TO DIRECT THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO ANNUALLY DESIGNATE AT LEAST ONE CITY IN THE UNITED STATES AS AN “AMERICAN WORLD WAR II HERITAGE CITY”, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

OCTOBER 30, 2018.—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. 6118]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Natural Resources, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 6118) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to annually designate at least one city in the United States as an “American World War II Heritage City”, and for other purposes, 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. 6118 is to direct the Secretary of the Interior to annually designate at least one city in the United States as an “American World War II Heritage City”.

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION

On December 7, 1941, military forces of the Empire of Japan attacked the U.S. Naval Fleet and ground bases at Pearl Harbor in Hawaii.1 On December 8, 1941, one day after what President Roosevelt referred to as, “a date which will live in infamy,” the United States declared war against the Empire of Japan.2 Three days later, on December 11, 1941, Japan’s ally, Germany, declared war on the United States.3 Sixteen million Americans, mostly young
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working-age men, served in the military during World War II, out of an overall United States population of 113 million.\(^4\)

While an unprecedented number of Americans served in World War II, the country drastically increased its war production on the home front, serving not only the needs of the armed forces of the United States but her allies as well—in what President Franklin Roosevelt called “The Arsenal of Democracy.”\(^5\) The combination of millions serving in the military, during a period of necessary and drastic increases in production, led to significant social changes on the American home front.\(^6\)

The World War II period resulted in the largest number of people migrating within the United States in the history of the country. Individuals and families relocated to industrial centers for good paying jobs out of a sense of patriotic duty. Many industrial centers became “boomtowns,” growing at phenomenal rates. One example, the City of Richmond, California, grew from a population of under 24,000 to over 100,000 during the war.\(^7\)

Another boomtown was the City of Wilmington, North Carolina. During World War II, Wilmington was called “The Defense Capital of the State.”\(^8\) Wilmington’s largest employer, the North Carolina Shipbuilding Company, constructed 243 cargo vessels.\(^9\) Wilmington was also home to many strategic defense industries, including fertilizer plants, pulpwood and creosote factories, dairies, and concrete floating drydock manufacturing. Wilmington was also the site of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad headquarters and a P–47 fighter plane training area.\(^10\) The City and its surrounding area hosted training for all five military branches, and the City’s population more than doubled with the influx of military personnel, forcing everyone to cope with a strain on housing, schools, transportation, the food supply, medical and social services.\(^11\)

Workers faced many challenges, as working conditions were difficult and dangerous. Between the bombing of Pearl Harbor in December 1941 and the D-Day Invasion of Europe in June 1944, there were more home-front industrial casualties than military casualties. The high number of industrial casualties led to improved workplace safety and regulations.\(^12\)

In addition to home-front workers, everyone was expected to be an active participant in the war effort. Rationing was a way of life as twenty commodities were rationed, and people were asked to, “Use it up—Wear it out—Make it do—or Do without.”\(^13\) Materials vital to the war effort were collected, often by youth groups, and recycled. Many Americans supported the war effort by purchasing war bonds. Women replaced men in sports leagues, orchestras, and community institutions. Americans grew 60% of the produce they
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consumed in Victory Gardens.\textsuperscript{14} The war effort on the United States home front was a total effort.\textsuperscript{15}

In recognition of the industrial, governmental, and citizen efforts that eventually led the United States to victory in World War II, Congress designated the Rosie the Riveter World War II Home Front National Historical Park in October 2000.\textsuperscript{16} The Park includes sites, structures, and areas of Richmond, California, that are associated with the home-front efforts. Richmond, California, was chosen as the site for this National Historical Park because of the City's many surviving sites and structures that help tell the diverse stories of the home front.\textsuperscript{17}

H.R. 6118 would provide further commemoration of the World War II home-front efforts by requiring the Secretary of the Interior to designate at least one city in the United States each year as an “American World War II Heritage City.” The bill requires that Wilmington, North Carolina, be the first city to receive such a designation.

COMMITTEE ACTION

H.R. 6118 was introduced on June 14, 2018, by Congressman David Rouzer (R–NC). The bill was referred to the Committee on Natural Resources and within the Committee, to the Subcommittee on Federal Lands. The Subcommittee held a hearing on the bill on September 6, 2018. On September 26, 2018, 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.

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 AND CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT

1. Cost of Legislation and the Congressional Budget Act. With respect to the requirements of clause 3(c)(2) and (3) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and sections 308(a) and 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Committee has received the following estimate for the bill from the Director of the Congressional Budget Office:
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DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 6118, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to annually designate at least one city in the United States as an “American World War II Heritage City,” and for other purposes.

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

Sincerely,

MARK P. HADLEY
(For Keith Hall, Director).

Enclosure.

H.R. 6118—A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to annually designate at least one city in the United States as an “American World War II Heritage City,” and for other purposes

H.R. 6118 would direct the Secretary of the Interior to designate at least one city in the United States annually as an American World War II Heritage City. That designation would be based on the city’s contributions to the war and its effort to preserve the history of its contributions during the war. The bill would designate Wilmington, North Carolina, as the first American World War II Heritage City.

Using information from the National Park Service, CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 6118 would have an insignificant cost in each year and cost about $1 million over the 2019–2023 period; such spending would be subject to the availability of appropriated funds. Those costs include developing an application and selection process, maintaining a website, and consulting with the Smithsonian Institution or the National Trust for Historic Preservation to help determine the designation criteria and make the annual city selection.

Enacting H.R. 6118 would not affect direct spending or revenues; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures do not apply.

CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 6118 would not increase net direct spending or on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2029.

H.R. 6118 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Jacob Fabian. The estimate was reviewed by H. Samuel Papenfuss, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

2. 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 direct the Secretary of the Interior to annually designate at least one city in the United States as an “American World War II Heritage City”.
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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. This bill does not contain any directed rule makings.

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

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