

States embassies and other diplomatic facilities worldwide, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 228. A bill to establish the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 29

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 29, a bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for automatic continuing resolutions.

S. 43

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 43, a bill to require that any debt limit increase be balanced by equal spending cuts of the next decade.

S. 47

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 47, a bill to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.

S. 56

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 56, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the credit for employers establishing workplace child care facilities, to increase the child care credit to encourage greater use of quality child care services, to provide incentives for students to earn child care-related degrees and to work in child care facilities, and to increase the exclusion for employer-provided dependent care assistance.

S. 82

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 82, a bill to provide that any executive action infringing on the Second Amendment has no force or effect, and to prohibit the use of funds for certain purposes.

S. 84

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) were added as cosponsors of S. 84, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 109

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 109, a bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects.

S. 113

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 113, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require certain creditors to obtain certifications from institutions of higher education, and for other purposes.

S. 114

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 114, a bill to amend title 11, United States Code, with respect to certain exceptions to discharge in bankruptcy.

S. 123

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 123, a bill to modernize voter registration, promote access to voting for individuals with disabilities, protect the ability of individuals to exercise the right to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes.

S. 128

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 128, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve education and prevention related to campus sexual violence, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

S. 153

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 153, a bill to amend section 520J of the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for mental health first aid training programs.

S. 157

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 157, a bill to provide for certain improvements to the Denali National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes.

S. 162

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 162, a bill to reauthorize and improve the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Act of 2004.

S. 177

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of S. 177, a bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 entirely.

S. 183

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) were added

as cosponsors of S. 183, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for fairness in hospital payments under the Medicare program.

S. 190

At the request of Mr. JOHANNIS, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 190, a bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds for certain activities of the National Labor Relation Board and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

S. 192

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 192, a bill to enhance the energy security of United States allies, and for other purposes.

S. 200

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 200, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the interment in national cemeteries under the control of the National Cemetery Administration of individuals who served in combat support of the Armed Forces in the Kingdom of Laos between February 28, 1961, and May 15, 1975, and for other purposes.

S. 204

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 204, a bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities.

S. 207

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. 207, a bill to restrict the sale, lease, transfer, retransfer, or delivery of F-16 aircraft, M1 tanks, or certain other defense articles or services to the Government of Egypt.

S. RES. 24

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 24, a resolution commemorating the 10-year anniversary of the loss of the Space Shuttle Columbia.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 208. A bill to require the Federal Aviation Administration to prescribe regulations to reduce helicopter noise pollution in residential areas in Los Angeles County, California; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Los Angeles Residential Helicopter Noise Relief Act of 2013.

This legislation, which I introduce with Senator BOXER, would require the

Federal Aviation Administration to prescribe regulations for helicopter operations in the skies above Los Angeles in order to reduce helicopter noise pollution in residential areas.

In addition to addressing noise, the FAA's regulations would have to increase safety, minimize commercial aircraft delays, and exempt first responders and military aircraft from their limitations.

The bill also would direct the FAA to consult with local communities and local helicopter operators when developing the regulations.

This legislation is necessary because today the citizens of Los Angeles County suffer intrusive and disruptive low-flying helicopter traffic above their neighborhoods to an unprecedented degree.

The unique terrain of Los Angeles, with its many canyons and valleys, often concentrates the high decibel level noise from low-flying helicopters on many of the millions of homes in the county.

The noise interrupts daily life for Los Angeles County's residents, drowning out conversations and disrupting sleep cycles.

Despite multiple efforts from several community and homeowner organizations in Los Angeles County to address these disturbances over many years, helicopter traffic in Los Angeles County is not currently regulated by the Federal Aviation Administration or any other agency.

As one expert recently explained to *The Los Angeles Times*, a helicopter pilot is free to hover over a person's home for as many hours as he would like. The only limitation on helicopter hovering, in fact, appears to be fuel supply.

Last year, at my request the Senate Appropriations Committee directed the Federal Aviation Administration to begin developing solutions to this matter.

In response, the Federal Aviation Administration formed an internal working group in July 2012 to solicit input from local communities and stakeholders on helicopter noise and safety issues in Los Angeles County.

As part of that process, FAA Regional Administrator Bill Withycombe hosted several public meetings in the summer and fall of 2012 that have allowed stakeholders and citizens to express their concerns and propose solutions.

The Federal Aviation Administration will release a report in May 2013 evaluating a full set of voluntary and regulatory options to reduce helicopter noise and address safety issues in Los Angeles County.

The study is a necessary first step in order to determine how helicopters can be regulated in Los Angeles County in a manner that provides relief to residents from helicopter noise and increase safety.

But the study is only a first step. It must be followed by meaningful and ef-

fective regulations to limit the impacts of these helicopters. I introduce this legislation in order to ensure that the FAA will follow through on the regulatory options it plans to evaluate in its May 2013 report.

This legislation directs the FAA to act in the interest of the millions of Americans in Los Angeles County. I appreciate the steps the FAA has taken to date, but only regulations appear capable of addressing the quality of life impact caused by helicopters in Los Angeles.

