

The legislation could be interpreted in an overly broad fashion resulting in the inclusion of programs that may not be appropriate to include—programs or services only “relating to” job training, skill development, and economic development, or other related goals.

The Education and the Workforce Committee, on which I serve as Ranking Member, was given a sequential jurisdictional referral on this legislation, but has not considered the legislation nor considered its impact on education and training programs within our jurisdiction.

Specifically, our Committee has an interest in ensuring that program funds are used for their intended purpose. Whether the TANF program or Head Start, adequate reporting and oversight protect beneficiaries and ensure the quality of services. For example, Head Start performance standards are vital to the success of the program.

While I do not intend to oppose the legislation, I encourage continued robust oversight of the programs impacted by this bill to ensure that quality and effective education and job training programs remain available to our nation’s tribes.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 329, the Indian Employment, Training, and Related Services Consolidation Act of 2015.

In particular, I’m grateful for the opportunity I had to work with Representative YOUNG and the Natural Resources Committee to address some concerns I had with a previous version of the bill, and I’m grateful for the collaborative effort between our two committees so this bill can move forward today.

Under current law, Indian tribes can combine funding for employment, training, and related services to streamline their administration of social service programs—often referred to as “section 477 demonstration projects.” Many times the dollar amounts received from the individual programs are rather small, so being able to combine funds with similar purposes allows tribes to achieve more effective economies of scale. However, in recent years these tribes have run into challenges as they have sought to operate these demonstration projects to best serve their members. The goal of H.R. 329 is to clarify confusion related to these demonstration projects, increase the flexibility Indian tribes have in consolidating these programs, and ensure accountability of taxpayer dollars.

While I agreed with the general intent of the prior version of this bill, I was concerned that it may have unintentionally undermined important requirements in current law for programs under Ways and Means jurisdiction, such as TANF and child care. To balance the goal of increased flexibility for tribes with appropriate oversight and accountability, I asked Representative YOUNG to amend the text to ensure the bill would not:

Undermine important rules regarding how funds appropriated for specific purposes can be used;

Eliminate requirements specifying how the spending of consolidated funds must be accounted for; and

Change how funds authorized by the Ways and Means Committee are treated for matching purposes.

First, I’m glad this bill now reiterates that agencies providing funding to tribes have the authority to approve or deny waivers of key

program provisions. For example, this would mean the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) could deny an Indian tribe’s request to use federal child care funds for the purchase or improvement of land, as such use of child care funds is not permitted under current law. HHS could also forbid a tribe from using federal TANF funds to pay for medical services, something states and tribes are not permitted to do under current law. At the same time, agencies and departments, like HHS, are encouraged to waive program requirements when they will assist the tribe in streamlining the administration of their social service programs to better serve their members, as long as they don’t undermine the central purposes for which the money was originally appropriated.

Second, there was some concern that the bill would eliminate requirements that tribes report how they spend funds consolidated in section 477 projects. Mr. YOUNG has modified the bill to reiterate that tribes must report how funds are spent, but that they will not be required to report spending by specific program. Since 2011, a tribal working group has worked diligently to simplify tribal financial reporting, and the group has recently agreed upon a unified financial report that allows tribes to report by category, instead of by program. This form allows taxpayers to understand broadly how dollars are spent, without requiring tribes to maintain complex accounting systems necessary to report on spending per the rules for each separate program. This form is now in use, and I hope this working group, or future iterations of it, will continue to engage, as needed, to ensure this form adequately serves all stakeholders in the same manner.

Third, the earlier version of this bill allowed tribes operating section 477 projects to count federal funding received through HHS and the Department of Labor (DOL) to count as tribal spending for matching purposes. Because this would have allowed tribes to use federal funds as match to draw down additional federal dollars—and because it would have advantaged tribes operating these demonstrations compared to those not operating these demos—I asked that this language not apply to funding administered by HHS and DOL. Mr. YOUNG agreed to incorporate this change, and I’m grateful for his willingness to do so.

Finally, I’m glad we could work together to restore language in the bill regarding coordination between the Department of the Interior and other departments as these projects are approved. It is important that agencies work together to ensure tribes have the flexibility they need to streamline their services, while maintaining a balance between flexibility and accountability.

Together, these changes will support tribes as they seek to better serve their members, while maintaining appropriate accountability of taxpayer dollars and ensuring funds are used to meet the goals for which they were appropriated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 329, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# JOHN H. CHAFEE COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM BOUNDARIES REVISION

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6400) to revise the boundaries of certain John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System units in New Jersey.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6400

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

## SECTION 1. REPLACEMENT OF JOHN H. CHAFEE COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM MAP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The map subtitled “Seidler Beach Unit NJ-02, Cliffwood Beach Unit NJ-03P, Conasconk Point Unit NJ-04”, dated August 1, 2014, that is included in the set of maps entitled “Coastal Barrier Resources System” referred to in section 4(a) of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3503(a)) and relating to certain John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System units in New Jersey, is hereby replaced by another map subtitled “Seidler Beach Unit NJ-02/NJ-02P, Cliffwood Beach Unit NJ-03P, Conasconk Point Unit NJ-04, Sayreville Unit NJ-15P, Matawan Point Unit NJ-16P” and dated October 7, 2016.

