

FORT ONTARIO STUDY ACT

—————
JULY 14, 2016.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of
the Union and ordered to be printed

—————
Mr. BISHOP of Utah, from the Committee on Natural Resources,
submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 4202]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Natural Resources, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 4202) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of Fort Ontario in the State of New York, 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. 4202 is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of Fort Ontario in the State of New York.

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION

H.R. 4202 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to initiate a special resource study of Fort Ontario, a military installation in Oswego, New York. In the study, the Secretary of the Interior will evaluate the site's national significance, determine the suitability and feasibility of designating Fort Ontario as a unit of the National Park System, and consider other alternatives for preservation, protection, and interpretation of the lands by Federal, State, or local governmental entities, or private and nonprofit organizations.

Fort Ontario was originally built by the British in 1755 to protect the area around the east end of Lake Ontario. Located at the mouth of the Oswego River in Oswego, New York, Fort Ontario directly overlooks the shores of Lake Ontario. In 1756, the French Army destroyed the fort, also known as the "Fort of the Six Nations." In 1759, the British built a much stronger and larger fort on the same site.

During the American Revolution, the British abandoned Fort Ontario, and in 1778 American troops destroyed the fort. Despite the surrender at Yorktown in 1781, the British reoccupied Oswego in 1782 and rebuilt Fort Ontario for the third time. The British held it until 1796 before finally turning it over to the United States.

During the War of 1812, British forces captured and destroyed the fort. After a period of abandonment, new construction started in part due to tensions with Great Britain as well as to check smuggling activities between Canada and the United States. Construction of a fourth Fort Ontario commenced in 1839, amidst tensions arising from Canada's Patriot War. Later, amid fears of British intervention in the Civil War, the United States upgraded defenses of the fort in 1860.

Fort Ontario later served as a training post from 1903 to 1905, a hospital camp during World War I, and a training installation for military police and anti-aircraft units in World War II. Additionally, from August 1944 to February 1946, Fort Ontario operated as the nation's only emergency refugee shelter during World War II and housed approximately 982 refugees, predominantly of Jewish descent.

After nearly two hundred years of active military use, the United States Army abandoned the fort in 1946 and transferred it to the State of New York. In 1953, Fort Ontario opened as a New York state historic site. The fort was added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1970 and remains open to the public today.

COMMITTEE ACTION

H.R. 4202 was introduced on December 9, 2015, by Congressman John Katko (R-NY). The bill was referred to the Committee on Natural Resources, and within the Committee to the Subcommittee on Federal Lands. On May 24, 2016, the Subcommittee held a hearing on the bill. On June 14, 2016, the Natural Resources Committee met to consider the bill. The Subcommittee was discharged by unanimous consent. No amendments were offered and the bill was ordered favorably reported to the House of Representatives by unanimous consent on June 15, 2016.

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 Com-

mittee has received the following cost estimate for this bill from the Director of the Congressional Budget Office:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, June 30, 2016.

Hon. ROB BISHOP,
*Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 4202, the Fort Ontario Study Act.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Marin Burnett.

Sincerely,

KEITH HALL.

Enclosure.

H.R. 4202—Fort Ontario Study Act

H.R. 4202 would require the National Park Service (NPS) to conduct a special resource study of Fort Ontario, a state historic site in Oswego, New York. (Fort Ontario was used during the French and Indian War, the Revolutionary War, and the War of 1812.) The study would determine whether the site meets NPS criteria for inclusion in the National Park System. Based on information provided by the NPS, CBO estimates that implementing the legislation would cost about \$250,000; such spending would be subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

Enacting H.R. 4202 would not affect direct spending or revenues; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures do not apply. CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 4202 would not increase net direct spending or on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2027.

H.R. 4202 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Marin Burnett. The estimate was approved by H. Samuel Papenfuss, 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 spending authority, credit authority, or an increase or decrease in revenues or tax expenditure. According to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), implementing H.R. 4202 would cost about \$250,000, subject to appropriation. CBO estimates that the bill “would not increase net direct spending or on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10 year periods beginning in 2027”.

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 authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of Fort Ontario in the State of New York.

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.

COMPLIANCE WITH H. RES. 5

Directed Rule Making. The Chairman does not believe that this bill directs any executive branch official to conduct any specific rule-making proceedings.

Duplication of Existing Programs. This bill does not establish or reauthorize a program of the federal government known to be duplicative of another program. Such program was not included in any report from the Government Accountability Office to Congress pursuant to section 21 of Public Law 111-139 or identified in the most recent Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance published pursuant to the Federal Program Information Act (Public Law 95-220, as amended by Public Law 98-169) as relating to other programs.

PREEMPTION OF STATE, LOCAL OR TRIBAL LAW

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

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

This bill makes no changes to existing law.