Last August, thousands of people sat in the stands of the Hollywood Bowl for a night of Beethoven.

Nestled into the Hollywood Hills and with little sign of the Nation's second largest city that surrounds it, the Hollywood Bowl is a unique spot to take in a concert.

But just as violinist Renaud Capuçon stood for a solo, an unidentified helicopter flew overhead, drowning out the sound of his music.

It was an upsetting event for the audience, but it is far from unusual.

The people of Los Angeles have had too many wonderful outdoor concerts and other cultural events disrupted by helicopters that fly without restriction.

Choppers in L.A.'s sky have caused too many sleepless nights.

Paparazzi helicopters have too often flown dangerously low and close to homes in their constant pursuit of celebrity images.

The air space above Los Angeles is the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Aviation Administration, so to bring some sanity to the skies above L.A. requires Federal action, and Federal leadership.

This legislation directs the FAA to provide that leadership necessary to protect the public interest.

I encourage my colleagues to support it, and I look forward to working with my fellow members to enact this important legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 208

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 "Los Angeles Residential Helicopter Noise Relief Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Residents throughout Los Angeles County suffer intrusive and disruptive low-flying helicopter traffic above their neighborhoods. The unique terrain of canyons and valleys that surround residential neighborhoods in Los Angeles County often concentrate high decibel level noise from the low-flying helicopters in and around Los Angeles County residences. The concentrated noise interrupts daily life for many Los Angeles County residents by drowning out conversations and disrupting sleep cycles.

(2) Los Angeles County is home to a uniquely large concentration of scenic, historic, entertainment, and transportation venues, including sight-seeing, movie studios, movie star homes, outdoor entertainment facilities, Griffith Park, the Hollywood Sign, freeways, and many others, that generate extensive helicopter activity.

(3) Los Angeles County is home to the world's leading civil helicopter manufacturer that conducts extensive helicopter operational testing across the region.

(4) Despite multiple efforts from several community and homeowner organizations in Los Angeles County to address these disturbances, helicopter traffic in Los Angeles County is not currently regulated by the Federal Aviation Administration or any other agency.

(5) At the request of members of Congress, the Federal Aviation Administration formed an internal working group in July 2012 to solicit input from local communities and stakeholders on helicopter noise and safety issues in Los Angeles County.

(6) As part of that process, several public meetings were held in the fall and summer of 2012 that have allowed the Federal Aviation Administration and stakeholders to hear and better understand the concerns and complaints of affected residents.

(7) The Federal Aviation Administration is scheduled to release a report in May 2013 evaluating a full set of voluntary and regulatory options to reduce helicopter noise and address safety issues in Los Angeles County.

(8) The report is expected to explore how helicopters can be regulated in Los Angeles County in a manner that provides relief to residents from helicopter noise while also meeting the needs of relevant stakeholders, including first responders.

SEC. 3. REGULATIONS TO REDUCE HELICOPTER NOISE POLLUTION IN CERTAIN RESIDENTIAL AREAS.

(a) **RULEMAKING.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall prescribe regulations for helicopter operations in Los Angeles County, California, that include requirements relating to the flight paths and altitudes associated with such operations to reduce helicopter noise pollution in residential areas, increase safety, and minimize scheduled commercial aircraft delays.

(b) **EXEMPTIONS.**—In prescribing regulations under subsection (a), the Administrator shall exempt helicopter operations related to emergency, law enforcement, or military activities from the requirements described in that subsection.

(c) **CONSULTATIONS.**—In prescribing regulations under subsection (a), the Administrator shall make reasonable efforts to consult with local communities and local helicopter operators in order to develop regulations that meet the needs of local communities, helicopter operators, and the Federal Aviation Administration.

By Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. VITTER):

S. 215. A bill to ensure that the Federal Reserve conducts its policies to ensure long-term price stability and a low rate of inflation; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I am here today to introduce the Federal Reserve Mandate Act of 2013 in an effort to begin returning our country to the right place in monetary policy. Senator VITTER is joining me in this effort.

The objective of our bill is simple. Our Central Bank, like other Central Banks around the world, should be focused on creating an environment of price stability. This should be the guiding principle of monetary policy decisions.

This is neither a radical nor a new idea. Most economists argue that the proper role of the Central Bank is to serve as a lender of last resort in a time of crisis, to supply payment distribution and clearing mechanisms, and to manage the money supply so that inflation stays in check. Managing unemployment is a completely separate task and not appropriate for the blunt tools of monetary policy. That is why almost every developed country's Central Bank has as its mandate the maintenance of price stability. In other words, we are an outlier.

This is not to say that a focus on price stability means the Fed is abandoning unemployment. In fact, just the opposite is true. Monetary policy can and should create an environment where jobs can grow and thrive by giving the economy certainty that prices will remain stable over the long term.