(b) AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary of the Interior shall keep the replacement map referred to in subsection (a) on file and available for inspection in accordance with section 4(b) of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3503(b)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6400, introduced by my colleague, Mr. PALLONE, makes boundary adjustments to multiple units of the Coastal Barrier Resources System along the coast of his New Jersey congressional district. I have no objection to this bill and compliment the gentleman for introducing the bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, under the Coastal Barrier Resources Act—or CoBRA—the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service identifies hazardous areas on

the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts, and submits maps to Congress recommending that we make Federal subsidies off limits to people who choose to develop those lands.

This is a commonsense, scientific, fiscally conservative way to protect private property and public infrastructure, while also ensuring that taxpayers do not have to foot the bill for risky coastal development. In this time of rising sea levels and increased storm surge brought on by climate change, CoBRA is becoming more and more important every day.

H.R. 6400 would adjust the boundaries of several Coastal Barrier Resources System units in New Jersey, including one that contains an important flood control structure. These changes have been carefully mapped by the Fish and Wildlife Service, and reflect improvements in technology that have allowed us to show with great accuracy which parcels of land do and do not constitute "coastal barrier resources" under the law.

As a result, numerous properties that were originally included by mistake will be removed, and other properties that have been identified as at-risk will be included.

These changes to the C.B.R.S. are protective of private property rights, the environment, and the taxpayers, and I support passage of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the author of the bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6400.

This bill is extremely important to my constituents, especially those living in Union Beach, New Jersey. Passing this bill will allow the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to move forward on an important flood control project for Union Beach.

H.R. 6400 would realign the mapping of several New Jersey units of the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resource System. Congressional approval is required for any changes to these maps by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Over the past year, the Fish and Wildlife Service worked with the Corps to make noncontroversial changes to the mapping, completed its review, and transmitted them to Congress on November 21 of this year.

Until these maps are approved by Congress, Mr. Speaker, the Union Beach flood control project will be in limbo. The Corps cannot sign a project partnership agreement or make other progress until the updated maps are approved.

Union Beach was devastated by Superstorm Sandy, and residents have been waiting far too long for this project to be completed. It was initially authorized by the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 on November 8, 2007, and funding and authorization for the project came from Sandy relief funding in 2013.

Moving forward on this project is a priority for the State of New Jersey, local authorities in Union Beach, and the Army Corps; however, that can only be done if Congress approves the new maps, which it can do by passing H.R. 6400.

Again, passing this bill is vitally important. It is noncontroversial. I want to thank Chairman BISHOP, Ranking Member GRIJALVA, and House leadership for allowing this legislation to be considered under suspension of the rules.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 6400. The people of Union Beach have waited long enough to rebuild and protect their community from future storms.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I would like to compliment the gentleman from New Jersey. I do hope he understands that this is his district and I will support his legislation. I would like to have him do the same thing when I bring legislation to the floor that only affects my district.

So, with courtesy to him, I will urge a "yes" vote on this legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOLD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6400.

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.

#### CHICANO PARK PRESERVATION ACT

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3711) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of Chicano Park, located in San Diego, California, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3711

*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 "Chicano Park Preservation Act".*

#### SEC. 2. SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDY.

(a) *STUDY.*—The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a special resource study of Chicano Park and its murals located in San Diego, California.

(b) *CONTENTS.*—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) *evaluate the national significance of the site;*

(2) *determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the site as a National Historic Landmark or Affiliated Area of the National Park System;*

(3) *consider other alternatives for preservation, protection, and interpretation of Chicano Park and its murals by Federal, State, or local governmental entities, or private and nonprofit organizations;*

(4) *consult with interested Federal, State, or local governmental entities, private and nonprofit organizations or any other interested individuals; and*

(5) *identify cost estimates for any development, interpretation, operation, and maintenance associated with the alternatives.*

(c) *APPLICABLE LAW.*—The study required under subsection (a) shall be conducted in accordance with section 100507 of title 54, United States Code, except that the study shall not consider any options that involve Federal acquisition of lands, interests in lands, or any other property related to the Chicano Park and its murals.

(d) *REPORT.*—Not later than 18 months after the date on which funds are first made available for the study under subsection (a), 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 containing the results of the study and any conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, located in the Barrio Logan community of San Diego, Chicano Park is a 7.4-acre parcel known for its display of nearly 50 vibrant murals depicting the history, culture, and its civil rights movement.

□ 1315

Residents secured the creation of the park in 1970 by protesting the construction of a parking lot on the vacant land the city previously promised for the development of the community park. After successfully taking over the land, artists painted dozens of vibrant murals on the pillars and ramps of the San Diego-Coronado Bay Bridge located in the park, creating the largest concentration of these murals in the world.

H.R. 3711 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to evaluate the national significance of the park, determine the suitability and feasibility of designating it as a national historic landmark or affiliated area of the National Park Service through a special resource study. The bill prohibits the Secretary from considering any options that result in the Federal acquisition of the park.

I urge adoption of this bill, H.R. 3711.

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

Mr. SABLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS).