

presented conflicts with working ranches and dairies, such as taking up permanent residence on dairies' critical organic pastureland, interfering with ranch operations, or damaging infrastructure, hardly the outcomes envisioned by the Park Service's 1998 elk management plan.

While providing this general policy guidance, the bill leaves broad discretion to the Park Service to determine how best to manage the elk. It leaves in place all existing tools, while adding a new opportunity to explore relocation and cultural ceremonial activities with interested Native American Tribes.

I am grateful for the broad public support that this bill has received, ranging from the Marin Conservation League to the Marin County Farm Bureau and the Marin County Board of Supervisors.

I also want to address, briefly, some misconceptions that a few of the bill's critics have raised.

First, nothing in this bill elevates ranching above other uses of the seashore. It specifically does not amend the purpose section of the enabling act, which means that operations of the ranches and dairies will remain consistent with the policies and legal requirements that govern the Interior Department's stewardship of the land.

It is important to remember that less than one-third of the seashore is in agricultural use today. Nearly twice that amount is designated as wilderness. Nothing in this bill expands agriculture. It is limited to the areas where there is currently ranching or dairy operations.

I also want to address and emphasize the fact that nothing in this bill suggests elimination of elk from the seashore. I am not aware of a single stakeholder who has suggested eliminating elk. If they had, I would reject it. There is no reason elk and ranching cannot coexist on the seashore if there is effective management and separation in areas of conflict. This bill leaves broad discretion to the Park Service to determine the strategies and actions that make the most sense to achieve that goal.

For those worried that this bill may somehow reopen the 2012 decision by Interior Secretary Ken Salazar to not renew for Drakes Bay Oyster Company and to designate and manage Drakes Estero as marine wilderness, let me be emphatically clear. There is nothing in the letter or the intent of this bill that possibly could be read to do that. The bill has nothing to do with the oyster issue. It focuses on making sure the unresolved part of Secretary Salazar's 2012 decision, the part providing long-term assurances for the historic ranches and dairies, is actually carried out.

In this regard, I was mindful in drafting the bill of Secretary Salazar's specific direction in his memo of November 29, 2012, that the Park Service work with the ranches and dairies to "reaf-

firm my intention that, consistent with applicable laws and planning processes, recognition of the role of ranching be maintained and to pursue extending permits to 20-year terms. . . ."

Secretary Salazar also directed that "the values of multigenerational ranching and farming at Point Reyes should be fully considered in future planning efforts. These working ranches are a vibrant and compatible part of Point Reyes National Seashore and both now and in the future represent an important contribution to Point Reyes' superlative natural and cultural resources." I couldn't agree more.

Finally, we have been careful in this bill not to micromanage or tie the hands of the Park Service. As we made clear in amendments at markup and in the committee report, the Service retains the ability to exercise common-sense discretion in the supervision of the seashore's agriculture property and in administering its various permits and leases.

For example, the Park Service is not financially responsible for operating ranches and dairies. It is not required to bring back property into agriculture if it has been retired or converted to other purposes. It doesn't have to allow ranching on agricultural property where there is no willing lessee.

Nothing in this bill diminishes any of the Secretary's existing discretionary authority regarding how to manage agricultural property, including setting and enforcing permit terms and conditions and allowing shorter lease or permit terms if a rancher does not want a 20-year lease or permit. All of this is common sense.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6687 is a narrowly tailored bill to help ensure that sustainable ranches and dairies continue as part of the fabric of our spectacular Point Reyes National Seashore for generations to come. The bill does this without compromising any environmental standards. It is consistent with both longstanding congressional intent, with Secretary Salazar's 2012 policy directive, and with the current National Park Service planning process.

I am proud that this bill has been a refreshing bipartisan effort here in Congress, and I do want to thank my colleagues on the Natural Resources Committee for their support and assistance, especially Chairman ROB BISHOP and his staff, as well as Ranking Member RAÚL GRIJALVA and his staff, who have worked diligently to perfect this legislation and to move it forward.

I also want to thank my staff, especially my district director, Jenny Callaway, as well as Logan Ferree and Christine Sur from my legislative team, for their hard work to make this bill possible.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for adoption of the bill, and 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. McCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6687, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to manage the Point Reyes National Seashore in the State of California consistently with Congress' long-standing intent to continue to authorize working dairies and ranches on agricultural property as part of the seashore's unique historic, cultural, scenic and natural values, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FDR HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5420) to authorize the acquisition of land for addition to the Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site in the State of New York, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5420

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 "FDR Historic Preservation Act".

SEC. 2. HOME OF FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE.