We have strayed a long way from traditional Central Bank actions. We have lost sight of the proper role of monetary policy in our economy. With roughly \$3 trillion in assets—and I think the Presiding Officer knows that by the end of this year it is projected we will have \$4 trillion in assets—sitting on the Fed's balance sheet, there is no question that the Fed is distorting financial markets with multiple rounds of quantitative easing. At a minimum, we have completely lost price signals from instruments such as treasuries and mortgage-backed securities. It is likely, however, we are doing more damage than just that. We may be creating asset bubbles elsewhere as money moves into investments that are risky.

We are also punishing savers. Purchasing assets to drive down rates forces pension funds and retirees to shift money into asset classes that may not be best for them. We are creating "Fed addicts" in our markets. Equity markets go through cycles where they become almost Fed obsessed. In these environments, good news is bad for equity markets because it means less QE buying. Meanwhile, bad economic news is good for markets because it means more easy money is on the way. Now we risk the perils of unwinding this policy.

Economists are beginning to discuss the likelihood that the Fed will take significant losses on assets it has purchased. We just had one of the Fed Governors in our office last week sharing with us that as we begin unwinding these balance sheets, it is very likely, as the Presiding Officer can imagine, as interest rates go up and the Fed begins to buy these securities, we are going to lose money on those assets. So it is likely the Fed is going to take sig-

nificant losses on the assets it purchased. Since the Fed is buying these bonds at record low yields, they will likely sell them down the road at higher yields. I don't think there is anybody right now who disagrees with that probability.

The effect of this is a permanent increase in monetary supplies. This is an incredibly perverse situation we have now locked ourselves into.

The employment mandate at the Fed has not always existed. A lot of people believe it has. It was added with the passage of the Humphrey-Hawkins Act in 1978. Humphrey-Hawkins was passed in a moment of self-congratulations, like a lot of things around here are passed. Congress patted itself on the back for "ending unemployment." Obviously, nothing could be further from the truth. The Fed cannot end unemployment by printing money.

The Central Bank should be tasked with maintaining price stability. We must return to this core principle. This is the reason we are offering this piece of legislation today.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 224. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish a grant program to support the restoration of San Francisco Bay; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise on behalf of myself and Senator BOXER to introduce legislation to further the restoration of the San Francisco Bay.

Over the last 150 years, the water quality and health of the San Francisco Bay Estuary have been diminished by pollution, invasive species, loss of wetland habitat and other factors. The degradation has not only impacted fish and wildlife, but has also reduced the estuary's ability to support important economic activities such as commercial and sport fishing, shipping, agriculture, recreation, and tourism.

Federal funding in recent years has begun the Bay's recovery process by investing in projects which improve water quality and restore critical habitat. These investments, \$28 million between 2008 and 2012 by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency alone, were critical to spurring \$22 million in matching funds and leveraging \$81 million from other partners. But much work remains.

That is why I am pleased to introduce the San Francisco Bay Restoration Act with Senator BOXER, Chairwoman of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee. Companion legislation will also be introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives by Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER.

This bill was first introduced in the 112th Congress. The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works reported favorably on the bill and recommended its passage on January 26, 2012.

This bill recognizes the important restoration work that must be done to restore and protect the iconic San Francisco Bay by authorizing \$5 million a year for restoration work between 2013 and 2017, and prioritizing funding for projects that will protect and restore vital estuarine habitat for migratory waterfowl, shorebirds, and wildlife; improve and restore water quality and rearing habitat for fish; and in turn reinvigorate recreation, tourism, and agricultural activities in and around the bay.

I urge my colleagues to join me in their support for this measure.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 224

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 "San Francisco Bay Restoration Act".

SEC. 2. SAN FRANCISCO BAY RESTORATION GRANT PROGRAM.

Title I of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 123. SAN FRANCISCO BAY RESTORATION GRANT PROGRAM.

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) ANNUAL PRIORITY LIST.—The term 'annual priority list' means the annual priority list compiled under subsection (b).

"(2) COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.—The term 'comprehensive plan' means—

"(A) the comprehensive conservation and management plan approved under section 320 for the San Francisco Bay estuary; and

"(B) any amendments to that plan.

"(3) ESTUARY PARTNERSHIP.—The term 'Estuary Partnership' means the San Francisco Estuary Partnership, the entity that is designated as the management conference under section 320.

"(b) ANNUAL PRIORITY LIST.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—After providing public notice, the Administrator shall annually compile a priority list identifying and prioritizing the activities, projects, and studies intended to be funded with the amounts made available under subsection (c).

"(2) INCLUSIONS.—The annual priority list compiled under paragraph (1) shall include—

"(A) activities, projects, or studies, including restoration projects and habitat improvement for fish, waterfowl, and wildlife, that advance the goals and objectives of the approved comprehensive plan;

"(B) information on the activities, projects, programs, or studies specified under subparagraph (A), including a description of—

"(i) the identities of the financial assistance recipients; and

"(ii) the communities to be served; and

"(C) the criteria and methods established by the Administrator for selection of activities, projects, and studies.

