

GRAND CANYON CENTENNIAL PROTECTION ACT

—————
OCTOBER 4, 2019.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State
of the Union and ordered to be printed
—————

Mr. GRIJALVA, from the Committee on Natural Resources,
submitted the following

R E P O R T

together with

DISSENTING VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 1373]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Natural Resources, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 1373) to protect, for current and future generations, the watershed, ecosystem, and cultural heritage of the Grand Canyon region in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act”.

SEC. 2. WITHDRAWAL OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND IN THE STATE OF ARIZONA.

(a) **DEFINITION OF MAP.**—In this Act, the term “Map” means the map prepared by the Bureau of Land Management entitled “Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act” and dated July 11, 2019.

(b) **WITHDRAWAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the approximately 1,006,545 acres of Federal land in the State of Arizona, generally depicted on the Map as “Federal Mineral Estate to be Withdrawn”, including any land or interest in land that is acquired by the United States after the date of the enactment of this Act, are hereby withdrawn from—

- (1) all forms of entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;
- (2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and
- (3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The Map shall be kept on file and made available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 1373 is to protect, for current and future generations, the watershed, ecosystem, and cultural heritage of the Grand Canyon region in the State of Arizona.

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Federal efforts to protect the Grand Canyon's iconic landscape began in 1882 when then-Senator Benjamin Harrison introduced a bill to establish the Grand Canyon National Park. While that bill was unsuccessful, it motivated protective actions for the region, including preservation as a Forest Reserve in 1893, and President Theodore Roosevelt's 1908 declaration of the Grand Canyon National Monument under the recently passed Antiquities Act of 1906. These designations paved the way for the Grand Canyon's designation as a national park on February 26, 1919. In 1979, the park was recognized by UNESCO as a World Heritage Site. However, despite the longstanding interest in preserving the unique values of the Grand Canyon, the region has continued to face threats from development and mineral extraction—in particular, from uranium extraction.¹

The history of uranium extraction in the Grand Canyon region began during the atomic era in 1950 when prospectors mined millions of tons of uranium ore from tribal and public lands, leaving behind a toxic legacy that has scarred the landscape and polluted the region's water and air. In the mid-2000s, a spike in the uranium market renewed mining interests in the region and triggered 10,000 new mining claims around the Grand Canyon by the end of the decade.²

In 2012, the Secretary of the Interior issued a 20-year moratorium on new mining claims on over 1 million acres surrounding Grand Canyon National Park, due in part to the lack of scientific knowledge regarding the environmental impacts of uranium mining. The decision was the result of more than two years of evaluation, including an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)³ and 350,000 public comments. In addition, the Bureau of Land Management, in cooperation with the U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Geological Survey, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, tribes, counties, and other stakeholders, determined that the threat of uranium mining to environmental quality and public health warranted further study before allowing any new mineral claims in the Northern Arizona withdrawal area. The EIS that preceded the moratorium found that groundwater contamination from uranium mining posed a potentially high risk to water supplies in the region.⁴ The EIS also found that any mining within the region, a rec-

¹Amber Reimondo, Grand Canyon Trust, Uranium Mining in the Grand Canyon Region (2019), https://www.grandcanyontrust.org/sites/default/files/resources/Uranium_Mining_Grand_Canyon_Region_2019.pdf.

²*Id.* at 7.

³Bureau of Land Mgmt., Northern Arizona Proposed Withdrawal Final Environmental Impact Statement (2011).

⁴*Id.*

ognized traditional homeland and use area for seven tribes, posed a threat to sacred and traditional sites.⁵

The 20-year moratorium was intended to mitigate these recognized impacts and to provide time for further study of the region's hydrology before the moratorium expired in 2032. However, these efforts have been chronically underfunded and remain incomplete. Given the lack of reliable data, along with the known impacts that mining would have on tribal sites and the regional environment, and the potential for significant groundwater impacts, it is essential that Congress act to permanently protect the Grand Canyon region from uranium mining.

The Grand Canyon is vital to the region's economy and is home to significant hydrological resources, including the Colorado River watershed, abundant biodiversity and habitat, and culturally important resources. Visitors to Grand Canyon National Park contributed \$947 million⁶ to gateway economies in 2018 and helped generate \$160 million in local and state tax revenue in 2016. Public lands such as national parks often play an important economic role for local communities. However, the economic benefits of protected sites are heavily dependent on the preservation of untouched landscapes, recreation opportunities, and wildlife.

