

Rose (NY)	Sherrill	Trahan
Rouda	Sires	Trone
Roybal-Allard	Slotkin	Underwood
Ruiz	Smith (NJ)	Upton
Ruppersberger	Smith (WA)	Van Drew
Rush	Soto	Vargas
Ryan	Spanberger	Veasey
Sánchez	Speier	Vela
Sarbanes	Stanton	Velázquez
Scanlon	Stefanik	Visclosky
Schakowsky	Stevens	Wasserman
Schiff	Suozzi	Schultz
Schneider	Swalwell (CA)	Waters
Schrader	Takano	Watson Coleman
Schrier	Thompson (MS)	Welch
Scott (VA)	Titus	Wexton
Scott, David	Tlaib	Wild
Serrano	Tonko	Wilson (FL)
Sewell (AL)	Torres (CA)	Yarmuth
Shalala	Torres Small	
Sherman	(NM)	

NOES—185

Abraham	Gonzalez (OH)	Newhouse
Aderholt	Gooden	Norman
Allen	Gosar	Nunes
Amash	Granger	Olson
Amodei	Graves (GA)	Palazzo
Armstrong	Graves (LA)	Palmer
Arrington	Graves (MO)	Pence
Babin	Green (TN)	Perry
Bacon	Griffith	Posey
Baird	Grothman	Ratcliffe
Balderson	Guest	Reed
Banks	Guthrie	Reschenthaler
Barr	Hagedorn	Rice (SC)
Bergman	Harris	Riggleman
Biggs	Hartzler	Roby
Billirakis	Hern, Kevin	Roe, David P.
Bishop (NC)	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (AL)
Bishop (UT)	Hill (AR)	Rogers (KY)
Bost	Holding	Rouzer
Brady	Hollingsworth	Roy
Brooks (AL)	Huizenga	Rutherford
Brooks (IN)	Hunter	Scalise
Buchanan	Hurd (TX)	Schweikert
Buck	Johnson (LA)	Scott, Austin
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Sensenbrenner
Budd	Johnson (SD)	Shimkus
Burchett	Jordan	Simpson
Burgess	Joyce (OH)	Smith (MO)
Byrne	Joyce (PA)	Smith (NE)
Calvert	Keller	Smucker
Carson (IN)	Kelly (MS)	Spano
Carter (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Stauber
Carter (TX)	King (IA)	Steil
Chabot	King (NY)	Steube
Cheney	Kinzinger	Stewart
Cline	Kustoff (TN)	Stivers
Cloud	LaHood	Taylor
Collins (GA)	LaMalfa	Thompson (PA)
Comer	Lamborn	Thornberry
Conaway	Latta	Tipton
Crawford	Lesko	Turner
Crenshaw	Long	Wagner
Curtis	Loudermilk	Walberg
Davidson (OH)	Lucas	Walden
Davis, Rodney	Luetkemeyer	Walker
DesJarlais	Marchant	Walorski
Diaz-Balart	Marshall	Waltz
Duncan	Massie	Watkins
Dunn	Mast	Weber (TX)
Emmer	McCarthy	Webster (FL)
Estes	McCaul	Wenstrup
Ferguson	McClintock	Westerman
Fleischmann	McHenry	Williams
Flores	McKinley	Wilson (SC)
Fortenberry	Meadows	Wittman
Foxx (NC)	Meuser	Womack
Fulcher	Miller	Woodall
Gaetz	Mitchell	Wright
Gallagher	Moolenaar	Yoho
Gianforte	Mooney (WV)	Young
Gibbs	Mullin	Zeldin
Gohmert	Murphy (NC)	

NOT VOTING—10

Beatty	Hudson	Thompson (CA)
Gabbard	McEachin	Timmons
Hice (GA)	Rodgers (WA)	
Hill (CA)	Rose, John W.	

□ 1802

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

COLORADO OUTDOOR RECREATION AND ECONOMY ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 823.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 656 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 823.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1805

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 823) to provide for the designation of certain wilderness areas, recreation management areas, and conservation areas in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes, with Mrs. MURPHY of Florida in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in the first section of House Resolution 656 and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE).

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I would first like to thank Chairman GRIJALVA and Chairwoman HAALAND for their support and advocacy of this bill.

I stand today in support of my bill, H.R. 823, the Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act, or the CORE Act.

As Representatives for the people, as legislators here in the Halls of Congress, our job is to fight for common-sense solutions that come directly from our communities.

When our constituents raise their voices on issues that impact them, and when we are able to respond with legislation that benefits our districts and our State, that is when our work is most effective.

I am proud that the CORE Act was crafted by Coloradans over the last decade. It is a product of collaboration, careful consultation, and negotiation.

Local elected officials, community members, businesses, outdoor recreation and conservation groups, ranchers, sportsmen, they have all contributed their input and their passion for the outdoor areas that they love.

Each title in this bill has been carefully vetted by a thoughtful group of local elected leaders and community members, and each title is well deserving of consideration on the House floor today.

I will just give a brief overview of the bill.

The CORE Act would conserve over 400,000 acres of public land, and it consists of four titles that Coloradans have been asking Congress to pass, as I said, for well over a decade.

Title 1 is the Continental Divide Recreation, Wilderness and Camp Hale Legacy Act. It establishes permanent protections for nearly 100,000 acres of wilderness, recreation, and conservation areas in the White River National Forest along Colorado's Continental Divide.

The title creates two new wildlife conservation areas, totaling approximately 12,000 acres. The Porcupine Gulch Wildlife Conservation Area would protect Colorado's only migration corridor over Interstate 70 for elk, bear, mule, deer, and other wildlife. The Williams Fork Wildlife Conservation Area would also enhance wildlife habitat for the greater sage grouse and other species.

Title 1 also designates the first-ever national historic landscape at Camp Hale. This unprecedented designation speaks to the storied legacy of the Army's 10th Mountain Division in Colorado and around the world. As my colleagues may know, the soldiers that trained at Camp Hale led our Nation to victory in World War II and then went on to create the outdoor recreation industry as we know it today.

The second title is the San Juan Mountains Wilderness Act. This title, which has previously received bipartisan support in both the House and the Senate, provides permanent protections for nearly 61,000 acres of land located in the heart of the San Juan Mountains in southwest Colorado. It designates some of the State's most iconic peaks as wilderness, including

two fourteeners, Mount Sneffels and Wilson Peak.

The third title is the Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Act, which prevents new oil and gas development in one of Colorado's most treasured landscapes while also protecting private property rights. The Thompson Divide, through ranching and outdoor recreation, contributes \$30 million a year to the statewide economy. It is an area that is simply too valuable to drill for oil and gas.

This title also includes a pilot program to allow the capture of fugitive methane from both active and inactive coal mines in portions of Pitkin, Delta, Gunnison, and Garfield Counties.

Madam Chair, this is a point that is worth underscoring. This provision that I mentioned was developed at the request of local elected leaders. Ultimately, I am thankful for their thoughtful input to improve the bill.

The fourth and final title formally establishes the boundary for the Curecanti National Recreation Area, currently one of only a handful of National Park Service units without a formal designation by an act of Congress. This special place consists of three reservoirs that are a designation for boating, fishing, hiking, and camping. It is a long-overdue formal designation that will allow the National Park Service to more effectively manage the area, and it also will help ensure that the Federal Government lives up to a longstanding commitment it made to the State of Colorado to provide new fishing access for sportsmen in the Gunnison River basin.

Finally, I would like to call out an important addition to this bill that was included in the manager's amendment to honor the life of an outstanding individual who was truly loved by his family and friends, and he served as a pillar of his community. Sanford Morris Treat, Jr., who went by the name "Sandy," was a World War II veteran who served in the 10th Mountain Division and trained at Camp Hale.

I had the honor of meeting Sandy before his passing earlier this year, and it is due to his and his fellow veterans' unwavering advocacy that Camp Hale would be forever maintained as a National Historic Landscape under the CORE Act. Therefore, the manager's amendment includes language to designate the Sandy Treat Overlook as an interpretive site overlooking Camp Hale.

It is my hope that those who visit it will be reminded of his service to our country, his zest for life, and his passion for protecting the legacy of Camp Hale.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues, respectfully, to support the CORE Act, not only to honor those who came before us, but also to protect our treasured places for generations to come.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 823, a bill that creates land restrictions for approximately 400,000 acres of land in Colorado in the form of new wilderness, permanent mineral withdrawals, as well as recreation and conservation areas.

While the goals of the public lands legislation in this bill are certainly admirable and well-intended, and I have great respect for the bill's sponsor, my friend and fellow Coloradan, Congressman NEGUSE, it is clear that this proposal lacks the type of local consensus required for a bill of this scale.

I am proud to call Colorado home, and I am honored to represent the Fifth District of Colorado. I truly believe our State is the most beautiful in the Union, and myself and the bill's sponsor and other Representatives from Colorado that you will hear from during our debate would agree with me on that. We love our State, and we are very proud of it.

As is the case for most Western States, Colorado has a large amount of public lands, with roughly one-third of the State under Federal management. These rich and diverse public lands provide countless outdoor recreation opportunities, habitat for wildlife, and significant economic benefits for our rural communities and our State as a whole.

Because of these diverse uses of our public lands, it is vital that the land management decisions we make find balance and common ground. I regret to say today that this bill before us falls short on both counts.

To put the enormity of this bill into perspective, Madam Chairman, this bill affects a total acreage that is nine times the size of Washington, D.C. A bill of this magnitude should not be forced through along partisan party lines, yet that is what we are facing today.

Public lands decisions should be made with local collaboration and input. They have real consequences for communities on the ground who live near these public lands.

It is troubling to note that 65 percent of the lands affected by the bill before us are located in Congressman TIPTON's district. Not only was Mr. TIPTON not meaningfully consulted on this legislation, but he was not even made aware of it until the day that it was publicly announced.

It is not against the law to write bills affecting other people's districts, but I think that consensus and collaboration require that they should be brought into the loop and be part of the process.

Subsequent efforts to engage on this legislation and find compromise have been largely ignored. That lack of engagement sadly continues today.

□ 1815

Mr. TIPTON, for instance, offered 10 good faith amendments that raised spe-

cific concerns that his constituents have brought to him concerning this bill. Only three of these were made in order by the Democrat-controlled Rules Committee.

Substantial stakeholder concerns about this bill have been raised by impacted counties, recreation groups, forestry health advocates, as well as the relevant Federal agencies.

One particularly worrying concern has been raised by the National Guard Bureau—not the State, but the national National Guard Bureau—about this bill's impact on the Colorado Army National Guard's High Altitude Aviation Training Site, or HAATS, that has yet to be resolved.

Proposed wilderness expansions in Colorado around the Colorado Army National Guard's HAATS, or High Altitude Aviation Training Site, are creating concerns about the future of the site's ability to ensure military readiness for the men and women who may be deployed to combat zones in the Middle East.

This HAATS site is a treasure. It is the only place in the country where high-altitude rotary-wing aircraft can get the training in real-life conditions that they will encounter overseas in places like Afghanistan or training for search and rescue in mountainous areas around the country or around the world.

So this is a treasure. It is a unique site that must be protected. And it is a collection of sites. It is not just one landing zone. It is a multitude of landing zones.

While the sponsors of the CORE Act have indicated that their goal is to protect HAATS, the only way to provide certainty for HAATS is to codify the existing Department of Defense guidance for aircraft flying over Colorado wilderness areas.

As with any compromise, balance is key. There is no room for winner-take-all mentalities if you want to achieve lasting public land management agreements. This bill, unfortunately, has chosen a winner-take-all path that may deliver some great press releases momentarily but will ultimately fall short of becoming law. I believe this bill will not be supported in the other body and is certainly not supported by the administration.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, with great respect for my colleague from Colorado Springs, whom I certainly enjoy serving with, I would just say that local community support is so critical on public lands bills of this nature. That is why I am so proud that this bill has overwhelming support from the local communities that are impacted by it.

One thing, I suspect, that you will not hear from my distinguished colleagues on this side of the aisle is a reference to any counties, cities, or towns directly impacted by this bill that ultimately don't support it.

Just to give you a sense of some of those communities, the town of Crested Butte, the town of Carbondale, the city of Glenwood Springs, the town of Telluride, the town of Basalt, the town of Breckenridge, the town of Ophir, the town of Ridgway, the town of Mountain Village, the town of Snowmass Village, the town of Frisco, and the town of Dillon, they have all supported this bill.

Garfield County supports a provision of the bill which impacts its county. San Miguel County does the same. Gunnison County, Eagle County, San Juan County, Summit County, Ouray County, and Pitkin County—I am, in some respects, left at a loss of words in terms of trying to understand what local community support my distinguished colleague is referencing in terms of it being lacking.

And, of course, it makes perfect sense that these communities would so overwhelmingly support this bill because they have been engaged in important stakeholder input on this bill for 10 years, long before I came to Congress.

This bill has been the product of a very robust community-driven stakeholder process, which is why it has overwhelming support of not just the local communities that are impacted by it, but, ultimately, by the people shown by just a recent empirical study that over 70 percent of the people on the western side of Colorado and writ at large in the State support the provisions of the CORE Act. That is why it has also earned the support of my distinguished colleague from Colorado, the dean of our delegation.

Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Chair, I want to thank my colleague from Colorado and laud him for taking on the mantle of supporting the Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act.

Our State has some of the most remarkable outdoor landscapes in the country. As a fourth-generation Coloradan, I understand how important our public lands are to our livelihoods, our health, and, yes, our identity.

Like many Coloradans, I have personal memories of camping and hiking with my family and using our public lands to teach my daughters about the importance of environmental stewardship and conservation.

But preserving our public lands is not important just to those of us who enjoy exploring the outdoors; it is important to our State's economy.

We can't allow ourselves to sit back and assume that the places we cherish today will be there for future generations to experience as well. Every 30 seconds, our Nation loses the equivalent of a football field of natural area due to human activity.

Let me say that again. Every 30 seconds, our Nation loses a football field of natural area due to human activity. We are seeing this right now in our home State with the pressures of population growth.

That is why, for more than 20 years, I have been working with my colleagues in Congress, with local elected officials, and with citizens across the State to protect the very few remaining special areas that we have left. That is why I am so honored that we are now beginning to see the fruits of all of this action.