"(3) CONSULTATION.—In developing the priority list under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall consult with and consider the recommendations of—

"(A) the Estuary Partnership;

"(B) the State of California and affected local governments in the San Francisco Bay estuary watershed; and

"(C) any other relevant stakeholder involved with the protection and restoration of the San Francisco Bay estuary that the Administrator determines to be appropriate.

“(c) GRANT PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to section 320, the Administrator may provide funding through cooperative agreements, grants, or other means to State and local agencies, special districts, and public or nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations, including the Estuary Partnership, for activities, studies, or projects identified on the annual priority list.

“(2) MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF GRANTS; NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—

“(A) MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF GRANTS.—Amounts provided to any individual or entity under this section for a fiscal year shall not exceed an amount equal to 75 percent of the total cost of any eligible activities that are to be carried out using those amounts.

“(B) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the total cost of any eligible activities that are carried out using amounts provided under this section shall be—

“(i) not less than 25 percent; and

“(ii) provided from non-Federal sources.

“(d) FUNDING.—

“(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator to carry out this section \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017.

“(2) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Of the amount made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year, the Administrator shall use not more than 5 percent to pay administrative expenses incurred in carrying out this section.

“(3) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER FUNDING.—Nothing in this section limits the eligibility of the Estuary Partnership to receive funding under section 320(g).

“(4) PROHIBITION.—No amounts made available under subsection (c) may be used for the administration of a management conference under section 320.”

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 225. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of alternatives for commemorating and interpreting the role of the Buffalo Soldiers in the early years of the National Parks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of myself and Senator BOXER to introduce the Buffalo Soldiers in the National Parks Study Act. This legislation is an important step in preserving the legacy of the Army's first all-black infantry and cavalry units and their unique role in the creation of our National Park system.

The Buffalo Soldiers served bravely in campaigns both at home and abroad before being stationed at the military Presidio in San Francisco and being given charge of patrolling the National Park system. Although first tasked with taming the frontier, these troops also took on the responsibility of preserving that wilderness for future generations. Each summer, Buffalo Soldier regiments traveled roughly 320 miles from San Francisco to either Sequoia or Yosemite National Park, where they patrolled the parks for poachers and loggers, built trails, and escorted visitors. They were, in essence if not in name, the nation's first park rangers.

In a time of segregation and adversity, these soldiers served their coun-

try bravely and the National Parks they worked to establish are part of the legacy they leave behind. Unfortunately, this unique aspect of their history is neither widely recognized nor remembered. This legislation would address that by authorizing a study to determine the most appropriate way to memorialize the Buffalo Soldiers.

The study would evaluate the suitability and feasibility of establishing a national historic trail commemorating the route traveled by the Buffalo Soldiers from their post in the Presidio of San Francisco to Sequoia and Yosemite National Parks and to any other National Parks where they may have served.

The bill will identify properties associated with the Buffalo Soldiers that could be added to the National Register of Historic Places.

The bill will develop educational initiatives and a public awareness campaign about the contribution of African-American soldiers after the Civil War.

Although the experiences of the Buffalo Soldiers are an important piece of our national history, we are in danger of losing their legacy to the passage of time unless we take conscious steps to preserve the memory. This legislation works to ensure that the contributions of the Buffalo Soldiers will be remembered and shared by all.

Furthermore, as the centennial of the National Park Service in 2016 approaches, it is an especially appropriate time to conduct research and increase public awareness of the stewardship role the Buffalo Soldiers played in the early years of the National Parks.

I urge my colleagues to join me in their support for this measure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 225

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 “Buffalo Soldiers in the National Parks Study Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) In the late 19th century and early 20th century, African-American troops who came to be known as the Buffalo Soldiers served in many critical roles in the western United States, including protecting some of the first National Parks.

(2) Based at the Presidio in San Francisco, Buffalo Soldiers were assigned to Sequoia and Yosemite National Parks where they patrolled the backcountry, built trails, stopped poaching, and otherwise served in the roles later assumed by National Park rangers.

(3) The public would benefit from having opportunities to learn more about the Buffalo Soldiers in the National Parks and their contributions to the management of National Parks and the legacy of African-Americans in the post-Civil War era.

(4) As the centennial of the National Park Service in 2016 approaches, it is an especially

appropriate time to conduct research and increase public awareness of the stewardship role the Buffalo Soldiers played in the early years of the National Parks.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to authorize a study to determine the most effective ways to increase understanding and public awareness of the critical role that the Buffalo Soldiers played in the early years of the National Parks.

SEC. 3. STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a study of alternatives for commemorating and interpreting the role of the Buffalo Soldiers in the early years of the National Parks.

(b) CONTENTS OF STUDY.—The study shall include—

(1) a historical assessment, based on extensive research, of the Buffalo Soldiers who served in National Parks in the years prior to the establishment of the National Park Service;

(2) an evaluation of the suitability and feasibility of establishing a national historic trail commemorating the route traveled by the Buffalo Soldiers from their post in the Presidio of San Francisco to Sequoia and Yosemite National Parks and to any other National Parks where they may have served;

(3) the identification of properties that could meet criteria for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or criteria for designation as National Historic Landmarks;

(4) an evaluation of appropriate ways to enhance historical research, education, interpretation, and public awareness of the story of the Buffalo Soldiers' stewardship role in the National Parks, including ways to link the story to the development of National Parks and the story of African-American military service following the Civil War; and

(5) any other matters that the Secretary of the Interior deems appropriate for this study.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after funds are made available for the study, the Secretary of the Interior 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 containing the study's findings and recommendations.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 228. A bill to establish the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise on behalf of myself and Senator BOXER to introduce legislation to establish a National Heritage Area in the California Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. This legislation will create the first Heritage Area in California.

This bill was first introduced in January 2011 during the 112th Congress and received a hearing in the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources Subcommittee on National Parks. Since then, the Delta Protection Commission has completed a feasibility study, as required, and endorsed the legislation. Additionally, the National Park Service has confirmed that the study is consistent with the agency's interim National Heritage Area Feasibility Study Guidelines.

I was pleased to have had the opportunity to work with Senator BOXER,

Representative JOHN GARAMENDI, and the County Supervisors from the five Delta Counties to develop this legislation and look forward to continuing to partner with them as well as local, State and Federal agencies to care for and improve the Delta.

This bill will establish the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta as a National Heritage Area.

The Delta Protection Commission, created by California law and responsible to the citizens of the Delta and California, will manage the Heritage Area. It will ensure an open and public process, working with all levels of Federal, State, and local government, tribes, local stakeholders, and private property owners as it develops and implements the management plan for the Heritage Area. The goal is to conserve and protect the Delta, its communities, its resources, and its history.

It is also important to understand what this legislation will not do.

It will not affect water rights.

It will not affect water contracts.

It will not affect private property.

Nothing in this bill gives any governmental agency any more regulatory power than it already has, nor does it take away regulatory from agencies that have it.

In short, this bill does not affect water rights or water contracts, nor does it impose any additional responsibilities on local government or residents. Instead, it authorizes Federal assistance to a local process already required by State law that will elevate the Delta, providing a means to conserve and protect its valued communities, resources, and history.

The Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta is the largest estuary on the West Coast. It is the most extensive inland delta in the world, and a unique national treasure.

Today, it is a labyrinth of sloughs, wetlands, and deepwater channels that connect the waters of the high Sierra mountain streams to the Pacific Ocean through the San Francisco Bay. Its approximately 60 islands are protected by 1,100 miles of levees, and are home to 3,500,000 residents, including 2,500 family farmers. The Delta and its farmers produce some of the highest quality specialty crops in the United States.

The Delta offers recreational opportunities to the two million Californians who visit the Delta each year for boating, fishing, hunting, visiting historic sites, and viewing wildlife. It provides habitat for more than 750 species of plants and wildlife. These include sand hill cranes that migrate to the Delta wetland from places as far away as Siberia. The Delta also provides habitat for 55 species of fish, including Chinook salmon—some as large as 60 pounds—that return each year to travel through the Delta to spawn in the tributaries.

These same waterways also channel fresh water to the Federal and State-owned pumps in the South Delta that provide water to 23 million Californians and three million acres of irri-

gated agricultural land elsewhere in the State.

Before the Delta was reclaimed for farmland in the 19th Century, the Delta flooded regularly with snow melt each spring, and provided the rich environment that, by 1492, supported the largest settlement of Native Americans in North America.

The Delta was the gateway to the gold fields in 1849, after which Chinese workers built hundreds of miles of levees throughout the waterways of the Delta to make its rich peat soils available for farming and to control flooding.

Japanese, Italians, German, Portuguese, Dutch, Greeks, South Asians and other immigrants began the farming legacy, and developed technologies specifically adapted to the unique environment, including the Caterpillar Tractor, which later contributed to agriculture and transportation internationally.

Delta communities created a river culture befitting their dependence on water transport, a culture which has attracted the attention of authors from Mark Twain and Jack London to Joan Didion.

The Delta is in crisis due to many factors, including invasive species, urban and agricultural run-off, wastewater discharges, channelization, dredging, water export operations, and other stressors.

Many of the islands of the Delta are between 10 and 20 feet below sea level, and the levee system is presently inadequate to provide reliable flood protection for historic communities, significant habitats, agricultural enterprises, water resources, transportation and other infrastructure.

Existing levees have not been engineered to withstand earthquakes. Should levees fail for any reason, a rush of seawater into the interior of the Delta could damage the already fragile ecosystem, contaminate drinking water for many Californians, flood agricultural land, inundate towns, and damage roads, power lines, and water project infrastructure.

The State of California has been working for decades on a resolution to the water supply and ecosystem crisis in the State, and has a long history of partnerships with Federal agencies, working together to resolve challenges to the Delta's historic communities, ecosystem and the water it supplies so many Californians.