Protecting the waters of the Grand Canyon is also of interest for many of the tribal communities in the region, including the Havasupai people who have lived in Supai village at the bottom of the Canyon for more than 1,000 years. The Havasupai rely on the springs and flows from the Canyon for nearly all of their drinking water; therefore, contamination from uranium mining would pose an existential threat to their lives and culture.

To ensure that the risks posed by mining activities do not continue to threaten the Grand Canyon's treasured landscape and its unique resources, Representative Raúl Grijalva (D–AZ) introduced H.R. 1373 to formally remove the 2012 moratorium area from the jurisdiction of the public land laws, the Mining Law of 1872, and the Mineral Leasing Act—barring new claims for locatable minerals such as uranium and new leases for leasable minerals such as coal. This bill would prevent future damage to the region's exceptional resources while protecting tribal communities, local economies, and the region's hydrological resources.

COMMITTEE ACTION

H.R. 1373 was introduced on February 26, 2019, by Chair Raúl Grijalva (D–AZ). The bill was referred solely to the Committee on Natural Resources, and within the Committee to the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands. On June 5, 2019, the Subcommittee held a hearing on the bill. On July 17, 2019, the Natural Resources Committee met to consider the bill. The Subcommittee was discharged by unanimous consent. Chair Grijalva offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute. Representative Paul Gosar (R–AZ) offered an amendment designated Gosar #1 to the amendment in the nature of a substitute. The amendment was not agreed to by a roll call vote of 14 yeas and 20 nays, as follows:

⁵*Id.*; see also U.S. Dep't of the Interior, Record of Decision: Northern Arizona Withdrawal Mo-have and Coconino Counties, Arizona (2012).

⁶Headwater Econ., National Park Economic Impacts (last updated Aug. 2019), <https://headwaterseconomics.org/dataviz/national-park-service-units/>.

Date: July 17, 2019

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES
116th Congress - Roll Call

Bill / Motion: H.R. 1373**Amendment:** Mr. Gosar #1 amendment to the Grijalva amendment in the nature of a substitute**Disposition:** Not agreed to by a roll call vote of 14 yeas and 20 nays.

	DEM. MEMBERS (25)	YEAS	NAYS	PRESENT
1	Mr. Brown, MD			
2	Mr. Cartwright, PA		X	
3	Mr. Case, HI		X	
4	Mr. Clay, MO		X	
5	Mr. Costa, CA		X	
6	Mr. Cox, CA		X	
7	Mr. Cunningham, SC		X	
8	Ms. DeGette, CO		X	
9	Mrs. Dingell, MI		X	
10	Mr. Gallego, AZ		X	
11	Mr. Grijalva, AZ (Chair)		X	
12	Ms. Haaland, NM		X	
13	Mr. Horsford, NV		X	
14	Mr. Huffman, CA		X	
15	Mr. Levin, CA		X	
16	Mr. Lowenthal, CA		X	
17	Mr. McEachin, VA			
18	Ms. Napolitano, CA		X	
19	Mr. Neguse, CO			
20	Mr. Sablan, CNMI		X	
21	Mr. San Nicolas, GU			
22	Mr. Soto, FL			
23	Mr. Van Drew, NJ		X	
24	Mr. Tonko, NY		X	
25	Ms. Velázquez, NY		X	
	REP. MEMBERS (19)	Y	N	P
1	Mr. Bishop, UT (Ranking)	X		
2	Ms. Cheney, WY	X		
3	Mr. Cook, CA	X		
4	Mr. Curtis, UT	X		
5	Mr. Fulcher, ID	X		
6	Mr. Gohmert, TX	X		
7	Ms. González-Colón, PR	X		
8	Mr. Gosar, AZ	X		
9	Mr. Graves, LA			
10	Mr. Hern, OK	X		
11	Mr. Hice, GA			
12	Mr. Johnson, LA			
13	Mr. Lamborn, CO	X		
14	Mr. McClintock, CA	X		
15	Mrs. Radewagen, AS	X		
16	Mr. Webster, FL			
17	Mr. Westerman, AR	X		
18	Mr. Wittman, VA	X		
19	Mr. Young, AK			
	TOTALS	14	20	
	Total: 44 / Quorum: 15 / Report: 23	YEAS	NAYS	PRESENT

Representative Gosar offered an amendment designated Gosar #2 to the amendment in the nature of a substitute. The amendment was not agreed to by a roll call vote of 14 yeas and 20 nays, as follows:

Date: July 17, 2019

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES
116th Congress - Roll Call

Bill / Motion: H.R. 1373

Amendment: Mr. Gosar #2 amendment to the Grijalva amendment in the nature of a substitute

Disposition: Not agreed to by a roll call vote of 14 yeas and 20 nays.