The legislation that we will vote on today will protect an additional 400,000 acres of public lands in our State, including 70,000 acres of wilderness. It is part of our overall effort to preserve 1 million acres of public lands in our State, not just for wilderness, but also for multiple use, which is so critical for our State.

Together, the CORE Act and the Colorado Wilderness Act, which I am the prime sponsor of, will help boost Colorado's multibillion-dollar outdoor recreation industry, which supports more than 220,000 jobs in our State. They will also help increase our Nation's tourism industry, lift nearby property values, and improve residents' overall quality of life.

Our constituents have been clear on this issue: they want to protect our public lands. As Congressman NEGUSE noted, one recent poll found that as many as 90 percent of Colorado's residents believe that protecting our outdoor recreation economy is important to the future of our State.

Our State has changed. Our economy is dependent on the preservation of our special remaining wild places. I know many of us in the congressional delegation would agree. That is why we are so united in this effort. That is why we are eager to take on this fight.

Madam Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to give the people of our State what they want and to vote for this important legislation.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I do agree with my colleague from Denver that the outdoor recreation industry in Colorado is a thriving and vital part of our State's economy. We have such good material, such a good environment to work with that it is no wonder.

I would have to point out that, fortunately, the lands that are under consideration in this bill already have one form of protection or another due to being wilderness study areas or other types of Federal lands. The development that was being mentioned—one football field every 30 seconds—doesn't apply to these lands. These lands are not in that category.

Ms. DEGETTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Ms. DEGETTE. I would just note—and the gentleman and I have actually discussed this—as we have been preparing the maps for my bill, which we are going to be seeing in the Natural Resources Committee in the next few weeks, we have seen, even in areas that are protected as wilderness study areas

or other BLM Federal lands, we have seen a steady erosion by people who are over loving these lands, and that is why we need these protections.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chair, reclaiming my time, I understand where the gentlewoman is coming from.

Without getting into the philosophical area for time constraints over restricting lands that very few people can enter into as opposed to having lands as open as possible for as many people and many uses as possible, which I think is a balance we have to strike—there has got to be a place for both—I think we need to keep our discussion for the next part of our debate on the local collaboration, or lack thereof.

Madam Chair, for that reason, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON).

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, when it comes to public lands management, Colorado has a long history of balancing the interests of a broad range of stakeholders, including the needs and interests of citizens who may not be the most vocal on the issues. This is accomplished through proactive outreach to communities and engagement with citizens and local leaders who know their areas best.

This type of local engagement has proven to be effective on previous public lands efforts, such as Hermosa Creek and Chimney Rock in southwest Colorado. In both cases, there was an extensive and inclusive community outreach process with many months of bipartisan support, negotiations, and conversations with stakeholders from all sides of the debate.

The result was the House passing bipartisan measures to be able to protect these individual and valuable open spaces, both of which have become law. Behind these efforts was a recognition of historic multiple uses of the land as well as for the communities who live there.

For many decades, Colorado has responsibly developed natural resources on public lands, which has provided critical funding for emergency services, education, and infrastructure for rural communities that would otherwise be unable to have these services. While doing this, Colorado has also embraced a thriving outdoor economy and protected access to the public lands for historical uses, as well as for sportsmen and other recreational access.

We have prioritized conservation of delicate ecosystems and habitats, protected cultural and historic sites, and defended private property and water rights. There are certainly disagreements on the most effective ways to be able to carry out these ideas, but most of us agree that the most effective approach to be able to work through these disagreements is by being able to listen to the local communities and those most affected by Federal decisions and finding a way to be able to

incorporate those ideas into balanced legislation.

Unfortunately, we have not seen this same type of outreach negotiation and local engagement with the CORE Act as a whole. Some stakeholders and communities in the Third Congressional District were not included. It is important that we do not discount the Third District voices who feel like they were excluded or that their concerns were disregarded.

Madam Chair, I have heard from numerous county commissioners who have not been involved in the legislative process for the CORE Act and have simply asked to have their concerns addressed by the House before a vote takes place. This is the same feedback I have repeatedly heard from stakeholders and local elected officials in the Third District following public meetings on these issues over the past few months.

I am not saying that there is not support for the CORE Act in the Third District, because there is. Many of our resort and mountain communities are strongly behind the bill, and it is just as important to listen to their input as those in the rest of western Colorado.

I am optimistic that we can find a balanced public lands bill that reflects all of these communities, but it can't happen if one side is left out of the conversation from the beginning. More outreach needs to happen, negotiations need to take place, and compromise needs to be made.

The commissioners, other local elected officials, and stakeholders in the counties that have not yet been included in the experiences have knowledge and opinions that should be given due consideration when crafting public policy land bills that directly impact many of them and indirectly impacts all of them. We firmly are committed to giving all counties in the Third District the opportunity to be able to have their voices heard and their ideas included in any public lands legislation that impacts their region.

During a House Natural Resources Committee on the CORE Act and before the House Rules Committee this week, I introduced amendments that included reasonable and necessary additions to the bill based on direct feedback from Third District stakeholders and officials.

□ 1830

I provided my colleagues from Colorado who sponsored this legislation in both the House and the Senate with a similar list of items for inclusion beforehand.

These suggestions include protections for existing water and grazing rights; codification of the U.S. Army High-Altitude Aviation Training Site's flight guidelines over wilderness areas; allowing for current public land management activities to continue in recreation areas, and language to ensure that leaseholders in the Thompson Divide are fairly compensated for the value of their leases.

These amendments are not controversial. They are not partisan. They do not disrupt or alter the outcomes of the bill. What these amendments do is ensure that there is no ambiguity in the intent of the legislation, as stated by the bill's sponsors and supporters. There is great harm in ambiguity, which is what will result if these amendments are not accepted.

I have also offered two amendments to release wilderness study areas, at the request of counties in which they are located. Most of these areas have been deemed unsuitable for wilderness designation. That does not mean that they will not be protected public lands because they all have some measure of protection.

Madam Chairwoman, responsible management is not always the result of more restrictive designations. Instead, it can also mean giving local communities greater flexibility to be able to address local land challenges.

In recent testimony given before the House Natural Resources Committee, Montezuma County Commissioner Keenan Ertel made the argument for releasing wilderness study areas when they have been deemed unsuitable by the Federal land management agencies for wilderness protections. Seven years ago, the Menefee Mountain Wilderness Study Area was ravaged by fire. Years after the fire, noxious weeds consumed much of the landscape due to the stringent protections given in the area. The weed concerns continue to progress, as projected in this photo.

Local agencies are limited in their ability to be able to proactively manage these invasive species because of the stringent wilderness protections that remain in place.

If the Colorado delegation is truly vested in passing a statewide public lands bill that has broad local consensus, why aren't we including the removal of these areas that rely on Federal action to be able to allow for better management of these lands?

I have suggested to my bicameral Colorado colleagues, and even submitted an amendment, but it was not adopted. I continue to hear that local concerns have been addressed, yet we cannot assure Montezuma County residents that theirs have even been considered.

Along with allowing local communities greater access to be able to protect their cherished open spaces from potential wildfires, it also includes buffer zones between wilderness and nonwilderness areas.

A look at the devastating wildfires in Colorado over the years shows us just how important this is. In 2013, the West Fork Complex fire, which burned over 100,000 acres in southwest Colorado, is a prime example of how forest fires have no regard for arbitrary lines, as shown on the map.

We have, unfortunately, seen the aftermath of this fire and other fires, and they threaten the stability of roads and water quality and are great-

er erosion threats for many years to come.

I raised this concern with the sponsors of the bill, suggesting that we increase the offsets for the trails running on the borders of the wilderness area from 50 to 150 feet. With this reasonable ask, I believe we can eliminate unnecessary risks to our forests and protect them from future forest fires that have the potential to jump across boundary lines onto other public and private lands. Yet, this amendment was not allowed to move to the floor for consideration, nor were 8 out of the 10 amendments that I introduced.

Had there been greater outreach across the Third District, the CORE Act's sponsors could have heard more examples just like these that need to be addressed. This week alone, we received letters from Montezuma County, Dolores County, Rio Blanco County, Montrose County, Mesa County, all of which have various concerns about the CORE Act today. That is also accompanied by letters from individuals.

Madam Chairwoman, I applaud the CORE Act sponsor, my Colorado colleague, Mr. NEGUSE. He has a passion for being able to protect public lands in Colorado. It happens to be a passion we share.

However, Colorado's Third District, where most of this bill will have an impact, not Mr. NEGUSE's district—I would be remiss if I did not speak out on behalf of my constituents—have yet to have their voices heard in this process or their issues addressed.

I am optimistic that we could eventually get broad community consensus through the Third District on the CORE Act, but first, there is outreach that needs to be done, issues to be worked out, and compromises to be made.

There is no doubt that the CORE Act will pass the House tomorrow, that the bill will head to the Senate. However, in good conscience, given the concerns that we have heard out of the district that have not been addressed, I will have to reluctantly vote "no" on this current version of the bill.

It is my hope that the Senate will consider my amendments, that they will be included, that continued outreach occurs, and that we include the ideas of all western Colorado.

I stand willing and ready to be able to work with them.

Madam Chairwoman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chairwoman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just a few points before I yield some time to my distinguished colleague from the Sixth Congressional District.

I would first say, this reference to wilderness study areas and the notion that because, as my distinguished colleague from Colorado Springs mentioned, there are some wilderness study areas in certain areas, that, therefore, no further protections are needed, of course, as the gentleman from the

Third Congressional District just mentioned, in his effort to eliminate some of those wilderness study areas, the case in point that permanent protections are, in fact, needed. There is a reason why we pursue these permanent protections, and that is, ultimately, to ensure that the lands are protected for future generations, like my daughter, so that she can enjoy the same treasured public lands that I have had access to.

I would also say, with respect to my colleague from the Third Congressional District, what I failed to hear during his remarks or, for that matter, the gentleman from Colorado Springs' remarks is, again, any reference to a single county that is directly impacted by this bill that opposes this bill.

I understand the gentleman referenced Montezuma County, and I found the letter from Montezuma County a bit perplexing given that none of the CORE Act designations are in their county or even bordering their county.

As I mentioned earlier, the San Miguel Board of County Commissioners, which is in the Third Congressional District, supports this bill. The Gunnison Board of County Commissioners, the Eagle Board of County Commissioners, the San Juan Board of County Commissioners, the Ouray Board of County Commissioners, the Pitkin Board of County Commissioners, and a variety of other counties have expressed support for the provisions of the bill that impact their particular county, including the Garfield Board of County Commissioners, which is in the Third Congressional District.

So, make no mistake, I respect philosophical disagreements that may exist about the need to protect public lands, and there may be—in fact, there clearly is a disagreement there, and we are going to land on different sides of that debate.

But facts matter. And, ultimately, the local communities across the State that are impacted by this bill directly have made clear that they support the CORE Act. As I said, it is no surprise that they do because they have been engaged in the debate around the CORE Act for a decade.

I have each title of the CORE Act that has been introduced since 2011 by Mr. UDALL when he served in this Chamber, by Mr. Salazar, and, of course, by Senator BENNET in the upper Chamber. This bill is the product of a decade of collaboration.

Ultimately, what I have heard from these county commissioners and so many others is that they are tired of waiting, Madam Chair.

I recognize that I am new to Washington, but ultimately, I think our job here is to deliver results for the people who elect us to serve.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. CROW), who has served in our armed services so bravely, to discuss the HAATS issue, in particular. Then, I am happy to yield to

Mr. TIPTON so that we can engage in a colloquy.

Mr. CROW. Madam Chairwoman, I rise today in support of the Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act.

I would first like to thank my colleagues and friends from the Colorado delegation, Congressman JOE NEGUSE, and Senator MICHAEL BENNET, for their dedicated, hard work on this important bill.

Colorado is home to 4 national parks, 41 State parks, 960 wildlife species, and 6,000 miles of rivers. From hiking, to camping and skiing with my family, including my two children, who I am proud to say are fifth-generation Coloradans, I know that among the most important aspects of the Colorado way of life are the beautiful places where we live, work, and play.

But we must act quickly to ensure that Colorado's many national treasures are protected for our children, our grandchildren, and the generations to come.

The CORE Act will help us accomplish this by providing permanent protections for over 400,000 acres of Colorado's public lands. It unites and builds on many prior efforts by protecting four iconic landscapes in one single, all-encompassing conservation bill for all of Colorado.

As an Army veteran, I am also thrilled to highlight the U.S. Army's 10th Mountain Division, whose members trained at historic Camp Hale and fought valiantly in World War II. At the peak of the war, Camp Hale housed as many as 14,000 soldiers. They were trained in skiing, snowshoeing, mountain climbing, cold-weather survival skills, and winter combat to prepare themselves for the Alpine warfare that awaited them in northern Italy.

In 1945, they broke through German mountain defenses, drawing forces away from other theaters and playing a critical role in winning World War II.

Many of them came back afterward to help build Colorado's outdoor recreation industry that we now know, love, and cherish today.

By passing this bill, we honor the 10th Mountain Division's legacy and the sacrifices of those soldiers by designating over 28,000 acres of land that constitutes Camp Hale as the Nation's first-ever National Historic Landscape.

This measure ensures that people of all ages can recreate on the Camp Hale lands, walk in the footsteps of those soldiers who trained there, and protect the site for future generations so that history and legacy will live on.

I am honored to work with my delegation colleagues on this effort. The CORE Act is a once-in-a-generation protection of lands to hand to our kids and grandkids so that they can continue to love Colorado as much as we do.

I urge all Members to vote in favor of this bill.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chairwoman, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) to give him

a moment to respond. It seemed like he had something to say.

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Chair, I think the gentleman mentioned Montrose County. Is it going to be impacted by Curecanti?

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chair, I appreciate Representative TIPTON, my distinguished colleague, for mentioning that. I would say a few things.

First, of the nine counties that are impacted, as I mentioned, eight of them have expressed support for the provisions of the bill that impact them.

While I don't have the letter from Montrose County that apparently came in today—and I am happy to visit with the gentleman further about that letter—my understanding is that they expressed support still for the Curecanti title of the bill in their district.

I also would just say this: If the gentleman is willing to make a commitment that he will vote for this bill if the Montrose Board of County Commissioners supports the bill—is that the gentleman's intent?

