

(1) in the conveyance of the property under that paragraph—

(A) the County shall pay to the United States the proceeds of the conveyance; and

(B) the Secretary of the Interior may require that all property conveyed under subsection (a) (other than the property sold by the County under paragraph (1)) revert to the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 52, introduced by Senator HATCH, would convey the Minersville State Park to Beaver County, Utah. Representative CHRIS CANNON introduced the companion legislation in the House of Representatives, which has been approved by the Resources Committee.

Minersville State Park is currently owned by the Bureau of Land Management, but leased by the State of Utah for recreation. However, due to budgetary constraints and the park's loss of revenue, the State can no longer afford to manage the park. Considering its importance to the local community, Beaver County indicated its desire to own the park and, with title to the park, would have the flexibility to manage it in an economically feasible manner.

The State of Utah, the Bureau of Land Management, and Beaver County all strongly support this bill; and I urge passage of this noncontroversial measure.

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

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. UDALL of Colorado asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, normally, a proposal to turn over parkland free of charge would raise serious concerns, particularly when the proposal would also allow the new owner to sell off some of the land.

However, in this instance, we are convinced that Beaver County must have a revenue stream if they are to continue operating this local park. This is compromise legislation that will allow the county to sell some acreage in order to maintain the remainder as public open space.

Mr. Speaker, we do not oppose Senate bill 52.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of S. 52, the Senate companion bill to an identical bill I introduced earlier this year. This legislation is important to my constituents, it would allow Beaver County, Utah to obtain and maintain the former Minersville State Park without restrictions.

This legislation would permit county officials to sell a small portion of this land to offset funding needed to operate and maintain the park.

In 1963, the BLM first granted a patent to Beaver County, Utah for the lands that are now part of Minersville State Park, and in 1964, title was transferred to the State of Utah Division of Parks and Recreation.

However, under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act, Utah did not have authority to transfer title. Over the years, the State of Utah has made significant improvements to the Park, including building restrooms, campgrounds, a boat launch ramp, an entrance station, a pavilion and a maintenance building.

Under S. 52, Beaver County would be authorized to sell, at fair market value, portions of the property solely for maintenance and development of the recreational site.

Allowing the county this authority is vital to provide for adequate park maintenance. Currently, the park estimates that it is losing approximately \$90,000 annually.

This legislation gives Beaver County the necessary flexibility to generate revenue for continued use, without which Utah will be forced to close the park.

Minersville State Park is a beautiful recreational site and extremely important to the residents, my constituents, in the surrounding area. Passage of this bill will prevent the park from closing by enabling the county to maintain and operate the park.

S. 52 is important legislation to both Beaver County and to my state of Utah. This legislation passed the Senate unanimously both in the 108th Congress and in late July of this year.

I urge passage of this legislation, it will benefit Utahns and all those who wish to visit this park.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 52.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VALLES CALDERA PRESERVATION ACT OF 2005

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 212) to amend the Valles Caldera Preservation Act to improve the preservation of the Valles Caldera, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 212

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Valles Caldera Preservation Act of 2005".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO THE VALLES CALDERA PRESERVATION ACT.

(a) ACQUISITION OF OUTSTANDING MINERAL INTERESTS.—Section 104(e) of the Valles Caldera Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 698v-2(e)) is amended—

(1) by striking "The acquisition" and inserting the following:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The acquisition";

(2) by striking "The Secretary" and inserting the following:

"(2) ACQUISITION.—The Secretary";

(3) by striking "on a willing seller basis";

(4) by striking "Any such" and inserting the following:

"(3) ADMINISTRATION.—Any such"; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

"(4) AVAILABLE FUNDS.—Any such interests shall be acquired with available funds.

"(5) DECLARATION OF TAKING.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—If negotiations to acquire the interests are unsuccessful by the date that is 60 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall acquire the interests pursuant to section 3114 of title 40, United States Code.

"(B) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—Any difference between the sum of money estimated to be just compensation by the Secretary and the amount awarded shall be paid from the permanent judgment appropriation under section 1304 of title 31, United States Code."

(b) OBLIGATIONS AND EXPENDITURES.—Section 106(e) of the Valles Caldera Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 698v-4(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(4) OBLIGATIONS AND EXPENDITURES.—Subject to the laws applicable to Government corporations, the Trust shall determine—

"(A) the character of, and the necessity for, any obligations and expenditures of the Trust; and

"(B) the manner in which obligations and expenditures shall be incurred, allowed, and paid."

(c) SOLICITATION OF DONATIONS.—Section 106(g) of the Valles Caldera Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 698v-4(g)) is amended by striking "The Trust may solicit" and inserting "The members of the Board of Trustees, the executive director, and 1 additional employee of the Trust in an executive position designated by the Board of Trustees or the executive director may solicit".

(d) USE OF PROCEEDS.—Section 106(h)(1) of the Valles Caldera Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 698v-4(h)(1)) is amended by striking "subsection (g)" and inserting "subsection (g), from claims, judgments, or settlements arising from activities occurring on the Baca Ranch or the Preserve after October 27, 1999."

SEC. 3. BOARD OF TRUSTEES.

Section 107(e) of the Valles Caldera Preservation Act (U.S.C. 698v-5(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking "Trustees" and inserting "Except as provided in paragraph (3), trustees"; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking "Trustees" and inserting the following:

"(A) SELECTION.—Trustees"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(B) COMPENSATION.—On request of the chair, the chair may be compensated at a rate determined by the Board of Trustees, but not to exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of pay for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) in which the chair is engaged in the performance of duties of the Board of Trustees.

"(C) MAXIMUM RATE OF PAY.—The total amount of compensation paid to the chair

for a fiscal year under subparagraph (B) shall not exceed 25 percent of the annual rate of pay for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.”.

SEC. 4. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT.

(a) PROPERTY DISPOSAL LIMITATIONS.—Section 108(c)(3) of the Valles Caldera Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 698v-6(c)(3)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “The Trust may not dispose” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Trust may not dispose”;

(2) in the second sentence, by striking “The Trust” and inserting the following:

“(B) MAXIMUM DURATION.—The Trust”;

(3) in the last sentence, by striking “Any such” and inserting the following:

“(C) TERMINATION.—The”;

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) EXCLUSIONS.—For the purposes of this paragraph, the disposal of real property does not include the sale or other disposal of forage, forest products, or marketable renewable resources.”.

(b) LAW ENFORCEMENT AND FIRE MANAGEMENT.—Section 108(g) of the Valles Caldera Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 698v-6(g)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(1) LAW ENFORCEMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”;

(2) in the second sentence, by striking “The Trust” and inserting the following:

“(B) FEDERAL AGENCY.—The Trust”;

(3) by striking “At the request of the Trust” and all that follows through the end of the paragraph and inserting the following:

“(2) FIRE MANAGEMENT.—

“(A) NON-REIMBURSABLE SERVICES.—

“(i) DEVELOPMENT OF PLAN.—The Secretary shall, in consultation with the Trust, develop a plan to carry out fire preparedness, suppression, and emergency rehabilitation services on the Preserve.

“(ii) CONSISTENCY WITH MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.—The plan shall be consistent with the management program developed pursuant to subsection (d).

“(iii) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.—To the extent generally authorized at other units of the National Forest System, the Secretary shall provide the services to be carried out pursuant to the plan under a cooperative agreement entered into between the Secretary and the Trust.

“(B) REIMBURSABLE SERVICES.—To the extent generally authorized at other units of the National Forest System, the Secretary may provide presuppression and non-emergency rehabilitation and restoration services for the Trust at any time on a reimbursable basis.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

S. 212 was introduced by Senators DOMENICI and BINGAMAN to improve the management of the Valles Caldera National Preserve. In 2000, Congress passed the Valles Caldera Preservation Act, which acquired the Baca Ranch and directed the Secretary of Agriculture to manage it as a preserve.

While mostly successful, there have been some challenges to implementing the law. As a result, S. 212 was introduced to address these challenges and clarify the original intent of the act. Furthermore, it will ensure that the act is fully implemented in a cost-efficient manner.

I support this important legislation.

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

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. UDALL of Colorado asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, my good friend from California has already explained the purpose of Senate bill 212, which is a Senate-passed measure dealing with a conservation unit located in the district of the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), my colleague and cousin.

The Valles Caldera National Preserve, formerly known as the Baca Ranch, was authorized by Congress in 2000 to preserve certain natural, cultural, and recreational resources through a unique management arrangement. Since its establishment, the preserve has undergone some growing pains, which the provisions of S. 212 are intended to help address.

I want to commend the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) for his work and active support in helping to see that the Valles Caldera National Preserve achieves the purposes for which it was established.

Mr. Speaker, we support Senate bill 212 and urge adoption of the legislation by the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield so much time as he may consume to the gentleman from the great State of New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), my cousin.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Colorado yielding.

I rise today in support of the Valles Caldera Preservation Act of 2005. The original Valles Caldera Preservation Act was enacted in the 106th Congress and was signed into law on July 25, 2000.

This act directed the Forest Service to acquire the private Baca Ranch in northern New Mexico, which comprises nearly 95,000 acres. The United States acquired the entire surface estate and an undivided 87½ percent of the mineral estate. Third parties currently hold the outstanding 12½ percent of the mineral interest.

The original act directed the Forest Service to negotiate with the outstanding mineral interest owners for the acquisition of their interests. Un-

fortunately, there is a sizeable difference in what the Forest Service and the mineral rights owners believe to be the fair market value of the outstanding mineral interests; and for the past 5 years, there has been no significant effort to resolve the problem.

I believe that Senate bill 212, sponsored by Senators DOMENICI and BINGAMAN, and passed by the other Chamber on July 26, 2005, provides a reasonable method for resolving the differences in a timely fashion through a condemnation process. The outstanding mineral interest owners have advised each of us that they are in full support of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill, in addition to addressing the outstanding mineral interests, also addresses several issues that have been raised with respect to the administration of the trust. It is my belief that the bill appropriately provides for concerns of the Valles Caldera trust and the administration of the Baca Ranch in furthering the purposes for which these lands were acquired 4 years ago.

I urge my colleagues to support Senate bill 212, the Valles Caldera Preservation Act of 2005.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 212.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDIAN PUEBLO LAND ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 279) to amend the Act of June 7, 1924, to provide for the exercise of criminal jurisdiction.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 279

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

SECTION 1. INDIAN PUEBLO LAND ACT AMENDMENTS.

The Act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 636, chapter 331), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 20. CRIMINAL JURISDICTION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided by Congress, jurisdiction over offenses committed anywhere within the exterior boundaries of any grant from a prior sovereign, as confirmed by Congress or the Court of Private Land Claims to a Pueblo Indian tribe of New Mexico, shall be as provided in this section.

“(b) JURISDICTION OF THE PUEBLO.—The Pueblo has jurisdiction, as an act of the Pueblos’ inherent power as an Indian tribe,