	DEM. MEMBERS (25)	YEAS	NAYS	PRESENT
1	Mr. Brown, MD			
2	Mr. Cartwright, PA		X	
3	Mr. Case, HI		X	
4	Mr. Clay, MO		X	
5	Mr. Costa, CA		X	
6	Mr. Cox, CA		X	
7	Mr. Cunningham, SC		X	
8	Ms. DeGette, CO		X	
9	Mrs. Dingell, MI		X	
10	Mr. Gallego, AZ		X	
11	Mr. Grijalva, AZ (Chair)		X	
12	Ms. Haaland, NM		X	
13	Mr. Horsford, NV		X	
14	Mr. Huffman, CA		X	
15	Mr. Levin, CA		X	
16	Mr. Lowenthal, CA		X	
17	Mr. McEachin, VA			
18	Ms. Napolitano, CA		X	
19	Mr. Neguse, CO			
20	Mr. Sablan, CNMI		X	
21	Mr. San Nicolas, GU			
22	Mr. Soto, FL			
23	Mr. Van Drew, NJ		X	
24	Mr. Tonko, NY		X	
25	Ms. Velázquez, NY		X	
	REP. MEMBERS (19)	Y	N	P
1	Mr. Bishop, UT (Ranking)	X		
2	Ms. Cheney, WY	X		
3	Mr. Cook, CA	X		
4	Mr. Curtis, UT	X		
5	Mr. Fulcher, ID	X		
6	Mr. Gohmert, TX	X		
7	Ms. González-Colón, PR	X		
8	Mr. Gosar, AZ	X		
9	Mr. Graves, LA			
10	Mr. Hern, OK	X		
11	Mr. Hice, GA			
12	Mr. Johnson, LA			
13	Mr. Lamborn, CO	X		
14	Mr. McClintock, CA	X		
15	Mrs. Radewagen, AS	X		
16	Mr. Webster, FL			
17	Mr. Westerman, AR	X		
18	Mr. Wittman, VA	X		
19	Mr. Young, AK			
	TOTALS	14	20	
	Total: 44 / Quorum: 15 / Report: 23	YEAS	NAYS	PRESENT

Representative Gosar offered an amendment designated Gosar #3 to the amendment in the nature of a substitute. The amendment was not agreed to by a roll call vote of 14 yeas and 20 nays, as follows:

Date: July 17, 2019

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES
116th Congress - Roll Call

Bill / Motion: H.R. 1373

Amendment: Mr. Gosar #3 amendment to the Grijalva amendment in the nature of a substitute

Disposition: Not agreed to by a roll call vote of 14 yeas and 20 nays.

