

114TH CONGRESS  
2D SESSION

# H. CON. RES. 136

Expressing the sense of Congress opposing the President's proposed Coastal Climate Resilience Program.

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 10, 2016

Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HARPER, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mrs. ROBY) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Natural Resources

---

## CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Expressing the sense of Congress opposing the President's proposed Coastal Climate Resilience Program.

Whereas the Obama administration's climate regulations and carbon tax proposals have been rejected by the Congress multiple times;

Whereas the President has advocated for, and implemented through executive action, excessive and expensive regulations on the energy, agricultural, and industrial sectors resulting in costs that are ultimately shouldered by hard-working Americans;

Whereas the Obama administration's proposed Coastal Climate Resilience Program would cost \$2,000,000,000 and would divert funds already obligated by law in the Gulf

of Mexico Energy and Security Act of 2008 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note) and redistribute those monies to the Obama administration's pet projects;

Whereas more than 300 groups oppose the proposed Coastal Climate Resilience Program, including major environmental organizations, local governments, civic groups, and businesses, for diverting funds from well-established and science-based restoration and flood control projects in order to pay for the President's politically motivated climate-related activities; and

Whereas the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service estimates that as of May 6, 2016, the Obama administration has spent \$96,900,000,000 of direct Federal funding on climate change-related activities: Now, therefore, be it

1        *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate*  
 2 *concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—*

3            (1) the Coastal Climate Resilience Program is  
 4        not in the best interest of American families, busi-  
 5        nesses, local governments, wildlife, or public safety;  
 6        and

7            (2) Federal funds should not be made available  
 8        for the Coastal Climate Resilience Fund, the Coastal  
 9        Climate Resilience Program, or any substantially  
 10       similar successor Federal program.

○