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Chair, I have all the other issues that I have outlined, and I need those amendments to be able to do that. That does not make the bill bad, but it does make it an imperfect bill.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chair, reclaiming my time, the gentleman will have an opportunity to talk. I would just say this: We had this similar debate in the Rules Committee on Monday. Again, I am new to Washington, so perhaps this is just the way the process works, but this notion that amendments are offered and then a representation is made by the gentleman that even if every amendment passed, they would not support the bill, fundamentally, for me, this process is about good faith, negotiation, and discussion to get to a consensus.

I believe there are a number of amendments that the Representative, along with several others that have been proposed, that we are going to debate tonight. Some of those may, in fact, be amendments that we can agree to. But I would hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would approach the discussion on those amendments with that same good faith, with understanding that they would hope to get to yes, because a similar discussion happened earlier this year with respect to the Garfield Board of County Commissioners.

Their nonsupport of the bill was justified and rationalized as a reason to oppose it. Of course, eventually, by working with those county commissioners, Senator BENNET's office and myself were able to negotiate a compromise so that they could be in a position to support the title of the bill that impacts that county, so that we could protect the treasured public lands in the Thompson Divide.

Again, I believe it is important to underscore that point, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chairwoman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I would point out that Mr. TIPTON offered 10 amendments in the Rules Committee, only three of which were adopted. There were seven amendments right there that were not even brought to the floor for debate. I think that that is unfortunate.

Madam Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) who is the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Water, Oceans, and Wildlife on the Natural Resources Committee.

□ 1845

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairwoman, when I chaired the Public Lands Subcommittee, we set three overarching principles for the management of our public lands: to restore public access to the public lands, to restore good management to the public lands, and to restore the Federal Government as a good neighbor to those communities directly impacted by the public lands.

This bill appears to me to be the opposite of all of these principles. It closes off public use and access, it consigns our lands to a policy of neglect, and it thumbs our nose at the wishes of many of the people in the affected region.

H.R. 823 is a lopsided bill that offers a comparatively small, 28,000 acres, for motorized access versus roughly 400,000 acres of new wilderness enclosures. So 7 percent of the land is provided for motorized access and 93 percent of the land is closed to that access. That means, Madam Chair, you can't drive in to enjoy a family camping trip, and you can't even bring bicycles.

It withdraws all these lands from any kind of resource development, which means that taxpayers will not have the benefit of revenues that these lands could produce. Much of the acreage designated for wilderness restrictions does not even meet the legal requirements under the Wilderness Act, and yet they are imposed in disregard of that law. So, so much for the public's right to use the public lands.

As the growing menace of wildfires attests, 45 years of neglect of sound forest management due to the so-called environmental laws of the 1970s has abandoned our forests to themselves, and like any untended garden, an abandoned forest will grow and grow and grow until it chokes itself to death, and it is then consumed by catastrophic wildfire. Modern forest management broke this cycle of morbid overgrowth followed by catastrophic wildfire. I can tell you, in a State with a significant wildfire risk, this bill would further reduce the acres that have been identified as suitable for active forest management by approximately 8,000 acres. So, so much for good management of the public lands.

This bill flies in the face of significant local opposition, as expressed by many of the locally elected representatives of the communities affected by

this legislation, as we have heard from Mr. TIPTON. Rural county commissioners have warned that this bill will harm the economies of their local communities by removing multiple-use designations from these lands. In fact, when Republicans offered an amendment calling for consultation with the local communities that have been ignored by this legislation, that amendment was rejected on a party-line vote. So, so much for being a good neighbor to communities most affected by the Federal lands.

Now, in the past, the Natural Resources Committee has prided itself on attempting to forge bipartisan consensus on its bills. Those days appear to be over. In fact, 65 percent of the lands affected by H.R. 823 aren't even in the author's district. They are in the district of Mr. TIPTON, who has just expressed his significant concerns over this legislation, who was never consulted before the bill was introduced, and who was barred from engaging the bill's sponsor during the committee's consideration of the bill on April 2. In this kangaroo proceeding, the bill's author acted as a witness, an advocate, and the chairman of the proceeding all at the same time.

Every Republican Member from Colorado opposes this bill, and the bill is reported to us on a straight party-line vote. It is obvious that the majority has no interest in balancing the concerns of local residents, taxpayers, recreational user groups, and conservation groups, but instead feels entitled to impose its will over the pleas of the people most directly impacted. Fortunately, our system of government assures that such legislation, while it might pass one House, as I am sure it will tomorrow, but it will have no chance of becoming law—and rightly so.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chair, again, I think it is important to underscore the facts. While I appreciate the gentleman from California making his case, his characterization of local support or lack thereof on this bill is simply not consistent with the facts, because, again, I have yet to hear of a single community that is directly impacted by the CORE Act that opposes the title of the CORE Act that impacts that community—not one, Madam Chair. I have been waiting. Coloradans are waiting.

Again, it is completely permissible to have a philosophical debate about whether or not to protect public lands. I happen to believe that these incredibly iconic places across our State ought to be protected. They ought to be preserved. My colleagues may disagree. That is their right. But it is important to stress the facts.

To that point, the last point I will make, and just yet another area that apparently needs to be clarified, is around motorized recreation. Any characterization that the CORE Act mandates widespread closures of trails or roads is false. This bill does not

close any existing roads, jeep trails, off-highway vehicle trails, motorcycle trails, or groomed snowmobile trails, not one.

Facts matter, Madam Chair.

I would ask the Chair how much time do I have remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), who has a master's degree in forestry from Yale University.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, as much as I appreciate my colleagues' desire to do something good, I must rise in opposition today to H.R. 823.

As we all know, wilderness designations in theory implement natural management, meaning that man is to have a hands-off approach on the management of the forest. But this is a farce, because when catastrophic wildfires ignite, as they will under natural management, we often rush to put the fires out, which is just as much human management as thinning or other more recognized forestry management processes.

We need wilderness areas in our country, and we need to manage them as such if we want to be intellectually honest in claiming them as wilderness areas. This works in areas like Yellowstone National Park where the predominant species is lodgepole pine that naturally burns to the ground approximately every century, like we saw when one-third of the park burned in the 1980s.

The idea that we can preserve a forest is misguided. Forests are living organisms, and there is only one way to preserve a living organism: first you have to kill it. Take, for instance, a cucumber. If you want to make a pickle, the first thing you do to preserve a cucumber into a pickle is you boil it, you put it in vinegar, you put it in a jar, and you preserve it. If you want to preserve human tissue, you put the tissue in formaldehyde. There is a misnomer that we can preserve our forests because forests are living organisms.

We should be discussing instead conservation. We should want to conserve our forests, like Teddy Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot proposed.

Colorado's forests are currently in an unhealthy state. They are overstocked and infested with insects like the bark and pine beetle. I say that based on a report from the Colorado State Forest Service 2018 Forest Health Report.

It says that, for the seventh consecutive year, Colorado's most widespread and destructive insect pest was the spruce beetle. This insect has now affected more than 1.8 million cumulative acres since 2000, with a total of 178,000 acres of active infestations occurring in high-level Engelmann spruce forests in 2018. A 4-year trend of tens of thousands of new acres infested annually indicates a continuing spread of

spruce beetle into previously uninfested forests.

Moreover, more and more Coloradans are living closer to their forests and closer to the risk of wildfire.

Again, from the report:

A recent update to the CSFS-administered Colorado Wildfire Risk Assessment Portal indicated that the population living in areas at risk to wildland fire in Colorado increased to approximately 50 percent from 2012 to 2017, surpassing 2.9 million people.

Madam Chair, Colorado has some great places, some of which are incorporated into this bill. However, as my colleague from Colorado, Mr. TIPTON, and others have alluded to, what the State needs is not an attempt at preservation. What they need is the application of science to the forests. They need conservation.

Colorado needs the utilization and management of their forests to restore their health and well-being. These forests need thinning, prescribed fire, and selective timber harvest to restore the appropriate stand density and reduce the beetle epidemic.

What these acres do not need is inaction.

Wilderness prevents any action, which threatens not just the surrounding acreage and the communities that lie within those boundaries. Our congressional responsibility is to be good stewards of our lands and ensure that they are there for future generations.

I have no doubt that was the sponsor's intent when writing this bill. However, we cannot just claim vast swaths of land and call our work done. Instead, we must be precise as to what we are designing and why.

Wilderness, in this case, is not the answer. Natural management will not be followed because when life and property are at risk, we will spend vast resources to extinguish nature's management tools.

Authorizing this action over the objections of State and Federal representation is not wise. The future will be our judge if this land is designated wilderness, and nature will deliver its verdict in time. None of us may even be alive when the verdict is delivered, but I desire for the RECORD to indicate that I argued on the side of sound science, that I argued to be responsible and use science and management to restore our forest resiliency, and that I argued to make our forest carbon sinks instead of carbon emitters.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chair, I yield the gentleman from Arkansas an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chairwoman, I argue for wildlife, for water, and for a better environment, and it is because of these reasons that I encourage my colleagues to vote against H.R. 823.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chairman, I have great respect for my colleague from Arkansas. I know he has a deep

experience in his field, I appreciate him on the Natural Resources Committee, and I enjoy serving with him on that committee.

I would ask my distinguished colleague whether he would support the bill if we were to, say, amend the bill to give the Secretary unilateral power to do what the Secretary determines to be necessary for the control of fire and insects.

Would the gentleman be amenable to that?

Mr. WESTERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEGUSE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WESTERMAN. I would be amenable if we did that, but then it wouldn't be wilderness area.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chair, I thank my distinguished colleague from Arkansas; and I will tell the gentleman that we don't need to amend the bill because that language is in the bill, repeatedly in the bill because I share your concerns regarding wildfire, as do my distinguished colleagues from Colorado.

So we put great care to put into the bill language that reiterates "the Secretary may carry out any activity that the Secretary determines to be necessary for the control of fire, insects, and diseases."

So since we have that provision in the bill, I am hoping that the gentleman will join the bill, and I certainly hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will do the same, because I think this bill strikes the right balance in terms of protecting these incredible public lands and doing so in a way that ensures that we are not at risk of a wildfire and mitigating as best as we can.

I would also tell the gentleman, of the 400,000 acres in the bill—and I look forward to bringing my colleague from Arkansas to Colorado to see these public lands—only 73,000 of them would be designated as wilderness in this bill, and many of those acres are actually above the tree line or otherwise unforested.

So, I think the language of the bill addresses the gentleman's concerns, and I appreciate his raising them. I also very much appreciate his quoting a personal hero of mine, and I suspect a hero of many of the Members in this Chamber, and that is Teddy Roosevelt, who, of course, was an esteemed conservationist in his time.

I will share a quote that I have found to be very compelling: "Here is your country. Cherish these natural wonders, cherish the natural resources, cherish the history and romance as a sacred heritage, for your children and your children's children."

"Do not let selfish men or greedy interests skin your country of its beauty, its riches or its romance."

Madam Chair, it is important that we not lose sight of the bigger picture, which is that this bill is protecting iconic places like the Thompson Divide

in Colorado from oil and gas development.

The ranchers, the citizens of that community, they have been waiting an awfully long time for the protections in this bill, which is why I am so proud to be able to carry the baton for them in the CORE Act.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1900

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chair, I am ready to close, if that is where the gentleman from Colorado stands, also.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chair, I am ready to close as well.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, let me say that I am informed that Garfield and Montrose Counties, although they are comfortable with certain portions of the bill, are not willing to endorse the bill as a whole.

Also, I want to say that Colorado Springs Utilities in my district, representing about half a million people, and the Aurora Water District have raised concerns that the Camp Hale National Historic Landscape designation will negatively impact their existing and future water rights. These concerns have gone unaddressed.

I finish by stating what the administration, the Office of Management and Budget, says about this bill, which means, basically, that they have concerns that, if not addressed, will result in a veto of this bill, and it will not become law.

"The administration opposes H.R. 823, the Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act. This bill would impose land restrictions on nearly 400,000 acres of land in Colorado and would reduce areas open for motorized recreation. The administration has pledged to expand access to America's public lands; increase hunting, fishing, and recreational opportunities nationwide; and enhance conservation stewardship. H.R. 823, however, would not achieve these goals in a balanced way, and the administration opposes it as it is currently drafted."

It goes on to say, among other things, "Rural communities have raised concerns that the land-use restrictions included in H.R. 823 would have negative effects on local economies, and, as evidenced by the committee process, it appears that local sentiment has not been adequately taken into account when developing this bill. The administration, therefore, opposes H.R. 823 in its current form, but it is willing to work with the Congress to improve it if the bill is considered further."

So if it were presented to the President in its current form, his advisers would recommend he veto it.

I also have the understanding that the Senate will not take up this bill either.

Maybe it is an interesting exercise that we are doing here, but it is not

anything that is going to result in a law.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill, and let's move on from here. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, it is important that we not divorce ourselves from the fate of this legislation. Whether it will become law or not is dependent on each and every one of us and where we stand on the bill.

While I have great respect for my colleague from Colorado Springs, I think it is fitting that the closing that he offered cited President Trump and his threatened veto letter.

For me, and for the people I represent, for the citizens of my State, this bill is not about the President. It is not about any of us in this Chamber. It is about them and the public lands that they are so blessed to have in their respective communities.

I said this earlier—I will say it again—as a freshman lawmaker, I understand that I have not been in Congress long, but these pieces of legislation have been.

Public lands are at the heart of who we are as Coloradans. You heard the dean of our delegation talk about our recent poll where 73 percent of Coloradans consider themselves outdoor recreation enthusiasts. Whether they live in Gunnison, Glenwood Springs, Boulder, Fort Collins, Eagle County, Summit County, and everywhere in between, 73 percent say the ability to live near, recreate on, and enjoy public lands, like national forests, parks, and trails, is a significant reason why they live in the West.

Ninety percent believe that the outdoor recreation economy is important to the future of Colorado. It is why so many have labored on various components of this bill for so long—my predecessor, then-Congressman, now-Governor Jared Polis; former Senator Mark Udall; former Congressman John Salazar; and, of course, Senator BENNET today leading this companion legislation in the Senate; and the countless county commissioners, mayors, city councilors, town trustees, conservationists, and ranchers who have worked to build consensus on this bill, literally for a decade.

Many of them traveled here just a few months ago when we had a robust debate in the Committee on Natural Resources, and we were able to mark up this bill and send it here to the floor. They deserve to have their voices heard.

My colleagues can say as often as they would like that there are local voices missing or ignored, but that does not make it true. We know that the communities impacted by this bill support it. That is a fact. There can be no dispute about that.

We know that strong policy requires compromise, years of input, and, yes, vigorous debate. I am happy to partici-

pate in that debate, but the people of Colorado have made their voices clear on protecting these public lands.

I mentioned the stakeholder process that we have been engaged in, that the communities have been engaged in, that this State has been engaged in for a decade, regardless of what party was in power or what election year. It was local communities and stakeholders coming to the table to craft the designations that you see on the map to protect these wonderful iconic places that you see to my right. They have been advocating for far too long not to see action from their elected officials.

Madam Chair, it is time that Congress listen to the people of Colorado and vote to protect the places that my home State hold so dear. It is time to hold ourselves accountable. It is time we pass the CORE Act.

Madam Chair, I urge swift adoption of H.R. 823, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 116-264, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule, and shall be considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 823

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the “Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act”.

(b) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.*—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definition of state.

TITLE I—CONTINENTAL DIVIDE

Sec. 101. Definitions.

Sec. 102. Colorado Wilderness additions.

Sec. 103. Williams Fork Mountains Wilderness.

Sec. 104. Tenmile Recreation Management Area.

Sec. 105. Porcupine Gulch Wildlife Conservation Area.

Sec. 106. Williams Fork Mountains Wildlife Conservation Area.

Sec. 107. Camp Hale National Historic Landscape.

Sec. 108. White River National Forest Boundary modification.

Sec. 109. Rocky Mountain National Park Potential Wilderness Boundary adjustment.

Sec. 110. Administrative provisions.

TITLE II—SAN JUAN MOUNTAINS

Sec. 201. Definitions.

Sec. 202. Additions to National Wilderness Preservation System.

Sec. 203. Special management areas.

Sec. 204. Release of wilderness study areas.

Sec. 205. Administrative provisions.

TITLE III—THOMPSON DIVIDE

Sec. 301. Purposes.

Sec. 302. Definitions.

Sec. 303. Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area.

Sec. 304. Thompson Divide lease exchange.

Sec. 305. Greater Thompson Divide Fugitive Coal Mine Methane Use Pilot Program.

Sec. 306. Effect.

TITLE IV—CURECANTI NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Sec. 401. Definitions.

Sec. 402. Curecanti National Recreation Area.

Sec. 403. Acquisition of land; boundary management.

Sec. 404. General management plan.

Sec. 405. Boundary survey.

SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF STATE.

In this Act, the term “State” means the State of Colorado.

SEC. 3. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

TITLE I—CONTINENTAL DIVIDE

SEC. 101. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) *COVERED AREA.*—The term “covered area” means any area designated as wilderness by the amendments to section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103-77) made by section 102(a).

(2) *HISTORIC LANDSCAPE.*—The term “Historic Landscape” means the Camp Hale National Historic Landscape designated by section 107(a).

(3) *RECREATION MANAGEMENT AREA.*—The term “Recreation Management Area” means the Tenmile Recreation Management Area designated by section 104(a).

(4) *SECRETARY.*—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(5) *WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AREA.*—The term “Wildlife Conservation Area” means, as applicable—

(A) the Porcupine Gulch Wildlife Conservation Area designated by section 105(a); and

(B) the Williams Fork Mountains Wildlife Conservation Area designated by section 106(a).

SEC. 102. COLORADO WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.

(a) *DESIGNATION.*—Section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103-77) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (18), by striking “1993,” and inserting “1993, and certain Federal land within the White River National Forest that comprises approximately 6,896 acres, as generally depicted as ‘Proposed Ptarmigan Peak Wilderness Additions’ on the map entitled ‘Proposed Ptarmigan Peak Wilderness Additions’ and dated June 24, 2019,”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(23) *HOLY CROSS WILDERNESS ADDITION.*—Certain Federal land within the White River National Forest that comprises approximately 3,866 acres, as generally depicted as ‘Proposed Megan Dickie Wilderness Addition’ on the map entitled ‘Holy Cross Wilderness Addition Proposal’ and dated June 24, 2019, which shall be incorporated into, and managed as part of, the Holy Cross Wilderness designated by section 102(a)(5) of Public Law 96-560 (94 Stat. 3266).

“(24) *HOOSIER RIDGE WILDERNESS.*—Certain Federal land within the White River National Forest that comprises approximately 5,235 acres, as generally depicted as ‘Proposed Hoosier Ridge Wilderness’ on the map entitled ‘Tenmile Proposal’ and dated June 24, 2019, which shall be known as the ‘Hoosier Ridge Wilderness’.

“(25) *TENMILE WILDERNESS.*—Certain Federal land within the White River National Forest

that comprises approximately 7,624 acres, as generally depicted as 'Proposed Tenmile Wilderness' on the map entitled 'Tennmile Proposal' and dated June 24, 2019, which shall be known as the 'Tennmile Wilderness'.

"(26) **EAGLES NEST WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.**—Certain Federal land within the White River National Forest that comprises approximately 9,670 acres, as generally depicted as 'Proposed Freeman Creek Wilderness Addition' and 'Proposed Spraddle Creek Wilderness Addition' on the map entitled 'Eagles Nest Wilderness Additions Proposal' and dated June 24, 2019, which shall be incorporated into, and managed as part of, the Eagles Nest Wilderness designated by Public Law 94-352 (90 Stat. 870)."

(b) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—Any reference in the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.) to the effective date of that Act shall be considered to be a reference to the date of enactment of this Act for purposes of administering a covered area.

(c) **FIRE, INSECTS, AND DISEASES.**—In accordance with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)), the Secretary may carry out any activity in a covered area that the Secretary determines to be necessary for the control of fire, insects, and diseases, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(d) **GRAZING.**—The grazing of livestock on a covered area, if established before the date of enactment of this Act, shall be permitted to continue subject to such reasonable regulations as are considered to be necessary by the Secretary, in accordance with—

(1) section 4(d)(4) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(4)); and

(2) the guidelines set forth in Appendix A of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 2570 of the 101st Congress (H. Rept. 101-405).

(e) **COORDINATION.**—For purposes of administering the Federal land designated as wilderness by paragraph (26) of section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103-77) (as added by subsection (a)(2)), the Secretary shall, as determined to be appropriate for the protection of watersheds, coordinate the activities of the Secretary in response to fires and flooding events with interested State and local agencies, including operations using aircraft or mechanized equipment.

SEC. 103. WILLIAMS FORK MOUNTAINS WILDERNESS.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), certain Federal land in the White River National Forest in the State, comprising approximately 8,036 acres and generally depicted as "Proposed Williams Fork Mountains Wilderness" on the map entitled "Williams Fork Mountains Proposal" and dated June 24, 2019, is designated as a potential wilderness area.

(b) **MANAGEMENT.**—Subject to valid existing rights and except as provided in subsection (d), the potential wilderness area designated by subsection (a) shall be managed in accordance with—

(1) the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.); and

(2) this section.

(c) **LIVESTOCK USE OF VACANT ALLOTMENTS.**—(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), the Secretary shall publish a determination regarding whether to authorize livestock grazing or other use by livestock on the vacant allotments known as—

(A) the "Big Hole Allotment"; and

(B) the "Blue Ridge Allotment".

(2) **MODIFICATION OF ALLOTMENTS.**—In publishing a determination pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary may modify or combine the vacant allotments referred to in that paragraph.

(3) **PERMIT OR OTHER AUTHORIZATION.**—Not later than 1 year after the date on which a de-

termination of the Secretary to authorize livestock grazing or other use by livestock is published under paragraph (1), if applicable, the Secretary shall grant a permit or other authorization for that livestock grazing or other use in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations).

(d) **RANGE IMPROVEMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Secretary permits livestock grazing or other use by livestock on the potential wilderness area under subsection (c), the Secretary, or a third party authorized by the Secretary, may use any motorized or mechanized transport or equipment for purposes of constructing or rehabilitating such range improvements as are necessary to obtain appropriate livestock management objectives (including habitat and watershed restoration).

(2) **TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.**—The authority provided by this subsection terminates on the date that is 2 years after the date on which the Secretary publishes a positive determination under subsection (c)(3).

(e) **DESIGNATION AS WILDERNESS.**—

(1) **DESIGNATION.**—The potential wilderness area designated by subsection (a) shall be designated as wilderness, to be known as the "Williams Fork Mountains Wilderness"—

(A) effective not earlier than the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) on the earliest of—

(i) the date on which the Secretary publishes in the Federal Register a notice that the construction or rehabilitation of range improvements under subsection (d) is complete;

(ii) the date described in subsection (d)(2); and

(iii) the effective date of a determination of the Secretary not to authorize livestock grazing or other use by livestock under subsection (c)(1).

(2) **ADMINISTRATION.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the Secretary shall manage the Williams Fork Mountains Wilderness in accordance with—

(A) the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103-77); and

(B) this title.

SEC. 104. TENMILE RECREATION MANAGEMENT AREA.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the approximately 17,122 acres of Federal land in the White River National Forest in the State, as generally depicted as "Proposed Tenmile Recreation Management Area" on the map entitled "Tennmile Proposal" and dated June 24, 2019, are designated as the "Tenmile Recreation Management Area".

(b) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of the Recreation Management Area are to conserve, protect, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the recreational, scenic, watershed, habitat, and ecological resources of the Recreation Management Area.

(c) **MANAGEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall manage the Recreation Management Area—

(A) in a manner that conserves, protects, and enhances—

(i) the purposes of the Recreation Management Area described in subsection (b); and

(ii) recreation opportunities, including mountain biking, hiking, fishing, horseback riding, snowshoeing, climbing, skiing, camping, and hunting; and

(B) in accordance with—

(i) the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.);

(ii) any other applicable laws (including regulations); and

(iii) this section.

(2) **USES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall only allow such uses of the Recreation Management Area as the Secretary determines would further the purposes described in subsection (b).

(B) **VEHICLES.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in clause (iii), the use of motorized vehicles in the Recreation Management Area shall be limited to the roads, vehicle classes, and periods authorized for motorized vehicle use on the date of enactment of this Act.

(ii) **NEW OR TEMPORARY ROADS.**—Except as provided in clause (iii), no new or temporary road shall be constructed in the Recreation Management Area.

(iii) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Nothing in clause (i) or (ii) prevents the Secretary from—

(I) rerouting or closing an existing road or trail to protect natural resources from degradation, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate;

(II) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles for administrative purposes or roadside camping;

(III) constructing temporary roads or permitting the use of motorized vehicles to carry out pre- or post-fire watershed protection projects;

(IV) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles to carry out any activity described in subsection (d), (e)(1), or (f); or

(V) responding to an emergency.

(C) **COMMERCIAL TIMBER.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to clause (ii), no project shall be carried out in the Recreation Management Area for the purpose of harvesting commercial timber.

(ii) **LIMITATION.**—Nothing in clause (i) prevents the Secretary from harvesting or selling a merchantable product that is a byproduct of an activity authorized under this section.

(d) **FIRE, INSECTS, AND DISEASES.**—The Secretary may carry out any activity, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), that the Secretary determines to be necessary to prevent, control, or mitigate fire, insects, or disease in the Recreation Management Area, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(e) **WATER.**—

(1) **EFFECT ON WATER MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE.**—Nothing in this section affects the construction, repair, reconstruction, replacement, operation, maintenance, or renovation within the Recreation Management Area of—

(A) water management infrastructure in existence on the date of enactment of this Act; or

(B) any future infrastructure necessary for the development or exercise of water rights decreed before the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—Section 3(e) of the James Peak Wilderness and Protection Area Act (Public Law 107-216; 116 Stat. 1058) shall apply to the Recreation Management Area.

(f) **REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.**—Nothing in this section precludes the Secretary from authorizing, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), the use or leasing of Federal land within the Recreation Management Area for—

(1) a regional transportation project, including—

(A) highway widening or realignment; and

(B) construction of multimodal transportation systems; or

(2) any infrastructure, activity, or safety measure associated with the implementation or use of a facility constructed under paragraph (1).

(g) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—Nothing in this section affects the designation of the Federal land within the Recreation Management Area for purposes of—

(1) section 138 of title 23, United States Code; or

(2) section 303 of title 49, United States Code.

(h) **PERMITS.**—Nothing in this section alters or limits—

(1) any permit held by a ski area or other entity; or

(2) the acceptance, review, or implementation of associated activities or facilities proposed or authorized by law or permit outside the boundaries of the Recreation Management Area.

SEC. 105. PORCUPINE GULCH WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AREA.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the approximately 8,287 acres of Federal land located in the White River National Forest, as generally depicted as “Proposed Porcupine Gulch Wildlife Conservation Area” on the map entitled “Porcupine Gulch Wildlife Conservation Area Proposal” and dated June 24, 2019, are designated as the “Porcupine Gulch Wildlife Conservation Area” (referred to in this section as the “Wildlife Conservation Area”).

(b) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of the Wildlife Conservation Area are—

(1) to conserve and protect a wildlife migration corridor over Interstate 70; and

(2) to conserve, protect, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the wildlife, scenic, roadless, watershed, and ecological resources of the Wildlife Conservation Area.

(c) **MANAGEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall manage the Wildlife Conservation Area—

(A) in a manner that conserves, protects, and enhances the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(B) in accordance with—

(i) the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.);

(ii) any other applicable laws (including regulations); and

(iii) this section.

(2) **USES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall only allow such uses of the Wildlife Conservation Area as the Secretary determines would further the purposes described in subsection (b).

(B) **RECREATION.**—The Secretary may permit such recreational activities in the Wildlife Conservation Area that the Secretary determines are consistent with the purposes described in subsection (b).

(C) **MOTORIZED VEHICLES AND MECHANIZED TRANSPORT; NEW OR TEMPORARY ROADS.**—

(i) **MOTORIZED VEHICLES AND MECHANIZED TRANSPORT.**—Except as provided in clause (iii), the use of motorized vehicles and mechanized transport in the Wildlife Conservation Area shall be prohibited.