The Delta Protection Commission, established under State law, has been tasked by the California State Legislature with providing a forum for Delta residents to engage in decisions regarding actions to recognize and enhance the unique cultural, recreational, agricultural resources, infrastructure and legacy communities of the Delta and to serve as the facilitating agency for the implementation of a National Heritage Area in the Delta.

This legislation will complement the broadly supported State Water Legisla-

tion of 2009, which called for a Heritage designation for the Delta.

This legislation authorizes the creation of the Delta Heritage Area and Federal assistance to the Delta Protection Commission in implementing the Area. This legislation is just a small part of the commitment the Federal Government must make to the Delta. I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues at every level of government to restore and sustain the ecosystem in the Delta, to provide for reliable water supply in the State of California, to recover the native species of the Delta, protect communities in the Delta from flood risk, ensure economic sustainability in the Delta, improve water quality in the Delta, and sustain the unique cultural, historical, recreational, agricultural and economic values of the Delta.

The National Heritage Area designation for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta will help local governments develop and implement a plan for a sustainable future by providing Federal recognition, technical assistance and small amounts of funding to a community-based process already underway.

Through the Delta Heritage Area, local communities and citizens will partner with Federal, State and local governments to collaboratively work to promote conservation, community revitalization, and economic development projects.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 228

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 "Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area Establishment Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) HERITAGE AREA.—The term "Heritage Area" means the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Heritage Area established by section 3(a).

(2) HERITAGE AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The term "Heritage Area management plan" means the plan developed and adopted by the management entity under this Act.

(3) MANAGEMENT ENTITY.—The term "management entity" means the management entity for the Heritage Area designated by section 3(d).

(4) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) STATE.—The term "State" means the State of California.

SEC. 3. SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA HERITAGE AREA.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the "Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Heritage Area" in the State.

(b) BOUNDARIES.—The boundaries of the Heritage Area shall be in the counties of Contra Costa, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Solano, and Yolo in the State of California, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area Proposed Boundary", numbered T27/105,030, and dated September 2010.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map described in subsection (b) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service and the Delta Protection Commission.

(d) MANAGEMENT ENTITY.—The management entity for the Heritage Area shall be the Delta Protection Commission established by section 29735 of the California Public Resources Code.

(e) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) AUTHORITIES.—For purposes of carrying out the Heritage Area management plan, the Secretary, acting through the management entity, may use amounts made available under this Act to—

(A) make grants to the State or a political subdivision of the State, nonprofit organizations, and other persons;

(B) enter into cooperative agreements with, or provide technical assistance to, the State or a political subdivision of the State, nonprofit organizations, and other interested parties;

(C) hire and compensate staff, which shall include individuals with expertise in natural, cultural, and historical resources protection, and heritage programming;

(D) obtain money or services from any source including any that are provided under any other Federal law or program;

(E) contract for goods or services; and

(F) undertake to be a catalyst for any other activity that furthers the Heritage Area and is consistent with the approved Heritage Area management plan.

(2) DUTIES.—The management entity shall—

(A) in accordance with subsection (f), prepare and submit a Heritage Area management plan to the Secretary;

(B) assist units of local government, regional planning organizations, and nonprofit organizations in carrying out the approved Heritage Area management plan by—

(i) carrying out programs and projects that recognize, protect, and enhance important resource values in the Heritage Area;

(ii) establishing and maintaining interpretive exhibits and programs in the Heritage Area;

(iii) developing recreational and educational opportunities in the Heritage Area;

(iv) increasing public awareness of, and appreciation for, natural, historical, scenic, and cultural resources of the Heritage Area;

(v) protecting and restoring historic sites and buildings in the Heritage Area that are consistent with Heritage Area themes;

(vi) ensuring that clear, consistent, and appropriate signs identifying points of public access, and sites of interest are posted throughout the Heritage Area; and

(vii) promoting a wide range of partnerships among governments, organizations, and individuals to further the Heritage Area;

(C) consider the interests of diverse units of government, businesses, organizations, and individuals in the Heritage Area in the preparation and implementation of the Heritage Area management plan;

(D) conduct meetings open to the public at least semiannually regarding the development and implementation of the Heritage Area management plan;

(E) for any year that Federal funds have been received under this Act—

(i) submit an annual report to the Secretary that describes the activities, expenses, and income of the management entity (including grants to any other entities during the year that the report is made);

(ii) make available to the Secretary for audit all records relating to the expenditure of the funds and any matching funds;

(iii) require, with respect to all agreements authorizing expenditure of Federal funds by other organizations, that the organizations

receiving the funds make available to the Secretary for audit all records concerning the expenditure of the funds; and

(F) encourage by appropriate means economic viability that is consistent with the Heritage Area.

(3) PROHIBITION ON THE ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY.—The management entity shall not use Federal funds made available under this Act to acquire real property or any interest in real property.

(4) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.—The Federal share of the cost of any activity carried out using any assistance made available under this Act shall be 50 percent.