	DEM. MEMBERS (25)	YEAS	NAYS	PRESENT
1	Mr. Brown, MD			
2	Mr. Cartwright, PA		X	
3	Mr. Case, HI		X	
4	Mr. Clay, MO		X	
5	Mr. Costa, CA		X	
6	Mr. Cox, CA		X	
7	Mr. Cunningham, SC		X	
8	Ms. DeGette, CO		X	
9	Mrs. Dingell, MI		X	
10	Mr. Gallego, AZ		X	
11	Mr. Grijalva, AZ (Chair)		X	
12	Ms. Haaland, NM		X	
13	Mr. Horsford, NV		X	
14	Mr. Huffman, CA		X	
15	Mr. Levin, CA		X	
16	Mr. Lowenthal, CA		X	
17	Mr. McEachin, VA			
18	Ms. Napolitano, CA		X	
19	Mr. Neguse, CO			
20	Mr. Sablan, CNMI		X	
21	Mr. San Nicolas, GU			
22	Mr. Soto, FL			
23	Mr. Van Drew, NJ		X	
24	Mr. Tonko, NY		X	
25	Ms. Velázquez, NY		X	
	REP. MEMBERS (19)	Y	N	P
1	Mr. Bishop, UT (Ranking)	X		
2	Ms. Cheney, WY	X		
3	Mr. Cook, CA	X		
4	Mr. Curtis, UT	X		
5	Mr. Fulcher, ID	X		
6	Mr. Gohmert, TX	X		
7	Ms. González-Colón, PR	X		
8	Mr. Gosar, AZ	X		
9	Mr. Graves, LA			
10	Mr. Hern, OK	X		
11	Mr. Hice, GA			
12	Mr. Johnson, LA			
13	Mr. Lamborn, CO	X		
14	Mr. McClintock, CA	X		
15	Mrs. Radewagen, AS	X		
16	Mr. Webster, FL			
17	Mr. Westerman, AR	X		
18	Mr. Wittman, VA	X		
19	Mr. Young, AK			
	TOTALS	14	20	
	Total: 44 / Quorum: 15 / Report: 23	YEAS	NAYS	PRESENT

Representative Liz Cheney (R-WY) offered an amendment designated Cheney #4 to the amendment in the nature of a substitute. The amendment was not agreed to by a roll call vote of 15 yeas and 19 nays, as follows:

Date: July 17, 2019

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES
116th Congress - Roll Call

Bill / Motion: H.R. 1373**Amendment:** Ms. Cheney #4 amendment to the Grijalva amendment in the nature of a substitute**Disposition:** Not agreed to by a roll call vote of 15 yeas and 19 nays.

	DEM. MEMBERS (25)	YEAS	NAYS	PRESENT
1	Mr. Brown, MD			
2	Mr. Cartwright, PA		X	
3	Mr. Case, HI		X	
4	Mr. Clay, MO		X	
5	Mr. Costa, CA		X	
6	Mr. Cox, CA		X	
7	Mr. Cunningham, SC	X		
8	Ms. DeGette, CO		X	
9	Mrs. Dingell, MI		X	
10	Mr. Gallego, AZ		X	
11	Mr. Grijalva, AZ (<i>Chair</i>)		X	
12	Ms. Haaland, NM		X	
13	Mr. Horsford, NV		X	
14	Mr. Huffman, CA		X	
15	Mr. Levin, CA		X	
16	Mr. Lowenthal, CA		X	
17	Mr. McEachin, VA			
18	Ms. Napolitano, CA		X	
19	Mr. Neguse, CO			
20	Mr. Sablan, CNMI		X	
21	Mr. San Nicolas, GU			
22	Mr. Soto, FL			
23	Mr. Van Drew, NJ		X	
24	Mr. Tonko, NY		X	
25	Ms. Velázquez, NY		X	
	REP. MEMBERS (19)	Y	N	P
1	Mr. Bishop, UT (<i>Ranking</i>)	X		
2	Ms. Cheney, WY	X		
3	Mr. Cook, CA	X		
4	Mr. Curtis, UT	X		
5	Mr. Fulcher, ID	X		
6	Mr. Gohmert, TX	X		
7	Ms. González-Colón, PR	X		
8	Mr. Gosar, AZ	X		
9	Mr. Graves, LA			
10	Mr. Hern, OK	X		
11	Mr. Hice, GA			
12	Mr. Johnson, LA			
13	Mr. Lamborn, CO	X		
14	Mr. McClintock, CA	X		
15	Mrs. Radewagen, AS	X		
16	Mr. Webster, FL			
17	Mr. Westerman, AR	X		
18	Mr. Wittman, VA	X		
19	Mr. Young, AK			
	TOTALS	15	19	
	Total: 44 / Quorum: 15 / Report: 23	YEAS	NAYS	PRESENT

Representative Gosar offered an amendment designated Gosar #5 to the amendment in the nature of a substitute. The amendment was not agreed to by a roll call vote of 14 yeas and 20 nays, as follows:

Date: July 17, 2019

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES
116th Congress - Roll Call

Bill / Motion: H.R. 1373**Amendment:** Mr. Gosar #5 amendment to the Grijalva amendment in the nature of a substitute**Disposition:** Not agreed to by a roll call vote of 14 yeas and 20 nays.