(ii) **NEW OR TEMPORARY ROADS.**—Except as provided in clause (iii) and subsection (e), no new or temporary road shall be constructed within the Wildlife Conservation Area.

(iii) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Nothing in clause (i) or (ii) prevents the Secretary from—

(I) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles or mechanized transport for administrative purposes;

(II) constructing temporary roads or permitting the use of motorized vehicles or mechanized transport to carry out pre- or post-fire watershed protection projects;

(III) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles or mechanized transport to carry out activities described in subsection (d) or (e); or

(IV) responding to an emergency.

(D) **COMMERCIAL TIMBER.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to clause (ii), no project shall be carried out in the Wildlife Conservation Area for the purpose of harvesting commercial timber.

(ii) **LIMITATION.**—Nothing in clause (i) prevents the Secretary from harvesting or selling a merchantable product that is a byproduct of an activity authorized under this section.

(d) **FIRE, INSECTS, AND DISEASES.**—The Secretary may carry out any activity, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), that the Secretary determines to be necessary to prevent, control, or mitigate fire, insects, or disease in the Wildlife Conservation Area, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(e) **REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.**—Nothing in this section or section 110(e) precludes the Secretary from authorizing, in ac-

cordance with applicable laws (including regulations), the use or leasing of Federal land within the Wildlife Conservation Area for—

(1) a regional transportation project, including—

(A) highway widening or realignment; and

(B) construction of multimodal transportation systems; or

(2) any infrastructure, activity, or safety measure associated with the implementation or use of a facility constructed under paragraph (1).

(f) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—Nothing in this section affects the designation of the Federal land within the Wildlife Conservation Area for purposes of—

(1) section 138 of title 23, United States Code; or

(2) section 303 of title 49, United States Code.

(g) **WATER.**—Section 3(e) of the James Peak Wilderness and Protection Area Act (Public Law 107-216; 116 Stat. 1058) shall apply to the Wildlife Conservation Area.

SEC. 106. WILLIAMS FORK MOUNTAINS WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AREA.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the approximately 3,528 acres of Federal land in the White River National Forest in the State, as generally depicted as “Proposed Williams Fork Mountains Wildlife Conservation Area” on the map entitled “Williams Fork Mountains Proposal” and dated June 24, 2019, are designated as the “Williams Fork Mountains Wildlife Conservation Area” (referred to in this section as the “Wildlife Conservation Area”).

(b) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of the Wildlife Conservation Area are to conserve, protect, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the wildlife, scenic, roadless, watershed, recreational, and ecological resources of the Wildlife Conservation Area.

(c) **MANAGEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall manage the Wildlife Conservation Area—

(A) in a manner that conserves, protects, and enhances the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(B) in accordance with—

(i) the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.);

(ii) any other applicable laws (including regulations); and

(iii) this section.

(2) **USES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall only allow such uses of the Wildlife Conservation Area as the Secretary determines would further the purposes described in subsection (b).

(B) **MOTORIZED VEHICLES.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in clause (ii), the use of motorized vehicles in the Wildlife Conservation Area shall be limited to designated roads and trails.

(ii) **NEW OR TEMPORARY ROADS.**—Except as provided in clause (iii), no new or temporary road shall be constructed in the Wildlife Conservation Area.

(iii) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Nothing in clause (i) or (ii) prevents the Secretary from—

(I) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles for administrative purposes;

(II) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles to carry out activities described in subsection (d); or

(III) responding to an emergency.

(C) **BICYCLES.**—The use of bicycles in the Wildlife Conservation Area shall be limited to designated roads and trails.

(D) **COMMERCIAL TIMBER.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to clause (ii), no project shall be carried out in the Wildlife Conservation Area for the purpose of harvesting commercial timber.

(ii) **LIMITATION.**—Nothing in clause (i) prevents the Secretary from harvesting or selling a

merchantable product that is a byproduct of an activity authorized under this section.

(E) **GRAZING.**—The laws (including regulations) and policies followed by the Secretary in issuing and administering grazing permits or leases on land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary shall continue to apply with regard to the land in the Wildlife Conservation Area, consistent with the purposes described in subsection (b).

(d) **FIRE, INSECTS, AND DISEASES.**—The Secretary may carry out any activity, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), that the Secretary determines to be necessary to prevent, control, or mitigate fire, insects, or disease in the Wildlife Conservation Area, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(e) **REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.**—Nothing in this section or section 110(e) precludes the Secretary from authorizing, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), the use or leasing of Federal land within the Wildlife Conservation Area for—

(1) a regional transportation project, including—

(A) highway widening or realignment; and

(B) construction of multimodal transportation systems; or

(2) any infrastructure, activity, or safety measure associated with the implementation or use of a facility constructed under paragraph (1).

(f) **WATER.**—Section 3(e) of the James Peak Wilderness and Protection Area Act (Public Law 107-216; 116 Stat. 1058) shall apply to the Wildlife Conservation Area.

SEC. 107. CAMP HALE NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDSCAPE.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the approximately 28,676 acres of Federal land in the White River National Forest in the State, as generally depicted as “Proposed Camp Hale National Historic Landscape” on the map entitled “Camp Hale National Historic Landscape Proposal” and dated June 24, 2019, are designated the “Camp Hale National Historic Landscape”.

(b) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of the Historic Landscape are—

(1) to provide for—

(A) the interpretation of historic events, activities, structures, and artifacts of the Historic Landscape, including with respect to the role of the Historic Landscape in local, national, and world history;

(B) the historic preservation of the Historic Landscape, consistent with—

(i) the designation of the Historic Landscape as a national historic site; and

(ii) the other purposes of the Historic Landscape;

(C) recreational opportunities, with an emphasis on the activities related to the historic use of the Historic Landscape, including skiing, snowshoeing, snowmobiling, hiking, horseback riding, climbing, other road- and trail-based activities, and other outdoor activities; and

(D) the continued environmental remediation and removal of unexploded ordnance at the Camp Hale Formerly Used Defense Site and the Camp Hale historic cantonment area; and

(2) to conserve, protect, restore, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the scenic, watershed, and ecological resources of the Historic Landscape.

(c) **MANAGEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall manage the Historic Landscape in accordance with—

(A) the purposes of the Historic Landscape described in subsection (b); and

(B) any other applicable laws (including regulations).

(2) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare a management plan for the Historic Landscape.

(B) CONTENTS.—The management plan prepared under subparagraph (A) shall include plans for—

(i) improving the interpretation of historic events, activities, structures, and artifacts of the Historic Landscape, including with respect to the role of the Historic Landscape in local, national, and world history;

(ii) conducting historic preservation activities;

(iii) managing recreational opportunities, including the use and stewardship of—

(I) the road and trail systems; and

(II) dispersed recreation resources;

(iv) the conservation, protection, restoration, or enhancement of the scenic, watershed, and ecological resources of the Historic Landscape, including conducting the restoration and enhancement project under subsection (d); and

(v) environmental remediation and, consistent with subsection (e)(2), the removal of unexploded ordnance.

(3) EXPLOSIVE HAZARDS.—The Secretary shall provide to the Secretary of the Army a notification of any unexploded ordnance (as defined in section 101(e) of title 10, United States Code) that is discovered in the Historic Landscape.

(d) CAMP HALE RESTORATION AND ENHANCEMENT PROJECT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a restoration and enhancement project in the Historic Landscape—

(A) to improve aquatic, riparian, and wetland conditions in and along the Eagle River and tributaries of the Eagle River;

(B) to maintain or improve recreation and interpretive opportunities and facilities; and

(C) to conserve historic values in the Camp Hale area.

(2) COORDINATION.—In carrying out the project described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall coordinate with—

(A) the United States Army Corps of Engineers;

(B) the Camp Hale-Eagle River Headwaters Collaborative Group;

(C) the National Forest Foundation;

(D) the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment;

(E) the Colorado State Historic Preservation Office;

(F) units of local government; and

(G) other interested organizations and members of the public.

(e) ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army shall continue to carry out the projects and activities of the Department of the Army in existence on the date of enactment of this Act relating to cleanup of—

(A) the Camp Hale Formerly Used Defense Site; or

(B) the Camp Hale historic cantonment area.

(2) REMOVAL OF UNEXPLODED ORDNANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army may remove unexploded ordnance (as defined in section 101(e) of title 10, United States Code) from the Historic Landscape, as the Secretary of the Army determines to be appropriate in accordance with applicable law (including regulations).

(B) ACTION ON RECEIPT OF NOTICE.—On receipt from the Secretary of a notification of unexploded ordnance under subsection (c)(3), the Secretary of the Army may remove the unexploded ordnance in accordance with—

(i) the program for environmental restoration of formerly used defense sites under section 2701 of title 10, United States Code;

(ii) the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.); and

(iii) any other applicable provision of law (including regulations).

(3) EFFECT OF SUBSECTION.—Nothing in this subsection modifies any obligation in existence on the date of enactment of this Act relating to environmental remediation or removal of any unexploded ordnance located in or around the

Camp Hale historic cantonment area, the Camp Hale Formerly Used Defense Site, or the Historic Landscape, including such an obligation under—

(A) the program for environmental restoration of formerly used defense sites under section 2701 of title 10, United States Code;

(B) the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.); or

(C) any other applicable provision of law (including regulations).

(f) INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT.—The Secretary and the Secretary of the Army shall enter into an agreement—

(1) to specify—

(A) the activities of the Secretary relating to the management of the Historic Landscape; and

(B) the activities of the Secretary of the Army relating to environmental remediation and the removal of unexploded ordnance in accordance with subsection (e) and other applicable laws (including regulations); and

(2) to require the Secretary to provide to the Secretary of the Army, by not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and periodically thereafter, as appropriate, a management plan for the Historic Landscape for purposes of the removal activities described in subsection (e).

(g) EFFECT.—Nothing in this section—

(1) affects the jurisdiction of the State over any water law, water right, or adjudication or administration relating to any water resource;

(2) affects any water right in existence on or after the date of enactment of this Act, or the exercise of such a water right, including—

(A) a water right under an interstate water compact (including full development of any apportionment made in accordance with such a compact);

(B) a water right decreed within, above, below, or through the Historic Landscape;

(C) a water right held by the United States;

(D) the management or operation of any reservoir, including the storage, management, release, or transportation of water; and

(E) the construction or operation of such infrastructure as is determined to be necessary by an individual or entity holding water rights to develop and place to beneficial use those rights, subject to applicable Federal, State, and local law (including regulations);

(3) constitutes an express or implied reservation by the United States of any reserved or appropriative water right;

(4) alters or limits—

(A) a permit held by a ski area;

(B) the implementation of activities governed by a ski area permit; or

(C) the authority of the Secretary to modify or expand an existing ski area permit;

(5) prevents the Secretary from closing portions of the Historic Landscape for public safety, environmental remediation, or other use in accordance with applicable laws; or

(6) affects—

(A) any special use permit in effect on the date of enactment of this Act; or

(B) the renewal of a permit described in subparagraph (A).

(h) FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the general fund of the Treasury a special account, to be known as the “Camp Hale Historic Preservation and Restoration Fund”.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Camp Hale Historic Preservation and Restoration Fund \$10,000,000, to be available to the Secretary until expended, for activities relating to historic interpretation, preservation, and restoration carried out in and around the Historic Landscape.

(i) DESIGNATION OF OVERLOOK.—The interpretive site located beside United States Route 24 in the State, at 39.431N 106.323W, is hereby designated as the “Sandy Treat Overlook”.

SEC. 108. WHITE RIVER NATIONAL FOREST BOUNDARY MODIFICATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The boundary of the White River National Forest is modified to include the approximately 120 acres comprised of the SW 1/4, the SE 1/4, and the NE 1/4 of the SE 1/4 of sec. 1, T. 2 S., R. 80 W., 6th Principal Meridian, in Summit County in the State.

(b) LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.—For purposes of section 200306 of title 54, United States Code, the boundaries of the White River National Forest, as modified under subsection (a), shall be considered to be the boundaries of the White River National Forest as in existence on January 1, 1965.

SEC. 109. ROCKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK POTENTIAL WILDERNESS BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to provide for the ongoing maintenance and use of portions of the Trail River Ranch and the associated property located within Rocky Mountain National Park in Grand County in the State.

(b) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—Section 1952(b) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–11; 123 Stat. 1070) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—The boundary of the Potential Wilderness is modified to exclude the area comprising approximately 15.5 acres of land identified as ‘Potential Wilderness to Non-wilderness’ on the map entitled ‘Rocky Mountain National Park Proposed Wilderness Area Amendment’ and dated January 16, 2018.”.

SEC. 110. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

(a) FISH AND WILDLIFE.—Nothing in this title affects the jurisdiction or responsibility of the State with respect to fish and wildlife in the State.

(b) NO BUFFER ZONES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this title or an amendment made by this title establishes a protective perimeter or buffer zone around—

(A) a covered area;

(B) a wilderness area or potential wilderness area designated by section 103;

(C) the Recreation Management Area;

(D) a Wildlife Conservation Area; or

(E) the Historic Landscape.

(2) OUTSIDE ACTIVITIES.—The fact that a non-wilderness activity or use on land outside of a covered area can be seen or heard from within the covered area shall not preclude the activity or use outside the boundary of the covered area.

(c) MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file maps and legal descriptions of each area described in subsection (b)(1) with—

(A) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(2) FORCE OF LAW.—Each map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this title, except that the Secretary may correct any typographical errors in the maps and legal descriptions.

(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Each map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

(d) ACQUISITION OF LAND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may acquire any land or interest in land within the boundaries of an area described in subsection (b)(1) only through exchange, donation, or purchase from a willing seller.

(2) MANAGEMENT.—Any land or interest in land acquired under paragraph (1) shall be incorporated into, and administered as a part of, the wilderness area, Recreation Management Area, Wildlife Conservation Area, or Historic Landscape, as applicable, in which the land or interest in land is located.

