.¹⁸ *Arctic National Wildlife Refuge: An Assessment of Interior's Estimate of an Economically Viable Oil Field.* Washington, DC, July 1993. 31 p. GAO/RCED-93-130.

Author Contact Information

(name redacted)
Specialist in Natural Resources Policy
[redacted]@crs.loc.gov, 7-....

(name redacted)
Information Research Specialist
[redacted]@crs.loc.gov, 7-....

¹⁸ This agency is now called the Government Accountability Office.

EveryCRSReport.com

The Congressional Research Service (CRS) is a federal legislative branch agency, housed inside the Library of Congress, charged with providing the United States Congress non-partisan advice on issues that may come before Congress.

EveryCRSReport.com republishes CRS reports that are available to all Congressional staff. The reports are not classified, and Members of Congress routinely make individual reports available to the public.

Prior to our republication, we redacted names, phone numbers and email addresses of analysts who produced the reports. We also added this page to the report. We have not intentionally made any other changes to any report published on EveryCRSReport.com.

CRS reports, as a work of the United States government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.

Information in a CRS report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to members of Congress in connection with CRS' institutional role.

EveryCRSReport.com is not a government website and is not affiliated with CRS. We do not claim copyright on any CRS report we have republished.