

the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 902.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**TAUNTON, MASSACHUSETTS,  
SPECIAL RESOURCES STUDY ACT**

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1021) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resources study regarding the suitability and feasibility of designating certain historic buildings and areas in Taunton, Massachusetts, as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1021

*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 "Taunton, Massachusetts Special Resources Study Act".

**SEC. 2. FINDINGS.**

Congress finds the following:

(1) The city of Taunton, Massachusetts, is home to 9 distinct historic districts, with more than 600 properties on the National Register of Historic Places. Included among these districts are the Church Green Historic District, the Courthouse Historic District, the Taunton Green Historic District, and the Reed and Barton Historic District.

(2) All of these districts include buildings and building facades of great historical, cultural, and architectural value.

(3) Taunton Green is the site where the Sons of Liberty first raised the Liberty and Union Flag in 1774, an event that helped to spark a popular movement, culminating in the American Revolution, and Taunton citizens have been among the first to volunteer for America's subsequent wars.

(4) Robert Treat Paine, a citizen of Taunton, and the first Attorney General of Massachusetts, was a signer of the Declaration of Independence.

(5) Taunton was a leading community in the Industrial Revolution, and its industrial area has been the site of many innovations in such industries as silver manufacture, paper manufacture, and ship building.

(6) The landscaping of the Courthouse Green was designed by Frederick Law Olmsted, who also left landscaping ideas and plans for other areas in the city which have great value and interest as historical archives and objects of future study.

(7) Main Street, which connects many of the historic districts, is home to the Taunton City Hall and the Leonard Block building, 2 outstanding examples of early 19th Century American architecture, as well as many other historically and architecturally significant structures.

(8) The city and people of Taunton have preserved many artifacts, gravesites, and important documents dating back to 1638 when Taunton was founded.

(9) Taunton was and continues to be an important destination for immigrants from Europe and other parts of the world who have helped to give Southeastern Massachusetts its unique ethnic character.

**SEC. 3. STUDY.**

The Secretary, in consultation with the appropriate State historic preservation officers, State historical societies, the city of Taunton, and other appropriate organizations, shall conduct a special resources study regarding the suitability and feasibility of designating certain historic buildings and areas in Taunton, Massachusetts, as a unit of the National Park System. The study shall be conducted and completed in accordance with section 8(c) of Public Law 91-383 (16 U.S.C. 1a-5(c)) and shall include analysis, documentation, and determinations regarding whether the historic areas in Taunton—

(1) can be managed, curated, interpreted, restored, preserved, and presented as an organic whole under management by the National Park Service or under an alternative management structure;

(2) have an assemblage of natural, historic, and cultural resources that together represent distinctive aspects of American heritage worthy of recognition, conservation, interpretation, and continuing use;

(3) reflect traditions, customs, beliefs, and historical events that are valuable parts of the national story;

(4) provide outstanding opportunities to conserve natural, historic, cultural, architectural, or scenic features;

(5) provide outstanding recreational and educational opportunities; and

(6) can be managed by the National Park Service in partnership with residents, business interests, nonprofit organizations, and State and local governments to develop a unit of the National Park System consistent with State and local economic activity.

**SEC. 4. REPORT.**

Not later than 3 fiscal years after the date on which funds are first made available for this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report on the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the study required under section 3.

**SEC. 5. PRIVATE PROPERTY.**

The recommendations in the report submitted pursuant to section 4 shall include discussion and consideration of the concerns expressed by private landowners with respect to designating certain structures referred to in this Act as a unit of the National Park System.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam 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 Arizona?

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1021 directs the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resources study to determine if certain historic buildings and areas in Taunton, Massachusetts, are suitable

and feasible for designation as a unit of the National Park System. The bill was introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. BARNEY FRANK.

Taunton is a city rich in cultural and historic resources. The city is home to nine historic districts, with more than 600 properties on the National Registry of Historic Places. A comprehensive study of these resources will help to determine if inclusion within the National Park System is appropriate. This study will be completed in consultation with the State historic preservation officer, State Historical Society, and the city of Taunton and other appropriate organizations.

Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate Representative FRANK for his efforts on behalf of this legislation and this community. I would note that identical legislation was approved by the House in the last Congress, and we urge our colleagues to support the measure today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1430

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1021 has been adequately explained by the majority, and we have no objection to this legislation. We also have no other speakers.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1021.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**NATURAL RESOURCE PROTECTION  
COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT ACT**

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 658) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into cooperative agreements to protect natural resources of units of the National Park System through collaborative efforts on land inside and outside of units of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 658

*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 "Natural Resource Protection Cooperative Agreement Act".

**SEC. 2. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS FOR NATIONAL PARK NATURAL RESOURCE PROTECTION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior (referred to in this Act as the “Secretary”) may enter into cooperative agreements with State, local, or tribal governments, other Federal agencies, other public entities, educational institutions, private nonprofit organizations, or participating private landowners for the purpose of protecting natural resources of units of the National Park System through collaborative efforts on land inside and outside of National Park System units.