(e) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid rights in existence on the date of enactment of this Act,

the areas described in subsection (b)(1) are withdrawn from—

- (1) entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;
- (2) location, entry, and patent under mining laws; and
- (3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(f) **MILITARY OVERFLIGHTS.**—Nothing in this title or an amendment made by this title restricts or precludes—

- (1) any low-level overflight of military aircraft over any area subject to this title or an amendment made by this title, including military overflights that can be seen, heard, or detected within such an area;
- (2) flight testing or evaluation over an area described in paragraph (1); or
- (3) the use or establishment of—
 - (A) any new unit of special use airspace over an area described in paragraph (1); or
 - (B) any military flight training or transportation over such an area.

TITLE II—SAN JUAN MOUNTAINS

SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **COVERED LAND.**—The term “covered land” means—

(A) land designated as wilderness under paragraphs (27) through (29) of section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103–77) (as added by section 202); and

(B) a Special Management Area.

(2) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(3) **SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREA.**—The term “Special Management Area” means each of—

- (A) the Sheep Mountain Special Management Area designated by section 203(a)(1); and
- (B) the Liberty Bell East Special Management Area designated by section 203(a)(2).

SEC. 202. ADDITIONS TO NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM.

Section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103–77) (as amended by section 102(a)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(27) **LIZARD HEAD WILDERNESS ADDITION.**—Certain Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests comprising approximately 3,141 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Proposed Wilson, Sunshine, Black Face and San Bernardo Additions to the Lizard Head Wilderness’ and dated September 6, 2018, which is incorporated in, and shall be administered as part of, the Lizard Head Wilderness.

“(28) **MOUNT SNEFFELS WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.**—

“(A) **LIBERTY BELL AND LAST DOLLAR ADDITIONS.**—Certain Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests comprising approximately 7,235 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Proposed Liberty Bell and Last Dollar Additions to the Mt. Sneffels Wilderness, Liberty Bell East Special Management Area’ and dated September 6, 2018, which is incorporated in, and shall be administered as part of, the Mount Sneffels Wilderness.

“(B) **WHITEHOUSE ADDITIONS.**—Certain Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests comprising approximately 12,465 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Proposed Whitehouse Additions to the Mt. Sneffels Wilderness’ and dated September 6, 2018, which is incorporated in, and shall be administered as part of, the Mount Sneffels Wilderness.

“(29) **MCKENNA PEAK WILDERNESS.**—Certain Federal land in the State of Colorado comprising approximately 8,884 acres of Bureau of Land Management land, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Proposed McKenna Peak Wilderness Area’ and dated September 18, 2018, to be known as the ‘McKenna Peak Wilderness’.”

SEC. 203. SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—

(1) **SHEEP MOUNTAIN SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREA.**—The Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison and San Juan National Forests in the State comprising approximately 21,663 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Proposed Sheep Mountain Special Management Area” and dated September 19, 2018, is designated as the “Sheep Mountain Special Management Area”.

(2) **LIBERTY BELL EAST SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREA.**—The Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests in the State comprising approximately 792 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Proposed Liberty Bell and Last Dollar Additions to the Mt. Sneffels Wilderness, Liberty Bell East Special Management Area” and dated September 6, 2018, is designated as the “Liberty Bell East Special Management Area”.

(b) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of the Special Management Areas is to conserve and protect for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the geological, cultural, archaeological, paleontological, natural, scientific, recreational, wilderness, wildlife, riparian, historical, educational, and scenic resources of the Special Management Areas.

(c) **MANAGEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall manage the Special Management Areas in a manner that—

(A) conserves, protects, and enhances the resources and values of the Special Management Areas described in subsection (b);

(B) subject to paragraph (3), maintains or improves the wilderness character of the Special Management Areas and the suitability of the Special Management Areas for potential inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System; and

(C) is in accordance with—

- (i) the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.);
- (ii) this title; and
- (iii) any other applicable laws.

(2) **PROHIBITIONS.**—The following shall be prohibited in the Special Management Areas:

(A) Permanent roads.

(B) Except as necessary to meet the minimum requirements for the administration of the Federal land, to provide access for abandoned mine cleanup, and to protect public health and safety—

- (i) the use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment, or mechanical transport (other than as provided in paragraph (3)); and
- (ii) the establishment of temporary roads.

(3) **AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may allow any activities (including helicopter access for recreation and maintenance and the competitive running event permitted since 1992) that have been authorized by permit or license as of the date of enactment of this Act to continue within the Special Management Areas, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.

(B) **PERMITTING.**—The designation of the Special Management Areas by subsection (a) shall not affect the issuance of permits relating to the activities covered under subparagraph (A) after the date of enactment of this Act.

(C) **BICYCLES.**—The Secretary may permit the use of bicycles in—

(i) the portion of the Sheep Mountain Special Management Area identified as “Ophir Valley Area” on the map entitled “Proposed Sheep Mountain Special Management Area” and dated September 19, 2018; and

(ii) the portion of the Liberty Bell East Special Management Area identified as “Liberty Bell Corridor” on the map entitled “Proposed Liberty Bell and Last Dollar Additions to the Mt. Sneffels Wilderness, Liberty Bell East Special Management Area” and dated September 6, 2018.

(d) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—Water and water rights in the Special Management Areas shall be administered in accordance with section 8 of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–77; 107 Stat. 762), except that, for purposes of this Act—

(1) any reference contained in that section to “the lands designated as wilderness by this Act”, “the Piedra, Roubideau, and Tabeguache areas identified in section 9 of this Act, or the Bowen Gulch Protection Area or the Fossil Ridge Recreation Management Area identified in sections 5 and 6 of this Act”, or “the areas described in sections 2, 5, 6, and 9 of this Act” shall be considered to be a reference to “the Special Management Areas”; and

(2) any reference contained in that section to “this Act” shall be considered to be a reference to “the Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act”.

SEC. 204. RELEASE OF WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS.

(a) **DOMINGUEZ CANYON WILDERNESS STUDY AREA.**—Subtitle E of title II of Public Law 111–11 is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 2408 (16 U.S.C. 460zz–7) as section 2409; and

(2) by inserting after section 2407 (16 U.S.C. 460zz–6) the following:

“SEC. 2408. RELEASE.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Congress finds that, for the purposes of section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c)), the portions of the Dominguez Canyon Wilderness Study Area not designated as wilderness by this subtitle have been adequately studied for wilderness designation.

“(b) **RELEASE.**—Any public land referred to in subsection (a) that is not designated as wilderness by this subtitle—

“(1) is no longer subject to section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c)); and

“(2) shall be managed in accordance with this subtitle and any other applicable laws.”.

(b) **MCKENNA PEAK WILDERNESS STUDY AREA.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Congress finds that, for the purposes of section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c)), the portions of the McKenna Peak Wilderness Study Area in San Miguel County in the State not designated as wilderness by paragraph (29) of section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103–77) (as added by section 202) have been adequately studied for wilderness designation.

(2) **RELEASE.**—Any public land referred to in paragraph (1) that is not designated as wilderness by paragraph (29) of section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103–77) (as added by section 202)—

(A) is no longer subject to section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c)); and

(B) shall be managed in accordance with applicable laws.

SEC. 205. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

(a) **FISH AND WILDLIFE.**—Nothing in this title affects the jurisdiction or responsibility of the State with respect to fish and wildlife in the State.

(b) **NO BUFFER ZONES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Nothing in this title establishes a protective perimeter or buffer zone around covered land.

(2) **ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE WILDERNESS.**—The fact that a nonwilderness activity or use on land outside of the covered land can be seen or heard from within covered land shall not preclude the activity or use outside the boundary of the covered land.

(c) **MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary or the Secretary of the Interior, as appropriate,

shall file a map and a legal description of each wilderness area designated by paragraphs (27) through (29) of section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103-77) (as added by section 202) and the Special Management Areas with—

(A) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(2) **FORCE OF LAW.**—Each map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this title, except that the Secretary or the Secretary of the Interior, as appropriate, may correct any typographical errors in the maps and legal descriptions.

(3) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—Each map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service.

(d) **ACQUISITION OF LAND.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary or the Secretary of the Interior, as appropriate, may acquire any land or interest in land within the boundaries of a Special Management Area or the wilderness designated under paragraphs (27) through (29) of section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103-77) (as added by section 202) only through exchange, donation, or purchase from a willing seller.

(2) **MANAGEMENT.**—Any land or interest in land acquired under paragraph (1) shall be incorporated into, and administered as a part of, the wilderness or Special Management Area in which the land or interest in land is located.

(e) **GRAZING.**—The grazing of livestock on covered land, if established before the date of enactment of this Act, shall be permitted to continue subject to such reasonable regulations as are considered to be necessary by the Secretary with jurisdiction over the covered land, in accordance with—

(1) section 4(d)(4) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(4)); and

(2) the applicable guidelines set forth in Appendix A of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 2570 of the 101st Congress (H. Rept. 101-405) or H.R. 5487 of the 96th Congress (H. Rept. 96-617).

(f) **FIRE, INSECTS, AND DISEASES.**—In accordance with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)), the Secretary with jurisdiction over a wilderness area designated by paragraphs (27) through (29) of section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103-77) (as added by section 202) may carry out any activity in the wilderness area that the Secretary determines to be necessary for the control of fire, insects, and diseases, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(g) **WITHDRAWAL.**—Subject to valid rights in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, the covered land and the approximately 6,590 acres generally depicted on the map entitled “Proposed Naturita Canyon Mineral Withdrawal Area” and dated September 6, 2018, is withdrawn from—

(1) entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under mining laws; and

(3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

TITLE III—THOMPSON DIVIDE

SEC. 301. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are—

(1) subject to valid existing rights, to withdraw certain Federal land in the Thompson Divide area from mineral and other disposal laws; and

(2) to promote the capture of fugitive methane emissions that would otherwise be emitted into the atmosphere—

(A) to reduce methane gas emissions; and

(B) to provide—

(i) new renewable electricity supplies and other beneficial uses of fugitive methane emissions; and

(ii) increased royalties for taxpayers.

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **FUGITIVE METHANE EMISSIONS.**—The term “fugitive methane emissions” means methane gas from those Federal lands in Garfield, Gunnison, Delta, or Pitkin County in the State generally depicted on the pilot program map as “Fugitive Coal Mine Methane Use Pilot Program Area” that would leak or be vented into the atmosphere from an active, inactive or abandoned underground coal mine.

(2) **PILOT PROGRAM.**—The term “pilot program” means the Greater Thompson Divide Fugitive Coal Mine Methane Use Pilot Program established by section 305(a)(1).

(3) **PILOT PROGRAM MAP.**—The term “pilot program map” means the map entitled “Greater Thompson Divide Fugitive Coal Mine Methane Use Pilot Program Area” and dated June 17, 2019.

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) **THOMPSON DIVIDE LEASE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “Thompson Divide lease” means any oil or gas lease in effect on the date of enactment of this Act within the Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area.

(B) **EXCLUSIONS.**—The term “Thompson Divide lease” does not include any oil or gas lease that—

(i) is associated with a Wolf Creek Storage Field development right; or

(ii) before the date of enactment of this Act, has expired, been cancelled, or otherwise terminated.

(6) **THOMPSON DIVIDE MAP.**—The term “Thompson Divide map” means the map entitled “Greater Thompson Divide Area Map” and dated June 13, 2019.

(7) **THOMPSON DIVIDE WITHDRAWAL AND PROTECTION AREA.**—The term “Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area” means the Federal land and minerals generally depicted on the Thompson Divide map as the “Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area”.

(8) **WOLF CREEK STORAGE FIELD DEVELOPMENT RIGHT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “Wolf Creek Storage Field development right” means a development right for any of the Federal mineral leases numbered COC 007496, COC 007497, COC 007498, COC 007499, COC 007500, COC 007538, COC 008128, COC 015373, COC 0128018, COC 051645, and COC 051646, and generally depicted on the Thompson Divide map as “Wolf Creek Storage Agreement”.

(B) **EXCLUSIONS.**—The term “Wolf Creek Storage Field development right” does not include any storage right or related activity within the area described in subparagraph (A).

SEC. 303. THOMPSON DIVIDE WITHDRAWAL AND PROTECTION AREA.

(a) **WITHDRAWAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area is withdrawn from—

(1) entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(b) **SURVEYS.**—The exact acreage and legal description of the Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area shall be determined by surveys approved by the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 304. THOMPSON DIVIDE LEASE EXCHANGE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In exchange for the relinquishment by a leaseholder of all Thompson Divide leases of the leaseholder, the Secretary may

issue to the leaseholder credits for any bid, royalty, or rental payment due under any Federal oil or gas lease on Federal land in the State, in accordance with subsection (b).

(b) **AMOUNT OF CREDITS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), the amount of the credits issued to a leaseholder of a Thompson Divide lease relinquished under subsection (a) shall—

(A) be equal to the sum of—

(i) the amount of the bonus bids paid for the applicable Thompson Divide leases;

(ii) the amount of any rental paid for the applicable Thompson Divide leases as of the date on which the leaseholder submits to the Secretary a notice of the decision to relinquish the applicable Thompson Divide leases; and

(iii) the amount of any expenses incurred by the leaseholder of the applicable Thompson Divide leases in the preparation of any drilling permit, sundry notice, or other related submission in support of the development of the applicable Thompson Divide leases as of January 28, 2019, including any expenses relating to the preparation of any analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

(B) require the approval of the Secretary.

(2) **EXCLUSION.**—The amount of a credit issued under subsection (a) shall not include any expenses paid by the leaseholder of a Thompson Divide lease for legal fees or related expenses for legal work with respect to a Thompson Divide lease.

(c) **CANCELLATION.**—Effective on relinquishment under this section, and without any additional action by the Secretary, a Thompson Divide lease—

(1) shall be permanently cancelled; and

(2) shall not be reissued.

(d) **CONDITIONS.**—

(1) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—Except as otherwise provided in this section, each exchange under this section shall be conducted in accordance with—

(A) this Act; and

(B) other applicable laws (including regulations).

(2) **ACCEPTANCE OF CREDITS.**—The Secretary shall accept credits issued under subsection (a) in the same manner as cash for the payments described in that subsection.

(3) **APPLICABILITY.**—The use of a credit issued under subsection (a) shall be subject to the laws (including regulations) applicable to the payments described in that subsection, to the extent that the laws are consistent with this section.

(4) **TREATMENT OF CREDITS.**—All amounts in the form of credits issued under subsection (a) accepted by the Secretary shall be considered to be amounts received for the purposes of—

(A) section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 191); and

(B) section 20 of the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1019).

