AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

112TH CONGRESS
2d Session
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
REPORT
112–441

# RELEASE OF REVERSIONARY INTEREST AND USE CONDITIONS, COOK COUNTY AIRPORT, COOK COUNTY, MINNESOTA

APRIL 16, 2012.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Natural Resources, submitted the following

# R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 2947]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Natural Resources, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 2947) to provide for the release of the reversionary interest held by the United States in certain land conveyed by the United States in 1950 for the establishment of an airport in Cook County, Minnesota, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

## PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 2947 is to provide for the release of the reversionary interest held by the United States in certain land conveyed by the United States in 1950 for the establishment of an airport in Cook County, Minnesota.

## BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION

H.R. 2947 would require the Secretary of Agriculture to release the deed restrictions that were placed on a parcel of land conveyed to the State of Minnesota under the Federal Airport Act of 1946 to allow for the construction of an airport in Cook County, Minnesota. The original 1950 conveyance required that the lands be used for the specific purposes of expanding the Grand Marais-Cook County Airport, yet the entire parcel was never developed and the restrictions in the land grant keep it from being used for any other purpose. Release of this parcel will allow it to be utilized by the Cook County Highway Department for a local highway project.

## COMMITTEE ACTION

H.R. 2947 was introduced on September 15, 2011, by Congressman Chip Cravaack (R–MN). The bill was referred to the Committee on Natural Resources, and within the Committee to the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands. On December 2, 2011, the Subcommittee held a hearing on the bill. On February 29, 2012, the Full Natural Resources Committee met to consider the bill. The Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands was discharged by unanimous consent. No amendments were offered and the bill was then ordered favorably reported to the House of Representatives by voice vote.

## COMMITTEE OVERSIGHT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Regarding clause 2(b)(1) of rule X and clause 3(c)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Natural Resources' oversight findings and recommendations are reflected in the body of this report.

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XIII

1. Cost of Legislation. Clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives requires an estimate and a comparison by the Committee of the costs which would be incurred in carrying out this bill. However, clause 3(d)(2)(B) of that rule provides that this requirement does not apply when the Committee has included in its report a timely submitted cost estimate of the bill prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. Under clause 3(c)(3) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and section 403 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Committee has received the following cost estimate for this bill from the Director of the Congressional Budget Office:

*H.R. 2947—A bill to provide for the release of the reversionary interest held by the United States in certain land conveyed by the United States in 1950 for the establishment of an airport in Cook County, Minnesota*

H.R. 2947 would remove certain use restrictions from land that was conveyed by the federal government to the state of Minnesota in 1950. Under current law, if the land is not used for purposes related to the operation of Cook County Airport, it must be returned to the United States.

Based on information provided by managers of the Cook County Airport, CBO expects that, under current law, the affected lands would be retained by the airport. Therefore, we estimate that implementing the legislation would have no impact on the federal budget. Enacting H.R. 2947 would not affect direct spending or revenues; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures do not apply.

The bill contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Jeff LaFave. The estimate was approved by Theresa Gullo, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

2. Section 308(a) of Congressional Budget Act. As required by clause 3(c)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this bill does not contain any new budget authority, spending authority, credit authority, or an increase or decrease in revenues or tax expenditures. Based on information provided by managers of the Cook County Airport, CBO expects that, under current law, the affected lands would be retained by the airport. Therefore, CBO estimates that implementing the legislation would have no impact on the federal budget.

3. General Performance Goals and Objectives. As required by clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII, the general performance goal or objective of this bill is to provide for the release of the reversionary interest held by the United States in certain land conveyed by the United States in 1950 for the establishment of an airport in Cook County, Minnesota.

## EARMARK STATEMENT

This bill does not contain any Congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined under clause 9(e), 9(f), and 9(g) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

## COMPLIANCE WITH PUBLIC LAW 104–4

This bill contains no unfunded mandates as defined under Public Law 104–4.

## PREEMPTION OF STATE, LOCAL OR TRIBAL LAW

This bill is not intended to preempt any local or tribal law.

## CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

If enacted, this bill would make no changes in existing law.

○