

(C) subject to any other condition that the Secretary may consider appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(3) **COSTS.**—The City shall pay any transaction or administrative costs associated with a conveyance under paragraph (1), including the costs of the appraisal, title searches, maps, and boundary and cadastral surveys.

(4) **CONVEYANCE IS NOT A MAJOR FEDERAL ACTION.**—A conveyance under paragraph (1) shall not be considered a major Federal action for purposes of section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)).

(c) **FAIR MARKET VALUE.**—

(1) **DETERMINATION.**—The fair market value of the Property shall be—

(A) determined by an appraisal conducted by an independent appraiser selected by the Secretary; and

(B) approved by the Secretary in accordance with paragraph (3).

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—An appraisal conducted under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) be conducted in accordance with nationally recognized appraisal standards, including—

(i) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions; and

(ii) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice; and

(B) shall reflect the equitable considerations described in paragraph (3).

(3) **EQUITABLE CONSIDERATIONS.**—In approving the fair market value of the Property under this subsection, the Secretary shall take into consideration matters of equity and fairness, including the City's past and current lease of the Property, any maintenance or improvements by the City to the Property, and such other factors as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(d) **REVOCATION; REVERSION.**—Effective on and after the date on which a conveyance of the Property is made under subsection (b)(1)—

(1) Executive Order 3528, dated August 9, 1921, is revoked; and

(2) the use of the tide and shore lands belonging to the State of Washington and adjoining and bordering the Property, that were granted to the Government of the United States pursuant to the Act of the Legislature, State of Washington, approved March 13, 1909, the same being chapter 110 of the Session Laws of 1909, shall revert to the State of Washington.

#### SEC. 609. VESSEL DETERMINATION.

The vessel assigned United States official number 1205366 is deemed a new vessel effective on the date of delivery of the vessel after January 1, 2012, from a privately owned United States shipyard, if no encumbrances are on record with the Coast Guard at the time of the issuance of the new certificate of documentation for the vessel.

#### SEC. 610. SAFE VESSEL OPERATION IN THUNDER BAY.

The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may not prohibit a vessel operating within the existing boundaries and any future expanded boundaries of the Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary and Underwater Preserve from taking up or discharging ballast water to allow for safe and efficient vessel operation if the uptake or discharge meets all Federal and State ballast water management requirements that would apply if the area were not a marine sanctuary.

#### SEC. 611. PARKING FACILITIES.

(a) **ALLOCATION AND ASSIGNMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to the requirements of this section, the Administrator of

General Services, in coordination with the Commandant of the Coast Guard, shall allocate and assign the spaces in parking facilities at the Department of Homeland Security St. Elizabeths Campus to allow any member or employee of the Coast Guard, who is assigned to the Campus, to use such spaces.

(2) **TIMING.**—In carrying out paragraph (1), and in addition to the parking spaces allocated and assigned to Coast Guard members and employees in fiscal year 2014, the Administrator shall allocate and assign not less than—

(A) 300 parking spaces not later than September 30, 2015;

(B) 700 parking spaces not later than September 30, 2016; and

(C) 1,042 parking spaces not later than September 30, 2017.

(b) **TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and each fiscal year thereafter in which spaces are allocated and assigned under subsection (a)(2), the Administrator shall provide to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on—

(1) the impact of assigning and allocating parking spaces under subsection (a) on the congestion of roads connecting the St. Elizabeths Campus to the portions of Suitland Parkway and I-295 located in the Anacostia section of the District of Columbia; and

(2) progress made toward completion of essential transportation improvements identified in the Transportation Management Program for the St. Elizabeths Campus.

(c) **REALLOCATION.**—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Administrator may revise the allocation and assignment of spaces to members and employees of the Coast Guard made under subsection (a) as necessary to accommodate employees of the Department of Homeland Security, other than the Coast Guard, when such employees are assigned to the St. Elizabeths Campus.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DHS OIG MANDATES REVISION ACT OF 2014

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2651) to repeal certain mandates of the Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2651

*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 “DHS OIG Mandates Revision Act of 2014”.

#### SEC. 2. REPEAL OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT AN ANNUAL EVALUATION OF THE CARGO INSPECTION TARGETING SYSTEM.**—

(1) **REPEAL.**—Subsections (g) and (h) of section 809 of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-293; 46 U.S.C. 70101 note) are repealed.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Section 809 of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-293; 118 Stat. 1085), as amended by paragraph (1), is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “and (j)” and inserting “and (h)”;

(B) by redesignating subsections (i), (j), and (k) as subsections (g), (h), and (i), respectively.

(b) **REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT AN ANNUAL REVIEW OF COAST GUARD PERFORMANCE.**—

(1) **REPEAL.**—Section 888(f) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 468(f)) is repealed.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Section 888 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 468), as amended by paragraph (1), is amended by redesignating subsections (g), (h), and (i) as subsections (f), (g), and (h), respectively.

(c) **ANNUAL REVIEW OF GRANTS TO STATES AND HIGH-RISK URBAN AREAS.**—

(1) **REPEAL.**—Section 2022(a)(3) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 612(a)(3)) is repealed.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Section 2022(a) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 612(a)), as amended by paragraph (1), is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (3), (4), (5), and (6), respectively;

(B) in paragraph (4), as redesignated—

(i) by striking “paragraphs (2) and (3)” and inserting “paragraph (2)”;

(ii) by striking “paragraph (4)” and inserting “paragraph (3)”.

(3) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect on January 1, 2015.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on S. 2651.