(f) HERITAGE AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the management entity shall submit to the Secretary for approval a proposed Heritage Area management plan.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The Heritage Area management plan shall—

(A) incorporate an integrated and cooperative approach to agricultural resources and activities, flood protection facilities, and other public infrastructure;

(B) emphasizes the importance of the resources described in subparagraph (A);

(C) take into consideration State and local plans;

(D) include—

(i) an inventory of—

(I) the resources located in the core area described in subsection (b); and

(II) any other property in the core area that—

(aa) is related to the themes of the Heritage Area; and

(bb) should be preserved, restored, managed, or maintained because of the significance of the property;

(ii) comprehensive policies, strategies and recommendations for conservation, funding, management, and development of the Heritage Area;

(iii) a description of actions that governments, private organizations, and individuals have agreed to take to protect the natural, historical and cultural resources of the Heritage Area;

(iv) a program of implementation for the Heritage Area management plan by the management entity that includes a description of—

(I) actions to facilitate ongoing collaboration among partners to promote plans for resource protection, restoration, and construction; and

(II) specific commitments for implementation that have been made by the management entity or any government, organization, or individual for the first 5 years of operation;

(v) the identification of sources of funding for carrying out the Heritage Area management plan;

(vi) analysis and recommendations for means by which local, State, and Federal programs, including the role of the National Park Service in the Heritage Area, may best be coordinated to carry out this Act; and

(vii) an interpretive plan for the Heritage Area; and

(E) recommend policies and strategies for resource management that consider and detail the application of appropriate land and water management techniques, including the development of intergovernmental and interagency cooperative agreements to protect the natural, historical, cultural, educational, scenic, and recreational resources of the Heritage Area.

(3) RESTRICTIONS.—The Heritage Area management plan submitted under this subsection shall—

(A) ensure participation by appropriate Federal, State, tribal, and local agencies, in-

cluding the Delta Stewardship Council, special districts, natural and historical resource protection and agricultural organizations, educational institutions, businesses, recreational organizations, community residents, and private property owners; and

(B) not be approved until the Secretary has received certification from the Delta Protection Commission that the Delta Stewardship Council has reviewed the Heritage Area management plan for consistency with the plan adopted by the Delta Stewardship Council pursuant to State law.

(4) DEADLINE.—If a proposed Heritage Area management plan is not submitted to the Secretary by the date that is 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the management entity shall be ineligible to receive additional funding under this Act until the date that the Secretary receives and approves the Heritage Area management plan.

(5) APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL OF HERITAGE AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of receipt of the Heritage Area management plan under paragraph (1), the Secretary, in consultation with the State, shall approve or disapprove the Heritage Area management plan.

(B) CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL.—In determining whether to approve the Heritage Area management plan, the Secretary shall consider whether—

(i) the management entity is representative of the diverse interests of the Heritage Area, including governments, natural and historic resource protection organizations, educational institutions, businesses, and recreational organizations;

(ii) the management entity has afforded adequate opportunity, including public hearings, for public and governmental involvement in the preparation of the Heritage Area management plan; and

(iii) the resource protection and interpretation strategies contained in the Heritage Area management plan, if implemented, would adequately protect the natural, historical, and cultural resources of the Heritage Area.

(C) ACTION FOLLOWING DISAPPROVAL.—If the Secretary disapproves the Heritage Area management plan under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall—

(i) advise the management entity in writing of the reasons for the disapproval;

(ii) make recommendations for revisions to the Heritage Area management plan; and

(iii) not later than 180 days after the receipt of any proposed revision of the Heritage Area management plan from the management entity, approve or disapprove the proposed revision.

(D) AMENDMENTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall approve or disapprove each amendment to the Heritage Area management plan that the Secretary determines make a substantial change to the Heritage Area management plan.

(ii) USE OF FUNDS.—The management entity shall not use Federal funds authorized by this Act to carry out any amendments to the Heritage Area management plan until the Secretary has approved the amendments.

(g) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act affects the authority of a Federal agency to provide technical or financial assistance under any other law.

(2) CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION.—The head of any Federal agency planning to conduct activities that may have an impact on the Heritage Area is encouraged to consult and coordinate the activities with the Secretary and the management entity to the maximum extent practicable.

(3) OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Nothing in this Act—

(A) modifies, alters, or amends any law or regulation authorizing a Federal agency to manage Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Federal agency;

(B) limits the discretion of a Federal land manager to implement an approved land use plan within the boundaries of the Heritage Area; or

(C) modifies, alters, or amends any authorized use of Federal land under the jurisdiction of a Federal agency.