(e) **WOLF CREEK STORAGE FIELD DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS.**—

(1) **CONVEYANCE TO SECRETARY.**—As a condition precedent to the relinquishment of a Thompson Divide lease, any leaseholder with a Wolf Creek Storage Field development right shall permanently relinquish, transfer, and otherwise convey to the Secretary, in a form acceptable to the Secretary, all Wolf Creek Storage Field development rights of the leaseholder.

(2) **LIMITATION OF TRANSFER.**—An interest acquired by the Secretary under paragraph (1)—

(A) shall be held in perpetuity; and

(B) shall not be—

(i) transferred;

(ii) reissued; or

(iii) otherwise used for mineral extraction.

SEC. 305. GREATER THOMPSON DIVIDE FUGITIVE COAL MINE METHANE USE PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) **FUGITIVE COAL MINE METHANE USE PILOT PROGRAM.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established in the Bureau of Land Management a pilot program, to be known as the “Greater Thompson

Divide Fugitive Coal Mine Methane Use Pilot Program”.

(2) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of the pilot program is to promote the capture, beneficial use, mitigation, and sequestration of fugitive methane emissions—

- (A) to reduce methane emissions;
- (B) to promote economic development;
- (C) to produce bid and royalty revenues;
- (D) to improve air quality; and
- (E) to improve public safety.

(3) **PLAN.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop a plan—

(i) to complete an inventory of fugitive methane emissions in accordance with subsection (b);

(ii) to provide for the leasing of fugitive methane emissions in accordance with subsection (c); and

(iii) to provide for the capping or destruction of fugitive methane emissions in accordance with subsection (d).

(B) **COORDINATION.**—In developing the plan under this paragraph, the Secretary shall coordinate with—

- (i) the State;
- (ii) Garfield, Gunnison, Delta, and Pitkin Counties in the State;
- (iii) lessees of Federal coal within the counties referred to in clause (ii);
- (iv) interested institutions of higher education in the State; and
- (v) interested members of the public.

(b) **FUGITIVE METHANE EMISSION INVENTORY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete an inventory of fugitive methane emissions.

(2) **CONDUCT.**—The Secretary may conduct the inventory under paragraph (1) through, or in collaboration with—

- (A) the Bureau of Land Management;
- (B) the United States Geological Survey;
- (C) the Environmental Protection Agency;
- (D) the United States Forest Service;
- (E) State departments or agencies;
- (F) Garfield, Gunnison, Delta, or Pitkin County in the State;
- (G) the Garfield County Federal Mineral Lease District;
- (H) institutions of higher education in the State;
- (I) lessees of Federal coal within a county referred to in subparagraph (F);
- (J) the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration;
- (K) the National Center for Atmospheric Research; or
- (L) other interested entities, including members of the public.

(3) **CONTENTS.**—The inventory under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) the general location and geographic coordinates of each vent, seep, or other source producing significant fugitive methane emissions;

(B) an estimate of the volume and concentration of fugitive methane emissions from each source of significant fugitive methane emissions including details of measurements taken and the basis for that emissions estimate;

(C) an estimate of the total volume of fugitive methane emissions each year;

(D) relevant data and other information available from—

- (i) the Environmental Protection Agency;
- (ii) the Mine Safety and Health Administration;
- (iii) Colorado Department of Natural Resources;
- (iv) Colorado Public Utility Commission;
- (v) Colorado Department of Health and Environment; and
- (vi) Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement; and

(E) such other information as may be useful in advancing the purposes of the pilot program.

(4) **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION; DISCLOSURE.**—

(A) **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.**—The Secretary shall provide opportunities for public participation in the inventory under this subsection.

(B) **AVAILABILITY.**—The Secretary shall make the inventory under this subsection publicly available.

(C) **DISCLOSURE.**—Nothing in this subsection requires the Secretary to publicly release information that—

- (i) poses a threat to public safety;
- (ii) is confidential business information; or
- (iii) is otherwise protected from public disclosure.

(5) **USE.**—The Secretary shall use the inventory in carrying out—

- (A) the leasing program under subsection (c); and
- (B) the capping or destruction of fugitive methane emissions under subsection (d).

(c) **FUGITIVE METHANE EMISSION LEASING PROGRAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights and in accordance with this section, not later than 1 year after the date of completion of the inventory required under subsection (b), the Secretary shall carry out a program to encourage the use and destruction of fugitive methane emissions.

(2) **FUGITIVE METHANE EMISSIONS FROM COAL MINES SUBJECT TO LEASE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall authorize the holder of a valid existing Federal coal lease for a mine that is producing fugitive methane emissions to capture for use, or destroy by flaring, the fugitive methane emissions.

(B) **CONDITIONS.**—The authority under subparagraph (A) shall be—

- (i) subject to valid existing rights; and
- (ii) subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.

(C) **LIMITATIONS.**—The program carried out under paragraph (1) shall only include fugitive methane emissions that can be captured for use, or destroyed by flaring, in a manner that does not—

- (i) endanger the safety of any coal mine worker; or
- (ii) unreasonably interfere with any ongoing operation at a coal mine.

(D) **COOPERATION.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall work cooperatively with the holders of valid existing Federal coal leases for mines that produce fugitive methane emissions to encourage—

(I) the capture of fugitive methane emissions for beneficial use, such as generating electrical power, producing usable heat, transporting the methane to market, transforming the fugitive methane emissions into a different marketable material; or

(II) if the beneficial use of the fugitive methane emissions is not feasible, the destruction of the fugitive methane emissions by flaring.

(ii) **GUIDANCE.**—In furtherance of the purposes of this paragraph, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue guidance for the implementation of Federal authorities and programs to encourage the capture for use, or destruction by flaring, of fugitive methane emissions while minimizing impacts on natural resources or other public interest values.

(E) **ROYALTIES.**—The Secretary shall determine whether any fugitive methane emissions used or destroyed pursuant to this paragraph are subject to the payment of a royalty under applicable law.

(3) **FUGITIVE METHANE EMISSIONS FROM ABANDONED COAL MINES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as otherwise provided in this section, notwithstanding section 303, subject to valid existing rights, and in accordance with section 21 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 241) and any other applicable law, the Secretary shall—

(i) authorize the capture for use, or destruction by flaring, of fugitive methane emissions

from abandoned coal mines on Federal land; and

(ii) make available for leasing such fugitive methane emissions from abandoned coal mines on Federal land as the Secretary considers to be in the public interest.

(B) **SOURCE.**—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall offer for lease each significant vent, seep, or other source of fugitive methane emissions from abandoned coal mines.

(C) **BID QUALIFICATIONS.**—A bid to lease fugitive methane emissions under this paragraph shall specify whether the prospective lessee intends—

(i) to capture the fugitive methane emissions for beneficial use, such as generating electrical power, producing usable heat, transporting the methane to market, transforming the fugitive methane emissions into a different marketable material;

(ii) to destroy the fugitive methane emissions by flaring; or

(iii) to employ a specific combination of—

(I) capturing the fugitive methane emissions for beneficial use; and

(II) destroying the fugitive methane emission by flaring.

(D) **PRIORITY.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—If there is more than 1 qualified bid for a lease under this paragraph, the Secretary shall select the bid that the Secretary determines is likely to most significantly advance the public interest.

(ii) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In determining the public interest under clause (i), the Secretary shall take into consideration—

(I) the size of the overall decrease in the time-integrated radiative forcing of the fugitive methane emissions;

(II) the impacts to other natural resource values, including wildlife, water, and air; and

(III) other public interest values, including scenic, economic, recreation, and cultural values.

(E) **LEASE FORM.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall develop and provide to prospective bidders a lease form for leases issued under this paragraph.

(ii) **DUE DILIGENCE.**—The lease form developed under clause (i) shall include terms and conditions requiring the leased fugitive methane emissions to be put to beneficial use or flared by not later than 1 year after the date of issuance of the lease.

(F) **ROYALTY RATE.**—The Secretary shall develop a minimum bid and royalty rate for leases under this paragraph to advance the purposes of this section, to the maximum extent practicable.

(d) **SEQUESTRATION.**—If, by not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, any significant fugitive methane emissions from abandoned coal mines on Federal land are not leased under subsection (c)(3), the Secretary shall, in accordance with applicable law, take all reasonable measures—

(1) to cap those fugitive methane emissions at the source in any case in which the cap will result in the long-term sequestration of all or a significant portion of the fugitive methane emissions; or

(2) if sequestration under paragraph (1) is not feasible, destroy the fugitive methane emissions by flaring.

(e) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report detailing—

(1) the economic and environmental impacts of the pilot program, including information on increased royalties and estimates of avoided greenhouse gas emissions; and

(2) any recommendations by the Secretary on whether the pilot program could be expanded geographically to include other significant sources of fugitive methane emissions from coal mines.

SEC. 306. EFFECT.

Except as expressly provided in this title, nothing in this title—

(1) expands, diminishes, or impairs any valid existing mineral leases, mineral interest, or other property rights wholly or partially within the Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area, including access to the leases, interests, rights, or land in accordance with applicable Federal, State, and local laws (including regulations);

(2) prevents the capture of methane from any active, inactive, or abandoned coal mine covered by this title, in accordance with applicable laws; or

(3) prevents access to, or the development of, any new or existing coal mine or lease in Delta or Gunnison County in the State.

TITLE IV—CURECANTI NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

SEC. 401. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **MAP.**—The term “map” means the map entitled “Curecanti National Recreation Area, Proposed Boundary”, numbered 616/100,485C, and dated August 11, 2016.

(2) **NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.**—The term “National Recreation Area” means the Curecanti National Recreation Area established by section 402(a).

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 402. CURECANTI NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Effective beginning on the earlier of the date on which the Secretary approves a request under subsection (c)(2)(B)(i)(I) and the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, there shall be established as a unit of the National Park System the Curecanti National Recreation Area, in accordance with this Act, consisting of approximately 50,667 acres of land in the State, as generally depicted on the map as “Curecanti National Recreation Area Proposed Boundary”.

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF MAP.**—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(c) **ADMINISTRATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall administer the National Recreation Area in accordance with—

(A) this title; and

(B) the laws (including regulations) generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including section 100101(a), chapter 1003, and sections 100751(a), 100752, 100753, and 102101 of title 54, United States Code.

(2) **DAM, POWERPLANT, AND RESERVOIR MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Nothing in this title affects or interferes with the authority of the Secretary—

(i) to operate the Uncompahgre Valley Reclamation Project under the reclamation laws;

(ii) to operate the Wayne N. Aspinall Unit of the Colorado River Storage Project under the Act of April 11, 1956 (commonly known as the “Colorado River Storage Project Act”) (43 U.S.C. 620 et seq.); or

(iii) under the Federal Water Project Recreation Act (16 U.S.C. 4601–12 et seq.).

(B) **RECLAMATION LAND.**—

(i) **SUBMISSION OF REQUEST TO RETAIN ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.**—If, before the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of Reclamation submits to the Secretary a request for the Commissioner of Reclamation to retain administrative jurisdiction over the minimum quantity of land within the land identified on the map as “Lands withdrawn or acquired for Bureau of Reclamation projects” that the Commissioner of Reclamation identifies as necessary for the effective operation of Bureau of Reclamation water facilities, the Secretary may—

(I) approve, approve with modifications, or disapprove the request; and

(II) if the request is approved under subclause (I), make any modifications to the map that are necessary to reflect that the Commissioner of Reclamation retains management authority over the minimum quantity of land required to fulfill the reclamation mission.

(ii) **TRANSFER OF LAND.**—

(I) **IN GENERAL.**—Administrative jurisdiction over the land identified on the map as “Lands withdrawn or acquired for Bureau of Reclamation projects”, as modified pursuant to clause (i)(II), if applicable, shall be transferred from the Commissioner of Reclamation to the Director of the National Park Service by not later than the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(II) **ACCESS TO TRANSFERRED LAND.**—

(aa) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to item (bb), the Commissioner of Reclamation shall retain access to the land transferred to the Director of the National Park Service under subclause (I) for reclamation purposes, including for the operation, maintenance, and expansion or replacement of facilities.

(bb) **MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.**—The terms of the access authorized under item (aa) shall be determined by a memorandum of understanding entered into between the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Director of the National Park Service not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) **MANAGEMENT AGREEMENTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may enter into management agreements, or modify management agreements in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, relating to the authority of the Director of the National Park Service, the Commissioner of Reclamation, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, or the Chief of the Forest Service to manage Federal land within or adjacent to the boundary of the National Recreation Area.

(B) **STATE LAND.**—The Secretary may enter into cooperative management agreements for any land administered by the State that is within or adjacent to the National Recreation Area, in accordance with the cooperative management authority under section 101703 of title 54, United States Code.

(4) **RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES.**—

(A) **AUTHORIZATION.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall allow boating, boating-related activities, hunting, and fishing in the National Recreation Area in accordance with applicable Federal and State laws.

(B) **CLOSURES; DESIGNATED ZONES.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, acting through the Superintendent of the National Recreation Area, may designate zones in which, and establish periods during which, no boating, hunting, or fishing shall be permitted in the National Recreation Area under subparagraph (A) for reasons of public safety, administration, or compliance with applicable laws.

(ii) **CONSULTATION REQUIRED.**—Except in the case of an emergency, any closure proposed by the Secretary under clause (i) shall not take effect until after the date on which the Superintendent of the National Recreation Area consults with—

(I) the appropriate State agency responsible for hunting and fishing activities; and

(II) the Board of County Commissioners in each county in which the zone is proposed to be designated.

(5) **LANDOWNER ASSISTANCE.**—On the written request of an individual that owns private land located not more than 3 miles from the boundary of the National Recreation Area, the Secretary may work in partnership with the individual to enhance the long-term conservation of natural, cultural, recreational, and scenic resources in and around the National Recreation Area—

(A) by acquiring all or a portion of the private land or interests in private land located not more than 3 miles from the boundary of the National Recreation Area by purchase, exchange, or donation, in accordance with section 403;

(B) by providing technical assistance to the individual, including cooperative assistance;

(C) through available grant programs; and

(D) by supporting conservation easement opportunities.