(b) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—A cooperative agreement entered into under subsection (a) shall provide clear and direct benefits to park natural resources and—

(1) provide for—

(A) the preservation, conservation, and restoration of coastal and riparian systems, watersheds, and wetlands;

(B) preventing, controlling, or eradicating invasive exotic species that are within a unit of the National Park System or adjacent to a unit of the National Park System; or

(C) restoration of natural resources, including native wildlife habitat or ecosystems;

(2) include a statement of purpose demonstrating how the agreement will—

(A) enhance science-based natural resource stewardship at the unit of the National Park System; and

(B) benefit the parties to the agreement;

(3) specify any staff required and technical assistance to be provided by the Secretary or other parties to the agreement in support of activities inside and outside the unit of the National Park System that will—

(A) protect natural resources of the unit of the National Park System; and

(B) benefit the parties to the agreement;

(4) identify any materials, supplies, or equipment and any other resources that will be contributed by the parties to the agreement or by other Federal agencies;

(5) describe any financial assistance to be provided by the Secretary or the partners to implement the agreement;

(6) ensure that any expenditure by the Secretary pursuant to the agreement is determined by the Secretary to support the purposes of natural resource stewardship at a unit of the National Park System; and

(7) include such other terms and conditions as are agreed to by the Secretary and the other parties to the agreement.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—The Secretary shall not use any funds associated with an agreement entered into under subsection (a) for the purposes of land acquisition, regulatory activity, or the development, maintenance, or operation of infrastructure, except for ancillary support facilities that the Secretary determines to be necessary for the completion of projects or activities identified in the agreement.

(d) FUNDING.—Funds available to carry out the provisions of this Act shall be limited to programs and amounts specified in the statute for such use in the annual appropriation Act for the National Park Service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members 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 Arizona?

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 658 is an administration proposal introduced by Representative JON PORTER of Nevada. The bill would authorize the National Park Service to enter into cooperative agreements to spend Park Service funds outside of existing Park boundaries.

According to a report from the Government Accountability Office, the National Park Service is the only Federal land management agency that does not currently have that authority.

While there are several areas in which such cooperative agreements would be useful, the ability to participate in coordinated plans to eradicate invasive species in and around national parks is the primary reason that the National Park Service is seeking this authority.

Under the terms of this legislation, the National Park Service could enter into such agreements with State, local or tribal governments, with other public entities, educational institutions, private nonprofit organizations, or participating private landowners. The legislation requires that any such cooperative agreements provide clear benefits to park resources.

Madam Speaker, I would note this legislation does not authorize any new funding.

I thank my colleague from Nevada for his effort, and we support passage of H.R. 658 by the House today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 658, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 658 was introduced by the very effective Congressman from Nevada, JON PORTER, and would authorize the National Park Service to enter into a cooperative agreement with willing partners to protect park natural resources through collaborative efforts on land inside and outside of units of the National Park System. This was recommended by the Government Accountability Office, as the Park Service is still the only land management agency without this particular authority. So we expect this will help control the spread of invasive species and increase the protection of parks and wildlife.

At this point, Madam Speaker, I would like to engage the majority bill manager, Mr. GRIJALVA, in a colloquy to clarify an issue related to this bill, if he would.

I understand that the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies has brought to the committee's attention their concern that H.R. 658 not be interpreted to give the National

Park Service authority to manage fish and wildlife outside park boundaries.

Management authority for fish and wildlife resources within State boundaries has customarily been held in trust by the respective States. Congress has repeatedly affirmed this. This trust responsibility has been implemented primarily through State fish and wildlife agencies. In general, these principles are expressed in relevant fish and wildlife policies of the Department of the Interior found in volume 43 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 24.

Can the chairman of the subcommittee please clarify that the States' existing authority to manage fish and wildlife is not affected by H.R. 658?

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I thank the gentleman, and I agree with the gentleman from Utah on his description of Federal and State authorities to manage fish and wildlife resources.

I also agree that we should promote better coordination and cooperation between the Federal Government and the States to enhance our fish and wildlife resources for future generations, especially for the control of invasive species. I assure my colleague that nothing in H.R. 658 diminishes or enlarges the authority of the Federal Government or any State for the conservation and management of fish and wildlife.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his assurances, and with that, I urge adoption of the bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER), the author of this very good piece of legislation.

Mr. PORTER. Madam Speaker, invasive animal and plant species know no boundaries. That is why I introduced H.R. 658, the Natural Resource Protection Cooperative Agreement Act.

The passage of this legislation today has significance to my district, given the recent infestation at Lake Mead of quagga mussels. These are a species capable of causing massive destruction and billions of dollars in damages. The quagga mussel is a resilient species that multiplies at exponential rates and can cause enormous ecological, recreational, and economic damage. In recent years, the mussel has caused an estimated \$5 billion in damages to the Great Lakes region.

As the law currently exists, the National Park Service does not have the legal authority to enter into cooperative agreements with neighboring States and local governments or private entities. Rather, the Park Service

must wait until invasive species cross into their lands and waterways before they can be dealt with.

Part of responsible stewardship of our local environment is being proactive and not merely responsive to new ecological challenges. H.R. 658 enables the National Park Service to take preventative measures in order to preserve our lands and natural resources.

By entering into cooperative agreements with State and local experts, we will be able to eradicate invasive species before they encroach onto Federal lands. We have an obligation to our children and to our community to be responsible stewards of our local environment.

I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for working in a bipartisan manner on this very important issue.

I also want to thank my constituent Ann Schreiber in Nevada who has worked so hard to eradicate invasive plant life in my district and recognizes the importance of meeting these challenges head-on.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, we have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 658.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### CONVEYANCE OF LAND BY THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT TO PARK CITY, UTAH

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 838) to provide for the conveyance of the Bureau of Land Management parcels known as the White Acre and Gambel Oak properties and related real property to Park City, Utah, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 838

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

#### SECTION 1. CONVEYANCE OF LAND BY THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT TO PARK CITY, UTAH.

(a) LAND TRANSFER.—Notwithstanding the planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), the Secretary of the Interior shall convey, not later

than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, to Park City, Utah, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to two parcels of real property located in Park City, Utah, that are currently under the management jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management and designated as parcel 8 (commonly known as the White Acre parcel) and parcel 16 (commonly known as the Gambel Oak parcel). The conveyance shall be subject to all valid existing rights.

(b) DEED RESTRICTION.—The conveyance of the lands under subsection (a) shall be made by a deed or deeds containing a restriction requiring that the lands be maintained as open space and used solely for public recreation purposes or other purposes consistent with their maintenance as open space. This restriction shall not be interpreted to prohibit the construction or maintenance of recreational facilities, utilities, or other structures that are consistent with the maintenance of the lands as open space or its use for public recreation purposes.

(c) CONSIDERATION.—In consideration for the transfer of the land under subsection (a), Park City shall pay to the Secretary of the Interior an amount consistent with conveyances to governmental entities for recreational purposes under the Act of June 14, 1926 (commonly known as the Recreation and Public Purposes Act; 43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.).

#### SEC. 2. SALE OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND IN PARK CITY, UTAH, AT AUCTION.

(a) SALE OF LAND.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall offer for sale any right, title, or interest of the United States in and to two parcels of real property located in Park City, Utah, that are currently under the management jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management and are designated as parcels 17 and 18 in the Park City, Utah, area. The sale of the land shall be carried out in accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701) and other applicable law, other than the planning provisions of sections 202 and 203 of such Act (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), and shall be subject to all valid existing rights.

(b) METHOD OF SALE.—The sale of the land under subsection (a) shall be consistent with subsections (d) and (f) of section 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1713) through a competitive bidding process and for not less than fair market value.

#### SEC. 3. DISPOSITION OF LAND SALES PROCEEDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—All proceeds derived from the sale of the lands described in this Act shall be deposited in a special account in the treasury of the United States and shall be available without further appropriation to the Secretary of the Interior until expended for—

(1) the reimbursement of costs incurred by the Bureau of Land Management in implementing the provisions of this Act, including surveys, appraisals, and compliance with applicable Federal laws; and

(2) environmental restoration projects on Bureau of Land Management administered public lands within the Salt Lake City Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management.

(b) INVESTMENT OF SPECIAL ACCOUNT.—Any amounts deposited in the special account shall earn interest in an amount determined by the Secretary of the Treasury on the basis of the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities, and may be expended according to the provisions of this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gen-

tleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members 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 Arizona?

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 838, sponsored by the ranking member of the National Parks, Forests and Public Lands Subcommittee, Representative Rob Bishop, is intended to preserve existing open space in Park City, Utah. The bill would transfer two parcels of land owned by the Bureau of Land Management to Park City, with a deed restriction that the land be maintained as open space. Park City will pay fair-market value for the land.

Two other parcels in the area owned by the BLM are encumbered with unpatented mining claims. The bill directs that these parcels, which the BLM had previously identified for disposal, be sold at auction, subject to any valid existing rights, to resolve these outstanding issues. Park City is expected to bid for these properties at the auction.

It is our understanding that Park City has undertaken an aggressive campaign to maintain open space and that the citizens of Park City have proven their commitment by approving a local bond initiative to fund this project.

We applaud Park City's efforts and congratulate Representative BISHOP for working hard to bring this legislation to the floor.

Madam Speaker, identical legislation was approved by the House in the 109th Congress. We support passage of H.R. 838 and urge its adoption by the House today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 838 and yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 838 conveys to Park City about 110 acres of Bureau of Land Management land that was previously marked for disposal. This land would be used by Park City as recreational open space. The residents of Park City have placed a premium on preserving this space for the character of their resort town; and as the chairman accurately said, they have approved a \$20 million bond to purchase this environmentally sensitive land. The conveyance of this is consistent with Park City's long-range plan to protect its sensitive landscape.

Park City hosted many of the events of the 2002 Olympics, and visitors from around the world visit there to ski and