(h) PRIVATE PROPERTY AND REGULATORY PROTECTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), nothing in this Act—

(A) abridges the rights of any property owner (whether public or private), including the right to refrain from participating in any plan, project, program, or activity conducted within the Heritage Area;

(B) requires any property owner to permit public access (including access by Federal, State, or local agencies) to the property of the property owner, or to modify public access or use of property of the property owner under any other Federal, State, or local law;

(C) alters any duly adopted land use regulation, approved land use plan, or other regulatory authority of any Federal, State or local agency, or conveys any land use or other regulatory authority to the management entity;

(D) authorizes or implies the reservation or appropriation of water or water rights;

(E) diminishes the authority of the State to manage fish and wildlife, including the regulation of fishing and hunting within the Heritage Area; or

(F) creates any liability, or affects any liability under any other law, of any private property owner with respect to any person injured on the private property.

(2) OPT OUT.—An owner of private property within the Heritage Area may opt out of participating in any plan, project, program, or activity carried out within the Heritage Area under this Act, if the property owner provides written notice to the management entity.

(i) EVALUATION; REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years before the date on which authority for Federal funding terminates for the Heritage Area, the Secretary shall—

(A) conduct an evaluation of the accomplishments of the Heritage Area; and

(B) prepare a report in accordance with paragraph (3).

(2) EVALUATION.—An evaluation conducted under paragraph (1)(A) shall—

(A) assess the progress of the management entity with respect to—

(i) accomplishing the purposes of this Act for the Heritage Area; and

(ii) achieving the goals and objectives of the approved Heritage Area management plan;

(B) analyze the Federal, State, local, and private investments in the Heritage Area to determine the leverage and impact of the investments; and

(C) review the management structure, partnership relationships, and funding of the Heritage Area for purposes of identifying the critical components for sustainability of the Heritage Area.

(3) REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Based on the evaluation conducted under paragraph (1)(A), the Secretary shall prepare a report that includes recommendations for the future role of the National Park Service, if any, with respect to the Heritage Area.

(B) REQUIRED ANALYSIS.—If the report prepared under subparagraph (A) recommends that Federal funding for the Heritage Area

be reauthorized, the report shall include an analysis of—

(i) ways in which Federal funding for the Heritage Area may be reduced or eliminated; and

(ii) the appropriate time period necessary to achieve the recommended reduction or elimination.

(C) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—On completion of the report, the Secretary shall submit the report to—

(i) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(ii) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(j) EFFECT OF DESIGNATION.—Nothing in this Act—

(1) precludes the management entity from using Federal funds made available under other laws for the purposes for which those funds were authorized; or

(2) affects any water rights or contracts.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act \$10,000,000, of which not more than \$1,000,000 may be made available for any fiscal year.

(b) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.—The Federal share of the total cost of any activity under this Act shall be determined by the Secretary, but shall be not more than 50 percent.

(c) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the total cost of any activity under this Act may be in the form of in-kind contributions of goods or services.

SEC. 5. TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If a proposed Heritage Area management plan has not been submitted to the Secretary by the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Heritage Area designation shall be rescinded.

(b) FUNDING AUTHORITY.—The authority of the Secretary to provide assistance under this Act terminates on the date that is 15 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet in open session on Thursday, February 7, 2013, at 10:00 a.m. in room 216 of the Hart Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled “No Child Left Behind: Early Lessons from State Flexibility Waivers.”

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Leanne Hotek of the committee staff on (202) 228-6685.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The hearing will be held on Tuesday, February 12, 2013, at 10:00 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of this hearing is to explore opportunities and challenges associated with America’s natural gas resources.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify

by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record may do so by sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, DC. 20510-6150, or by e-mail to lauren_goldschmidt@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Todd Wooten at (202) 224-4971 or Lauren Goldschmidt at (202) 224-5488.

EMBASSY SECURITY FUNDS TRANSFER ACT OF 2013

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 227, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 227) to authorize the transfer of certain funds to improve security at United States embassies and other diplomatic facilities worldwide, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

S. 227

Mr. LEAHY. Today I am pleased the Senate will pass the bipartisan Embassy Security Funds Transfer Act of 2013. This commonsense legislation will enact a provision similar to one passed overwhelmingly by the Senate last December as part of the Sandy Supplemental but that was stripped out by House Republicans.

This bill simply provides authority to the State Department to transfer up to \$1.1 billion in overseas contingency operations funds appropriated in Fiscal Year 2012 for operations in Iraq, which are no longer needed due to reduced State operations there, to be used for increased security at U.S. embassies and other overseas posts identified in the Department’s security review after the terrorist attack in Benghazi.

Making such resources available for these purposes is one of the recommendations of the Accountability Review Board chaired by Ambassador Pickering and Admiral Mullen. The bill permits the transfer of funds between the diplomatic and consular programs and embassy security construction and maintenance accounts. Such transfers would otherwise be precluded due to percentage limitations.

To be clear, this legislation appropriates no additional funds. It costs the taxpayers no additional money. It has no scoring impact. It merely allows for the transfer of existing, appropriated funds for this critical purpose. There is nothing controversial about this bill.

We all want to do what we can to prevent another tragedy like what occurred in Benghazi. The State Department has done a review, and these funds will be used to expedite construction of Marine security guard posts at overseas facilities and for the construction of other secure embassies. While it is impossible to guarantee the safety of our diplomats and aid workers, many