	DEM. MEMBERS (25)	YEAS	NAYS	PRESENT
1	Mr. Brown, MD			
2	Mr. Cartwright, PA		X	
3	Mr. Case, HI		X	
4	Mr. Clay, MO		X	
5	Mr. Costa, CA		X	
6	Mr. Cox, CA		X	
7	Mr. Cunningham, SC		X	
8	Ms. DeGette, CO		X	
9	Mrs. Dingell, MI		X	
10	Mr. Gallego, AZ		X	
11	Mr. Grijalva, AZ (<i>Chair</i>)		X	
12	Ms. Haaland, NM		X	
13	Mr. Horsford, NV		X	
14	Mr. Huffman, CA		X	
15	Mr. Levin, CA		X	
16	Mr. Lowenthal, CA		X	
17	Mr. McEachin, VA			
18	Ms. Napolitano, CA		X	
19	Mr. Neguse, CO			
20	Mr. Sablan, CNMI		X	
21	Mr. San Nicolas, GU			
22	Mr. Soto, FL			
23	Mr. Van Drew, NJ		X	
24	Mr. Tonko, NY		X	
25	Ms. Velázquez, NY		X	
	REP. MEMBERS (19)	Y	N	P
1	Mr. Bishop, UT (<i>Ranking</i>)	X		
2	Ms. Cheney, WY	X		
3	Mr. Cook, CA	X		
4	Mr. Curtis, UT	X		
5	Mr. Fulcher, ID	X		
6	Mr. Gohmert, TX	X		
7	Ms. González-Colón, PR	X		
8	Mr. Gosar, AZ	X		
9	Mr. Graves, LA			
10	Mr. Hern, OK	X		
11	Mr. Hice, GA			
12	Mr. Johnson, LA			
13	Mr. Lamborn, CO	X		
14	Mr. McClintock, CA	X		
15	Mrs. Radewagen, AS	X		
16	Mr. Webster, FL			
17	Mr. Westerman, AR	X		
18	Mr. Wittman, VA	X		
19	Mr. Young, AK			
	TOTALS	14	20	
	Total: 44 / Quorum: 15 / Report: 23	YEAS	NAYS	PRESENT

Representative Gosar offered an amendment designated Gosar #6 to the amendment in the nature of a substitute. The amendment was not agreed to by a roll call vote of 14 yeas and 20 nays, as follows:

Date: July 17, 2019

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES
116th Congress - Roll Call

Bill / Motion: H.R. 1373**Amendment:** Mr. Gosar #6 amendment to the Grijalva amendment in the nature of a substitute**Disposition:** Not agreed to by a roll call vote of 14 yeas and 20 nays.

	DEM. MEMBERS (25)	YEAS	NAYS	PRESENT
1	Mr. Brown, MD			
2	Mr. Cartwright, PA		X	
3	Mr. Case, HI		X	
4	Mr. Clay, MO		X	
5	Mr. Costa, CA		X	
6	Mr. Cox, CA		X	
7	Mr. Cunningham, SC		X	
8	Ms. DeGette, CO		X	
9	Mrs. Dingell, MI		X	
10	Mr. Gallego, AZ		X	
11	Mr. Grijalva, AZ (<i>Chair</i>)		X	
12	Ms. Haaland, NM		X	
13	Mr. Horsford, NV		X	
14	Mr. Huffman, CA		X	
15	Mr. Levin, CA		X	
16	Mr. Lowenthal, CA		X	
17	Mr. McEachin, VA			
18	Ms. Napolitano, CA		X	
19	Mr. Neguse, CO			
20	Mr. Sablan, CNMI		X	
21	Mr. San Nicolas, GU			
22	Mr. Soto, FL			
23	Mr. Van Drew, NJ		X	
24	Mr. Tonko, NY		X	
25	Ms. Velázquez, NY		X	
	REP. MEMBERS (19)	Y	N	P
1	Mr. Bishop, UT (<i>Ranking</i>)	X		
2	Ms. Cheney, WY	X		
3	Mr. Cook, CA	X		
4	Mr. Curtis, UT	X		
5	Mr. Fulcher, ID	X		
6	Mr. Gohmert, TX	X		
7	Ms. González-Colón, PR	X		
8	Mr. Gosar, AZ	X		
9	Mr. Graves, LA			
10	Mr. Hern, OK	X		
11	Mr. Hice, GA			
12	Mr. Johnson, LA			
13	Mr. Lamborn, CO	X		
14	Mr. McClintock, CA	X		
15	Mrs. Radewagen, AS	X		
16	Mr. Webster, FL			
17	Mr. Westerman, AR	X		
18	Mr. Wittman, VA	X		
19	Mr. Young, AK			
	TOTALS	14	20	
	<small>Total: 44 / Quorum: 15 / Report: 23</small>	YEAS	NAYS	PRESENT

The amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Chair Grijalva was adopted by voice vote. The bill, as amended, was ordered favorably reported to the House of Representatives by a roll call vote of 21 yeas and 14 nays, as follows:

Date: July 17, 2019

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES
116th Congress - Roll Call

Bill / Motion: H.R. 1373

Amendment:

Disposition: Final Passage: H.R. 1373, as amended, was adopted and ordered favorably reported to the House of Representatives by a roll call vote of 21 yeas and 14 nays.

	DEM. MEMBERS (25)	YEAS	NAYS	PRESENT
1	Mr. Brown, MD			
2	Mr. Cartwright, PA	X		
3	Mr. Case, HI	X		
4	Mr. Clay, MO	X		
5	Mr. Costa, CA	X		
6	Mr. Cox, CA	X		
7	Mr. Cunningham, SC	X		
8	Ms. DeGette, CO	X		
9	Mrs. Dingell, MI	X		
10	Mr. Gallego, AZ	X		
11	Mr. Grijalva, AZ (Chair)	X		
12	Ms. Haaland, NM	X		
13	Mr. Horsford, NV	X		
14	Mr. Huffman, CA	X		
15	Mr. Levin, CA	X		
16	Mr. Lowenthal, CA	X		
17	Mr. McEachin, VA			
18	Ms. Napolitano, CA	X		
19	Mr. Neguse, CO	X		
20	Mr. Sablan, CNMI	X		
21	Mr. San Nicolas, GU			
22	Mr. Soto, FL			
23	Mr. Van Drew, NJ	X		
24	Mr. Tonko, NY	X		
25	Ms. Velázquez, NY	X		
	REP. MEMBERS (19)	Y	N	P
1	Mr. Bishop, UT (Ranking)		X	
2	Ms. Cheney, WY		X	
3	Mr. Cook, CA		X	
4	Mr. Curtis, UT		X	
5	Mr. Fulcher, ID		X	
6	Mr. Gohmert, TX		X	
7	Ms. González-Colón, PR		X	
8	Mr. Gosar, AZ		X	
9	Mr. Graves, LA			
10	Mr. Hern, OK		X	
11	Mr. Hice, GA			
12	Mr. Johnson, LA			
13	Mr. Lamborn, CO		X	
14	Mr. McClintock, CA		X	
15	Mrs. Radewagen, AS		X	
16	Mr. Webster, FL			
17	Mr. Westerman, AR		X	
18	Mr. Wittman, VA		X	
19	Mr. Young, AK			
	TOTALS	21	14	
	Total: 44 / Quorum: 15 / Report: 23	YEAS	NAYS	PRESENT

HEARINGS

For the purposes of section 103(i) of H. Res. 6 of the 116th Congress—the following hearing was used to develop or consider H.R. 1373: hearing by the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands on H.R. 1373 and H.R. 2181 held on June 5, 2019.

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:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, August 2, 2019.

Hon. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA,
*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. 1373, the Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act.

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

Sincerely,

PHILLIP L. SWAGEL,
Director.

Enclosure.

H.R. 1373, Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act			
As ordered reported by the House Committee on Natural Resources on July 17, 2019			
By Fiscal Year, Millions of Dollars	2019	2019-2024	2019-2029
Direct Spending (Outlays)	0	*	*
Revenues	0	0	0
Increase or Decrease (-) in the Deficit	0	*	*
Spending Subject to Appropriation (Outlays)	0	*	not estimated
Statutory pay-as-you-go procedures apply?	Yes	Mandate Effects	
Increases on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2030?	< \$5 billion	Contains intergovernmental mandate?	No
		Contains private-sector mandate?	No
* = between zero and \$500,000.			

H.R. 1373 would withdraw roughly 1 million acres of federal land in Arizona from mining laws and mineral and geothermal leasing, subject to valid existing rights. That is, the bill would not allow new mining or mineral production on those lands, which are adjacent to Grand Canyon National Park.

Under a public land order issued by the Department of the Interior (DOI), the affected lands are withdrawn from location and entry under mining laws until 2032. CBO estimates that any administrative costs to implement the mineral and geothermal leasing withdrawal would be insignificant; any spending would be subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

Enacting H.R. 1373 could increase direct spending. Payments from mineral and geothermal leasing are classified as offsetting receipts and recorded in the budget as reductions in direct spending. Using information from DOI, CBO expects that the affected land has moderate potential for geothermal resources and could be leased in the future. We estimate that any forgone receipts under the bill would be insignificant over the 2019–2029 period.

CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 1373 would not significantly increase on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2030.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Janani Shankaran. 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 goals and objectives of this bill is to protect, for current and future generations, the watershed, ecosystem, and cultural heritage of the Grand Canyon region in the State of Arizona.

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.

UNFUNDED MANDATES REFORM ACT STATEMENT

This bill contains no unfunded mandates.

EXISTING PROGRAMS

This bill does not establish or reauthorize a program of the federal government known to be duplicative of another program.

APPLICABILITY TO LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The Committee finds that the legislation does not relate to the terms and conditions of employment or access to public services or accommodations within the meaning of section 102(b)(3) of the Congressional Accountability Act.

PREEMPTION OF STATE, LOCAL, OR TRIBAL LAW

Any preemptive effect of this bill over state, local, or tribal law is intended to be consistent with the bill's purposes and text and the Supremacy Clause of Article VI of the U.S. Constitution.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

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

DISSENTING VIEWS

Like many of the bills advanced by Committee Democrats during this Congress, H.R. 1373 is an ideological and partisan bill that will not become law.

H.R. 1373 would permanently lock up approximately 1 million acres of public lands in Northern Arizona. This mistitled and misguided land grab solely impacts lands far outside the Grand Canyon, and concerns the largest tract of uranium deposits in the country.¹ The uranium that is contained in the area is high grade and necessary to help expand the domestic supply of uranium.² In 2017, 93 percent of U.S. demand for uranium was met by foreign imports, despite a large domestic supply.³ Making this land permanently out of bounds for mineral development is a clear threat to American energy security. This is a deeply partisan proposal, and one that exclusively impacts lands outside the lead sponsor's district. The majority of the mining sites impacted by this legislation are located in Congressman Paul Gosar's district. Congressman Gosar has expressed very clear opposition to this bill.

This bill would also have significant economic implications for the people in Northern Arizona. At the June 5, 2019, hearing, the Natural Resources Committee heard testimony from Mohave County Supervisor Buster Johnson, whose county contains significant portions of the land impacted by this legislation. Supervisor Johnson testified that this bill would have a negative economic impact on the rural communities in this part of Arizona where "uranium mining would create jobs during a time with the economy is in need of a boost."⁴ There is enormous potential for good-paying mining jobs that would be made possible by responsible uranium development in this area.

Arizona produces \$6.6 billion in nonfuel minerals, which makes it the second largest State in the production of minerals for the United States.⁵ Restricting access to parts of a mineral-rich State will not only hamper the economic progress of the State, but the national security of the United States. Furthermore, removing the potential for mining in this area would include restrictions on mining on tens of thousands of State Trust lands which help fund

¹Letter to Secretary Zinke from the Congressional Western Caucus, re: Arizona Uranium Mineral Withdrawal. July 27, 2018.

²Roberts, Harold R, Energy Fuels Resource (USA) Inc. Testimony for Public Listening Session on "Government Land Grabs Exposing the Truth". April 11, 2016. [https://gosar.house.gov/sites/gosar.house.gov/files/harold%20r%20roberts%20testimony%20april%2011%202016%20\(2\).pdf](https://gosar.house.gov/sites/gosar.house.gov/files/harold%20r%20roberts%20testimony%20april%2011%202016%20(2).pdf).

³U.S. Energy Information Administration Fact Sheet, "Nuclear Explained." <https://www.eia.gov/energyexplained/index.php?page=nuclear> where.

⁴Johnson, Buster, Mohave County, Supervisor. Testimony for Legislative hearing on H.R. 1373. June 5th, 2019. <https://naturalresources.house.gov/imo/media/doc/Johnson,%20Buster%20-%20Written%20Testimony.pdf>.