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

There was no objection.

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

S. 2651, the DHS OIG Mandates Revision Act of 2014, repeals three reports the Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General is required to conduct and submit annually to Congress. The reports include evaluations of the cargo inspection targeting system for international intermodal cargo containers, Coast Guard mission performance, and certain Department of Homeland Security grants.

Without a mandate, the Department's Office of Inspector General can continue to conduct these audits periodically, but at its own discretion. CBO estimates repeal of these mandates will save nearly \$2 million to the taxpayers annually.

I reserve the balance of my time.

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

#### COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,

Washington, DC, December 10, 2014.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,

Chairman, House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER: I write to you regarding the jurisdictional interest of the

Committee on Homeland Security in S. 2651, the "DHS OIG Mandates Revision Act of 2014". The measure passed the Senate by unanimous consent on September 17, 2014 and was additionally referred to the Committee on Homeland Security.

In the interest of permitting the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to proceed expeditiously to the House floor, I will forgo further consideration of S. 2651. However, I do so with the following reservation. By eliminating mandates of Inspector General investigations, Congress lessens its voice in oversight of the Department of Homeland Security. Under this lawless Administration, Congress should have more of a voice, not less, in what the Office of Inspector General investigates.

In addition, I will forgo consideration with the mutual understanding that the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security is in no way diminished. I further request that you urge the Speaker to name Members of this Committee to any conference committee that is named to consider such provisions.

Finally, I request you include this letter and your response into the Congressional Record during consideration of S. 2651 on the House floor. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,

Washington, DC, December 10, 2014.

Hon. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,  
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL: Thank you for your letter regarding the Committee on Homeland Security's jurisdictional interest in S. 2651, the DHS OIG Mandates Revision Act of 2014.

I appreciate your willingness to forego consideration of S. 2651, and weet that by forgoing action on this legislation, the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security is in no way diminished. Additionally, I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

Finally, I will include our letters in the Congressional Record during House floor consideration of the bill. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,  
Chairman.

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

I rise in support of this legislation. As summarized by my colleague from California, it alleviates the Office of Inspector General of the United States Department of Homeland Security from having to perform three annual audits.

Repeating these audits will help to slightly reduce the burden of congressionally mandated reports. All this information is available to us in other forms and it is good to get rid of these reports, which are sometimes not really sent anyway.

By the way, Mr. HUNTER, congratulations on the recently passed Coast Guard legislation.

Furthermore, eliminating the mandate will allow the IG to reallocate re-

sources to something really useful, like finding out what went wrong, wherever it might be. This way, the legislation may improve the oversight of programs and the activities of the Department of Homeland Security, which would be extremely useful to Congress.

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

Mr. HUNTER. 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. HUNTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2651.

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.

#### UNITED STATES COTTON FUTURES ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5810) to amend the United States Cotton Futures Act to exclude certain cotton futures contracts from coverage under such Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5810

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

#### SECTION 1. EXCLUDING CERTAIN COTTON FUTURES CONTRACTS FROM COVERAGE UNDER UNITED STATES COTTON FUTURES ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c)(1) of the United States Cotton Futures Act (7 U.S.C. 15B(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking "except that any cotton futures contract" and inserting the following: "except that—

“(A) any cotton futures contract”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) any cotton futures contract that permits tender of cotton grown outside of the United States is excluded from the coverage of this paragraph and section to the extent that the cotton grown outside of the United States is tendered for delivery under the cotton futures contract.”.

(b) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to cotton futures contracts entered into on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 5810.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he

may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND), my colleague.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5810.

This bill would meet the cotton industry's growing need for a rural contract for cotton on the United States market.

H.R. 5810 offers a simple technical fix that is needed due to the outdated 1916 Cotton Futures Act in terms of recognizing the global cotton trade.

Recent discussions with USDA revealed that the 1916 Cotton Futures Act requires all cotton tendered on a cotton futures contract that is listed for trading on a U.S. exchange to be classified by the USDA. This is unrealistic, both logistically and financially, for non-U.S. cotton stored in warehouses outside the U.S.

The industry's desire to trade and hedge a more modern contract requires a legislative tweak to the 1916 Cotton Futures Act to allow for any non-U.S. cotton tendered toward this U.S. contract to be inspected and classed by non-USDA personnel.

Our proposal would not change the regulation of the contract, nor the current USDA classing requirement that U.S. cotton must be classified by the USDA personnel.

Additionally, this bill also would not impact fees being generated by the USDA in the classing of U.S. cotton, tendered toward the existing cotton futures.

Here is the bottom line. For the industry to be able to hedge the 2015 cotton crop, they will need a tweak to this futures act that they may petition the CFTC for the new world contract to be listed. If H.R. 5810 is not passed, a new contract would likely be listed at other exchanges in Europe or Singapore.

With such unanimous support for this contract and solution, we hope this effort will be considered technical in nature and adopted quickly.

I urge my colleagues to support the measure.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As my colleague from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) has just eloquently stated, there is a great need for this, everybody is in agreement on it. The Cotton Number 2 contract is needed as a hedging tool for our cotton industry globally. It is needed so that we can have both delivery points inside as well as outside the United States because our global markets are now more global.

As my colleague, Mr. WESTMORELAND, mentioned, we have not touched this law since 1916. That is nearly 100 years. You can imagine so much has changed. It is very, very much more global, and we do not need to put our cotton participants in trade, in marketing, in commodities at a disadvantage, as was indicated, to other markets.

This is urgent. If we do not move within the next 3 weeks, so that we can