(a) **LAND ACQUISITION.**—*The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase from a willing seller using donated funds, or exchange, the approximately 89 acres of land identified as the "Morgan Property" and generally depicted on the map titled "Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site, Proposed Park Addition", numbered 384/138,461 and dated May 2017.*

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF MAP.**—*The map referred to in subsection (a) shall be available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.*

(c) **BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT; ADMINISTRATION.**—*Upon acquisition of the land referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior shall—*

(1) *adjust the boundary of the Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site to reflect the acquisition; and*

(2) *administer such land as part of the Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site in accordance with applicable laws.*

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5420, by Congressman FASO of New York, would allow 89 acres to be added to the historic site that was Franklin Roosevelt's lifelong home and birthplace in Hyde Park, New York, which was designated as a National Historic Site in 1944. The land is currently owned by the Scenic Hudson Land Trust, and they would like to deed it to the National Park Service.

The addition would provide important context for visitors and better connectivity to the Hyde Park Trail that links the FDR National Historic Site to the Vanderbilt Mansion National Historic Site to the north.

The addition would not require any outlay of Federal funds. The transfer would be by donation, exchange, or purchase, using donated funds only.

I would like to commend Congressman FASO for sponsorship of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman's description of this very good bill.

These two sites draw nearly 200,000 visitors to the Dutchess County region. They are significant contributors to the local economy. It is only fitting that we should work to improve the integration between these two sites and enhance their management and increase their accessibility to the public.

I know Representative FASO has worked hard on this bill and that it is a priority for his office. I want to commend him for working across the aisle, including with Senator GILLIBRAND's support, and I congratulate him on this success today.

Before wrapping up, I do want to mention that the money to carry out the expansion proposed in this bill will likely come from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, a popular program that expires at the end of this week. That is right. After more than 50 years of bipartisan support, LWCF is once again on the brink of expiring. This is despite the fact that a bill to make the program permanent has earned the support of 235 Members of the House. The bill was voted out of the committee by voice, and all this body must do is bring it up on the floor for a vote.

I am always happy to support legislation that protects our public lands and cultural legacies, like this bill by Mr. FASO. I urge immediate action, however, on the other step we need to take, and that is bringing forward the bill to address the pending expiration of the LWCF.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to remind the ranking member that the transfer of this land would be by donation, exchange, or purchase, using donated funds only. No Federal funds are involved from the LWCF or anywhere else.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for adoption of the bill, and 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. MCCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5420, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

MODIFYING APPLICATION OF TEMPORARY LIMITED APPOINTMENT REGULATIONS TO THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6599) to modify the application of temporary limited appointment regulations to the National Park Service, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6599

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

SECTION 1. APPLICATION OF TEMPORARY LIMITED APPOINTMENT REGULATIONS TO THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE.

With respect to the National Park Service, for purposes of carrying out section 316.401 of subpart D of part 316 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations (relating to temporary limited appointments)—

(1) the term "major subdivision" in paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of such section shall be defined by the Director of the National Park Service; and

(2) the requirement in such paragraph that a position be in the same local commuting area shall not apply.

SEC. 2. SUNSET.

The modification authority provided by section 1 and any such modification shall expire on the date that is one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Mem-

bers may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, recently, the Office of Personnel Management questioned how the National Park Service rehired temporary seasonal employees. The NPS did not agree with OPM's interpretation of the relevant regulation but, nonetheless, complied.

OPM's directive caused confusion for Park Service hiring managers and threatened the ability of parks to open and operate as normal this past summer. Additionally, many temporary seasonal employees were unexpectedly left without a job.

H.R. 6599 addresses this issue and allows the Park Service to continue its longstanding practices in hiring its essential seasonal employees for 1 year while Congress acts to address the issue systemically.

Congressman STEVE KNIGHT of California has brought us this measure, and I would like to commend him for his leadership on the issue. Americans across the country are going to benefit from this work. I would like to thank him for his cooperation, allowing this to go forward.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, September 24, 2018.

Hon. TREY GOWDY,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On September 5, 2018, the Committee on Natural Resources ordered favorably reported H.R. 6599, to modify the application of temporary limited appointment regulations to the National Park Service, and for other purposes. While this bill was not originally referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I believe your Committee has a valid jurisdictional interest in the measure.

I ask that you not seek a sequential referral of the bill so that it may be considered by the House of Representatives this week. This action in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and your response in the bill report and in the Congressional Record.

Thank you for your consideration, and I look forward to further opportunities to work with you this Congress.

Sincerely,

ROB BISHOP,
Chairman,
Committee on Natural Resources.