

Mr. Speaker, once again I am pleased to present to the House H.R. 1836, a bill introduced by the gentleman from New York, MIKE FORBES, to add a 98-acre oceanfront parcel of land to the Long Island National Wildlife Refuge.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious this bill was passed by the House on another occasion. It was sent over to the Senate, and it is back with an amendment. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the bill in its current form.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to once again present to the House H.R. 1836, a bill introduced by Congressman MIKE FORBES to add a 98-acre ocean-front parcel of land to the Long Island National Wildlife Refuge.

This legislation was overwhelmingly adopted in the House on April 23 of this year, and was approved by the other body on May 3. While the other body had no objection to the provisions of H.R. 1836, the text of H.R. 2005 was added to this measure and it is, therefore, necessary for the House to once again act affirmatively before sending this proposal to the President.

H.R. 2005 was unanimously approved by the House on October 30, 1995, and this non-controversial measure will correct a mapping error in the Coastal Barrier Resources System.

In 1982, when unit NY-59P was created, a portion of privately owned land was incorrectly mapped as being part of an adjacent "otherwise protected area", the Fire Island National Seashore. This 88-acre tract is owned by a private homeowners group, the Point O'Woods Association, and has never been part of the National Seashore. This small, but important change in the Coastal Barrier Resources System has broad bipartisan support and has been endorsed by the administration.

Finally, I would like to compliment the gentleman from New York [MIKE FORBES] for his outstanding leadership in this matter. MIKE is the author of both H.R. 1836 and H.R. 2005 and he has done an outstanding job of not only gaining support for these measures but also representing his constituents in a most effective manner.

I urge an aye vote on H.R. 1836.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1836 and the Senate amendment thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

#### WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH ACT OF 1984 AUTHORIZATION EXTENSION

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1743) to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 to extend the authorizations of appropriations through fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Senate Amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

#### SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Section 102 of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10301) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting " , productivity of natural resources and agricultural systems," after "environmental quality";

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking "and" at the end;

(3) in paragraph (7), by striking the period at the end and inserting " ; and"; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

"(8) long-term planning and policy development are essential to ensure the availability of an abundant supply of high quality water for domestic and other uses; and

"(9) the States must have the research and problem-solving capacity necessary to effectively manage their water resources."

#### SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

Section 103 of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10302) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by striking "to"; and

(B) by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting " ; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(7) encourage long-term planning and research to meet future water management, quality, and supply challenges."

#### SEC. 3. GRANTS; MATCHING FUNDS.

Section 104(c) of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303(c)) is amended by striking "one non-Federal dollar" and all that follows through "thereafter" and inserting "2 non-Federal dollars for every 1 Federal dollar".

#### SEC. 4. GENERAL AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 104(f)(1) of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303(f)(1)) is amended by striking "of \$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending September 30, 1989, through September 30, 1995," and inserting "of \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 1996, \$7,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1997 and 1998, and \$9,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 and 2000".

#### SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR RESEARCH FOCUSED ON WATER PROBLEMS OF INTERSTATE NATURE.

The first sentence of section 104(g)(1) of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303(g)(1)) is amended by striking "of \$5,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994, and 1995" and inserting "of \$3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1996 through 2000".

#### SEC. 6. COORDINATION.

Section 104 of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(h) COORDINATION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—To carry out this Act, the Secretary—

"(A) shall encourage other Federal departments, agencies (including agencies within the Department of the Interior), and instrumentalities to use and take advantage of the

expertise and capabilities that are available through the institutes established by this section, on a cooperative or other basis;

"(B) shall encourage cooperation and coordination with other Federal programs concerned with water resources problems and issues;

"(C) may enter into contracts, cooperative agreements, and other transactions without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5);

"(D) may accept funds from other Federal departments, agencies (including agencies within the Department of the Interior), and instrumentalities to pay for and add to grants made, and contracts entered into, by the Secretary;

"(E) may promulgate such regulations as the Secretary considers appropriate; and

"(F) may support a program of internships for qualified individuals at the undergraduate and graduate levels to carry out the educational and training objectives of this Act.

"(2) REPORT.—The Secretary shall report to Congress annually on coordination efforts with other Federal departments, agencies, and instrumentalities under paragraph (1).

"(3) RELATIONSHIP TO STATE RIGHTS.—Nothing in this Act shall preempt the rights and authorities of any State with respect to its water resources or management of those resources."

Mr. DOOLITTLE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California.

There be no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] for a brief explanation of the matter.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STUDDS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, the primary intent of H.R. 1743 is to extend the authorization for the State Water Resources Research Institutes. There are 54 of these institutes located at the land grant university in each of the 50 States and several of the territories. These institutes are a primary link between the academic community, the water-related personnel, and the Federal and State governments and the private sector.

H.R. 1743 would expand the act's findings and focus on the need for long-term planning and policy development and maintaining productivity of national resources and agricultural systems. In the fiscal year 1996 interior appropriations conference, there was a request to introduce an additional element of competition into this program. Subsequent discussions resulted in the USGS crafting a competitive element of the program, which takes funding out of the grants to the States and creates a competitive regional program.

Unfortunately, it did not leave adequate base funding for the State program. While the House-passed version of H.R. 1743 authorizing the program does not require a competitive element, the Senate amended this bill to specifically reauthorize the separate competitive regional program which had historically been a part of this program, thereby leaving the State-based program authorized by the House intact. We concur with this approach, and in adopting the Senate-passed language, endorse that approach, providing a competitive element to this program.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the minority for the extensive cooperation we have had from their side on this very broadly based, bipartisan-supported bill. I would urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1743.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### URANIUM MILL TAILINGS RADIATION CONTROL ACT OF 1978 AUTHORIZATION EXTENSION

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2967) to extend the authorization of the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2967

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. REFERENCE.

Whenever in this Act (other than in section 3) an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978.

#### SEC. 2. TERMINATION; AUTHORIZATION.

Section 112(a) (42 U.S.C. 7922(a)) is amended to read as follows:

“(a)(1) The authority of the Secretary to perform remedial action under this title shall terminate on September 30, 1998, except that—

“(A) the authority of the Secretary to perform groundwater restoration activities under this title is without limitation, and

“(B) the Secretary may continue operation of the disposal site in Mesa County, Colorado (known as the Cheney disposal cell) for re-

ceiving and disposing of residual radioactive material from processing sites and of byproduct material from property in the vicinity of the uranium milling site located in Monticello, Utah, until the Cheney disposal cell has been filled to the capacity for which it was designed, or September 30, 2023, whichever comes first.

“(2) For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘byproduct material’ has the meaning given that term in section 11e(2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2014(e)(2)).”

#### SEC. 3. REMEDIAL ACTION AT ACTIVE PROCESSING SITES.

(a) SECTION 1001.—Section 1001 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 2296a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)(A), by striking “\$5.50” and inserting “\$6.25”;

(2) in subsection (b)(2)(B), by striking “\$270,000,000” and inserting “\$350,000,000”;

(3) in subsection (b)(2)(C), by striking “\$40,000,000” and inserting “\$65,000,000”;

(4) in subsection (b)(2)(E)(i), by striking “\$5.50” and inserting “\$6.25”; and

(5) in subsection (b)(2)(E)(ii), by striking “\$5.50” and inserting “\$6.25”.

(b) SECTION 1003.—Section 1003 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2296a-2) is amended by striking “\$310,000,000” and inserting “\$415,000,000”.

#### SEC. 4. REMEDIAL ACTION FOR THE DISPOSAL OF RADIOACTIVE MATERIALS.

(a) SECTION 104.—Section 104(d) (42 U.S.C. 4914(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘site’ does not include any property described in section 101(6)(B) which is in a State which the Secretary has certified has a program which would achieve the purposes of this subsection.”

(b) SECTION 108.—Section 108(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 7918(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “Residual radioactive material from a processing site designated under this title may be disposed of at a facility licensed under title II under the administrative and technical requirements of such title. Disposal of such material at such a site in accordance with such requirements shall be considered to have been done in accordance with the administrative and technical requirements of this title.”

(c) SECTION 115.—Section 115(a) (42 U.S.C. 7925(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “This subsection does not prohibit the disposal of residual radioactive material from a processing site under this title at a site licensed under title II or the expenditure of funds under this title for such disposal.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] each will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER].

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. SCHAEFER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2967 reauthorizes the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act, the 1978 law which has been cleaning up the radioactive contamination created by uranium milling operations. The program has been a valuable and generally successful endeavor, and has already completed remediation at a number of uranium milling sites, many of which had been abandoned and at which mill tailings were simply left out on the open ground.

At title I sites, all of the contamination was generated by Federal activities. For the most part, the tailings were created in the process of obtaining supplies of uranium for the Manhattan Project, which produced America's first nuclear weapons. It is fitting that the Federal Government should be responsible for cleaning up these wastes, and the statute maintains a 90 percent Federal, 10 percent State split for remediation of these sites. Title II sites encompass a range of areas which have combined tailings of both Federal and private responsibility. At those sites, the private owners remediated the contamination, then are reimbursed by the Government for that share of tailings which can be traced to Federal activities.

The bill before us extends the authority for title I cleanup from 1996 to 1998. DOE is confident that all its title I sites can be cleaned up by that time. The bill also incorporates a number of changes to ensure that the program can continue to function in an efficient and responsible manner. First, the bill includes an authorization for DOE to keep one of its title I disposal cells open for the receipt of additional tailings from its Grand Junction and Monticello sites. Second, it increases the authorization of expenditures for the Government's share of its costs at title II sites, so that the Federal Government bears a more equitable share of its financial responsibility at these sites. Third, the bill clears up an ambiguity in the current statute to ensure that title I tailings can be disposed of at licensed title II sites. Finally, H.R. 2967 gives the DOE flexibility with the current statute's deed annotation requirement if the affected State has a sufficient program of landowner notification already in place. All of these changes will be of great benefit to the program, and were worked out in a very bipartisan manner within the Commerce Committee. In that regard, I would especially like to thank Mr. DINGELL and the ranking member of the Energy and Power Subcommittee, Mr. PALLONE, for their efforts to move this bill forward. I would also like to thank Mr. HASTERT for his contributions and involvement in this important issue.

Without this legislation DOE will be unable to continue its cleanup of the remaining title I sites. H.R. 2967 is a responsible measure—a positive measure—which allows the Federal Government to continue to clean up its environmental liabilities at uranium mill sites. I strongly recommend the bill's approval by the House.

□ 1515

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer my support for H.R. 2967. The legislation was considered in the Committee on Commerce and voted out with full support from both sides of the aisle.