⁵U.S. Geological Survey, 2019, Mineral commodity summaries 2019: U.S. Geological Survey, 200 p., <https://doi.org/10.3133/70202434>.

schools and hospitals in Arizona.⁶ Moreover, these million acres would not be the federal land in the area to be restricted in some form; in fact, including the many other designated federal lands in the area, the federal government would be overseeing nearly six million acres of land in Arizona, all of which is restricted for development and negatively impacts the many rural economies in the area.⁷ The Grand Canyon National Park already constitutes \$329.5 million of the more than \$11.5 billion in deferred maintenance costs that the National Park System faces; increasing the amount of land that the federal government manages only exacerbates issues of funding and maintenance.⁸

H.R. 1373 could also jeopardize water quality in the area. A small amount of natural uranium contamination of the Colorado River is occurring as a result of erosion, not due to mining.⁹ Uranium mining and the requisite reclamation of land would benefit the environment and improve water quality. The Arizona Geological Survey has published a report showing that uranium mining in this part of Arizona will not contaminate the Colorado River, the Grand Canyon or any of the surrounding watersheds.¹⁰ Modern mining techniques have been responsibly used in this area, and the land has been reclaimed without any damage.

During markup of H.R. 3195, several amendments offered by Republicans seeking to address flaws in the bill were rejected on largely party line votes. Among these was an amendment to ensure national security concerns were considered, an amendment to exempt lands in Congressman Gosar's district from the bill, and a delay until the U.S. begins obtaining 30% of its uranium from non-hostile sources. Additional proposed changes at the markup included an amendment to ensure that there are no other critical minerals that would be locked away in this area to the legislation, and another amendment that would have required assurance that this legislation would not adversely affect jobs available to Native Americans, other minorities, and women. All of these amendments were rejected by Committee Democrats, and the legislation advanced without a single Republican vote. Sadly, like many of the bills advanced by the Majority so far this Congress, consideration of this bill wasted the times of Members and prevented the consideration of bipartisan legislation that would be easily enacted into law if allowed to advance.

⁶ Atkins, Lisa, Arizona State Land Department, Commissioner. Testimony for Public Listing Session on: "Government Land Grabs: Exposing the Truth" April 11, 2016. <https://gosar.house.gov/sites/gosar.house.gov/files/lisa%20a.%20atkins,%20arizona%20state%201and%20department,%20commissioner.pdf>.

⁷ Davis, Kurt, Arizona Game and Fish Commission, Chairman. Testimony for Public Listing Session on: "Government Land Grabs Exposing the Truth". April 11, 2016. <https://gosar.house.gov/sites/gosar.house.gov/files/monument-davis%20testimony%20-april%2011th%20%20kurt%20davis.pdf>.

⁸ Hamer, Glenn, Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry. Testimony for Public Listing Session on: "Government Land Grabs Exposing the Truth". April 11, 2016. <https://gosar.house.gov/sites/gosar.house.gov/files/glenn%20hamer%20gcwnm%20written%20testimony.pdf>.

⁹ Shaw-Norton, Kelly Arizona Mining Association, President. Testimony for Public Listing Session on "Government Land Grabs Exposing the Truth". April 11, 2016. [https://gosar.house.gov/sites/gosar.house.gov/files/kelly%20norton%20testimony%20for%20field%20hearing.pdfhttps://gosar.house.gov/sites/gosar.house.gov/files/tyler%20carlson%20testimony%20\(jtc1\).pdf](https://gosar.house.gov/sites/gosar.house.gov/files/kelly%20norton%20testimony%20for%20field%20hearing.pdfhttps://gosar.house.gov/sites/gosar.house.gov/files/tyler%20carlson%20testimony%20(jtc1).pdf).

¹⁰ Spencer, J.E., and Wenrich, K (n.d.). *Breccia-Pipe Uranium Mining in the Grand Canyon Region and Implications for Uranium Levels in Colorado River Water* (Rep.).

ROB BISHOP.
DON YOUNG.
PAUL A. GOSAR.
JODY B. HICE.
BRUCE WESTERMAN.
LOUIE GOHMERT.
AUMUA AMATA COLEMAN
RADEWAGEN.
MIKE JOHNSON.