(6) **WITHDRAWAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, all Federal land within the National Recreation Area is withdrawn from—

(A) entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(B) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(C) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(7) **GRAZING.**—

(A) **STATE LAND SUBJECT TO A STATE GRAZING LEASE.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—If State land acquired under this title is subject to a State grazing lease in effect on the date of acquisition, the Secretary shall allow the grazing to continue for the remainder of the term of the lease, subject to the related terms and conditions of user agreements, including permitted stocking rates, grazing fee levels, access rights, and ownership and use of range improvements.

(ii) **ACCESS.**—A lessee of State land may continue its use of established routes within the National Recreation Area to access State land for purposes of administering the lease if the use was permitted before the date of enactment of this Act, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.

(B) **STATE AND PRIVATE LAND.**—The Secretary may, in accordance with applicable laws, authorize grazing on land acquired from the State or private landowners under section 403, if grazing was established before the date of acquisition.

(C) **PRIVATE LAND.**—On private land acquired under section 403 for the National Recreation Area on which authorized grazing is occurring before the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the lessee, may allow the continuation and renewal of grazing on the land based on the terms of acquisition or by agreement between the Secretary and the lessee, subject to applicable law (including regulations).

(D) **FEDERAL LAND.**—The Secretary shall—

(i) allow, consistent with the grazing leases, uses, and practices in effect as of the date of enactment of this Act, the continuation and renewal of grazing on Federal land located within the boundary of the National Recreation Area on which grazing is allowed before the date of enactment of this Act, unless the Secretary determines that grazing on the Federal land would present unacceptable impacts (as defined in section 1.4.7.1 of the National Park Service document entitled “Management Policies 2006: The Guide to Managing the National Park System”) to the natural, cultural, recreational, and scenic resource values and the character of the land within the National Recreation Area; and

(ii) retain all authorities to manage grazing in the National Recreation Area.

(E) **TERMINATION OF LEASES.**—Within the National Recreation Area, the Secretary may—

(i) accept the voluntary termination of a lease or permit for grazing; or

(ii) in the case of a lease or permit vacated for a period of 3 or more years, terminate the lease or permit.

(8) **WATER RIGHTS.**—Nothing in this title—

(A) affects any use or allocation in existence on the date of enactment of this Act of any water, water right, or interest in water;

(B) affects any vested absolute or decreed conditional water right in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, including any water right held by the United States;

(C) affects any interstate water compact in existence on the date of enactment of this Act;

(D) authorizes or imposes any new reserved Federal water right; or

(E) shall be considered to be a relinquishment or reduction of any water right reserved or appropriated by the United States in the State on or before the date of enactment of this Act.

(9) FISHING EASEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this title diminishes or alters the fish and wildlife program for the Aspinall Unit developed under section 8 of the Act of April 11, 1956 (commonly known as the “Colorado River Storage Project Act”) (70 Stat. 110, chapter 203; 43 U.S.C. 620g), by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Colorado Division of Wildlife (including any successor in interest to that division) that provides for the acquisition of public access fishing easements as mitigation for the Aspinall Unit (referred to in this paragraph as the “program”).

(B) ACQUISITION OF FISHING EASEMENTS.—The Secretary shall continue to fulfill the obligation of the Secretary under the program to acquire 26 miles of class 1 public fishing easements to provide to sportsmen access for fishing within the Upper Gunnison Basin upstream of the Aspinall Unit, subject to the condition that no existing fishing access downstream of the Aspinall Unit shall be counted toward the minimum mileage requirement under the program.

(C) PLAN.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(i) develop a plan for fulfilling the obligation of the Secretary described in subparagraph (B); and

(ii) submit to Congress a report that—

(I) includes the plan developed under clause (i); and

(II) describes any progress made in the acquisition of public access fishing easements as mitigation for the Aspinall Unit under the program.

SEC. 403. ACQUISITION OF LAND; BOUNDARY MANAGEMENT.

(a) ACQUISITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may acquire any land or interest in land within the boundary of the National Recreation Area.

(2) MANNER OF ACQUISITION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), land described in paragraph (1) may be acquired under this subsection by—

(i) donation;

(ii) purchase from willing sellers with donated or appropriated funds;

(iii) transfer from another Federal agency; or

(iv) exchange.

(B) STATE LAND.—Land or interests in land owned by the State or a political subdivision of the State may only be acquired by purchase, donation, or exchange.

(b) TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.—

(1) FOREST SERVICE LAND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Administrative jurisdiction over the approximately 2,560 acres of land identified on the map as “U.S. Forest Service proposed transfer to the National Park Service” is transferred to the Secretary, to be administered by the Director of the National Park Service as part of the National Recreation Area.

(B) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—The boundary of the Gunnison National Forest shall be adjusted to exclude the land transferred to the Secretary under subparagraph (A).

(2) BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND.—Administrative jurisdiction over the approximately 5,040 acres of land identified on the map as “Bureau of Land Management proposed transfer to National Park Service” is transferred from the Director of the Bureau of Land Management to the Director of the National Park Service, to be administered as part of the National Recreation Area.

(3) WITHDRAWAL.—Administrative jurisdiction over the land identified on the map as “Proposed for transfer to the Bureau of Land Management, subject to the revocation of Bureau of Reclamation withdrawal” shall be transferred to the Director of the Bureau of Land Management on relinquishment of the land by the Bureau of Reclamation and revocation by the Bureau of Land Management of any withdrawal as may be necessary.

(c) POTENTIAL LAND EXCHANGE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The withdrawal for reclamation purposes of the land identified on the map as “Potential exchange lands” shall be relinquished by the Commissioner of Reclamation and revoked by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management and the land shall be transferred to the National Park Service.

(2) EXCHANGE; INCLUSION IN NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.—On transfer of the land described in paragraph (1), the transferred land—

(A) may be exchanged by the Secretary for private land described in section 402(c)(5)—

(i) subject to a conservation easement remaining on the transferred land, to protect the scenic resources of the transferred land; and

(ii) in accordance with the laws (including regulations) and policies governing National Park Service land exchanges; and

(B) if not exchanged under subparagraph (A), shall be added to, and managed as a part of, the National Recreation Area.

(d) ADDITION TO NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.—Any land within the boundary of the National Recreation Area that is acquired by the United States shall be added to, and managed as a part of, the National Recreation Area.

SEC. 404. GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.

Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this title, the Director of the National Park Service, in consultation with the Commissioner of Reclamation, shall prepare a general management plan for the National Recreation Area in accordance with section 100502 of title 54, United States Code.

SEC. 405. BOUNDARY SURVEY.

The Secretary (acting through the Director of the National Park Service) shall prepare a boundary survey and legal description of the National Recreation Area.

The CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 116-264. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CURTIS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 116-264.

Mr. CURTIS. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:

TITLE V—APPLICATION**SEC. 501. APPLICATION.**

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, this Act shall not apply to any lands or waters in the Third Congressional District of Colorado as in existence on the date of enactment of this Act.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 656, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. CURTIS. Madam Chair, before I begin, I would like to list the number of areas where I likely agree with my

good friend from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE).

We share a State, a boundary, and our States are beautiful and full of public lands and recreational opportunities and areas that are majestic and are great treasures in our wonderful country.

I believe personally that strong, pragmatic legislation to solve these local land managements is very important and far superior to efforts like the Antiquities Act. I thank my colleague for the years that have gone into this bill and his personal time to build consensus in the area.

I found myself in his position just several months ago, offering a bill in my State. I believe the Congressman supported that bill, and I thank him for that support. It was a million acres of public land designation in my State. While not everybody got what they wanted, we were able to approach it from a prospect where I was able to get ranchers, environmentalists, outdoor enthusiasts to support that bill.

The major difference between our two bills and why I stand today is that, on my bill, I was able to claim support from my local county commissioners. Every elected official in the State, my Governor, the State legislature, and the entire delegation of Utah were able to support that.

While I want my friend from Colorado to succeed in his endeavor, I feel moving this bill without the support of the entire delegation and its members who represent the impacted land is a mistake.

I am told that half of the Colorado delegation opposes this bill, including a Member who represents 65 percent of the land covered by the bill. While I applaud the consensus that has been put into this, I don't believe there is enough consensus to get this bill across the finish line and into law.

With that said, in anticipation of the gentleman from Colorado's question, if this amendment passes, yes, I will support his bill. However, that is my second choice, and I think a poor, distant second choice to my first choice, which is that we would be able to find consensus with the other members of the delegation and move forward.

I can't support a bill that lacks the consensus needed to continue through the Senate process, and I truly hope that Mr. NEGUSE and Mr. TIPTON can work together to work out their remaining concerns.

I have had other Members of Congress make proposals in my district, especially in San Juan and Emery Counties. I know firsthand that proposals made in another Member's district sometimes can cause problems. In fact, in my case, it has made it more difficult to resolve those public land issues.

Similarly, on a practical level, any proposal that is not supported by all Members of Congress who represent that area doesn't have the consensus to get signed into the law. We all have a

duty to represent these local communities in Congress, and that consensus is vital for success in any public lands bill.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chair, I have great respect for my colleague from the State of Utah. I enjoy working with him on the Committee on Natural Resources and have enjoyed being able to partner with him on a number of efforts surrounding regenerative agriculture and many other subjects.

I would say that I oppose this amendment. The distinguished gentleman, I believe, mentioned—I hope I am quoting him right—that when his bill passed the Chamber, and I believe the bill earlier this year that passed our committee, that I was proud to vote for, he had the support of conservationists in his State, county commissioners, local elected officials, the Governor, and his congressional delegation.

I would tell the distinguished gentleman that he may not be aware that, in our case, we have the support of conservationists, county commissioners, local elected officials, and our Governor.

The gentleman is correct that the only support that seems to be missing is from Republican colleagues in the State's delegation, and that is a shame. I would hope that a bill that has this volume of support from local communities, as has been well established during the course of this very vigorous and robust debate, would earn the support of my friends on the other side of the aisle who also have the great privilege of representing the State that we love so much.

With respect to the more esoteric point on legislating in areas that an individual may not specifically represent, my understanding—again, I have been in Congress here for only 10 months. But my sense of it thus far is that we take votes literally every day on bills that impact our respective districts and, of course, areas far outside of our districts.

During the 114th Congress, just by way of example—I was not here. I believe my friends on the other side of the aisle who are gathered here today were. They voted to pass H.R. 8, which was the North American Energy Security Infrastructure Act of 2015, out of the House.

This was a bill widely opposed by many Democrats who were concerned that the bill would lead to increased opportunities for constructing natural gas pipelines across Federal lands in their home districts. That, of course, did not stop my colleagues from voting for that bill. They searched their conscience. They made the conclusion that they reached. And that is their right.

I would only say that it is the right of every Member on this particular bill to, again, search their conscience as to whether or not they believe areas like the Thompson Divide ought to be protected. If they believe that those areas should be protected, then they ought to vote "yes."

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

□ 1915

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chair, I would like to reemphasize my praise for the Congressman from Colorado. The consensus that he mentioned is not a simple thing and should be applauded.

I simply make a plea and request that the gentleman will continue to seek for that consensus, and particularly that of my colleagues and particularly his colleagues from Colorado, to see if he can get that final consensus needed to push this across the finish line.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time, and I am prepared to yield.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chair, we will continue to do that important work, and I appreciate the gentleman's statement in that regard. And I concur with it.

It is worth mentioning—I don't know that it has been mentioned yet during this debate: We have worked very hard. I have a stack of emails. This is literally 35, 40 pages of emails, exchanges between my staff who work on public lands with the Representative from the Third Congressional District over the last 8 months, working, trying to get that consensus.

I will certainly pledge to the gentleman that we are going to keep doing it.

Mr. Chair, with that, I am ready to close as well, but I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CROW). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 116-264.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 27, line 2, insert "and veteran outreach and engagement" before "activities".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 656, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to start by recognizing the hard work of Chairman GRIJALVA, and perhaps even more important, Congressman NEGUSE, my good friend, for his work on the underlying bill and the amount of time, energy, passion, and commitment that he devotes to the conservation and, yes, the preservation of Colorado's public lands. They are, in fact, iconic features of our American landscape and crucial engines for its recreational industry and State economy.

It is our duty to protect these treasured lands and to be responsible stewards so that future generations can enjoy them as much as we do today. We recognize how irreplaceable and rich these lands are, not simply for the value they bring to our country's vast ecological diversity but, also, for their contribution to our Nation's history.

One such area is Camp Hale. Decades ago, Camp Hale served as a base for our servicemembers to train in mountain warfare.

I am sure the Chair is excited to know that the training campground gave us the 10th Mountain Division, the famed and heroic mountain fighters, who, through their dedication, service, and sacrifice, helped our country achieve victory in World War II. And, upon returning home, it was these veterans who drew upon their training and experiences to help build Colorado's flourishing outdoor industry.

The legislation recognizes the significance of Camp Hale and, as such, designated it as a National Historic Landscape, the first such designation of its kind.

Yet, to fully honor Camp Hale's legacy, we should take every measure to ensure today's veterans are provided the opportunity to actively participate in the stewardship of this unique landscape.

As I sit here today in the Chamber, I hear a call, a loud call, for a bipartisan amendment that everybody can get their arms around, so, Mr. Chair, I offer mine.

My amendment strengthens the underlying legislation by including veteran outreach and engagement activities as part of the management plan for Camp Hale.

Public lands are important vehicles to connect veterans to our national heritage and history. Many initiatives and programs have demonstrated the unique opportunities that the outdoors offer veterans to reconnect, recover, and heal after they return from the battlefield.

We should ensure today's veterans are a part of the management of Camp

Hale. By doing so, we honor not only the legacy of Camp Hale and the servicemembers who trained there but, also, those who continue to serve this country today.

While I am not from Colorado, I recognize that veterans across the country will flock to this wonderful, historic-designated area and engage in the activities and the outreach for veterans.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, I will agree there is a good amendment here that we can all support.

The underlying bill designated 28,000-some-odd acres surrounding Camp Hale as the first-ever National Historic Landscape.

Now, Camp Hale was a U.S. Army training facility for what became the 10th Mountain Division, and it was established in 1942 in Colorado to provide winter and mountain warfare training during World War II. It was also used during the Cold War as well.

This amendment would add veteran outreach and engagement activities to the proposed management plan. It is a good amendment. It would rightfully prioritize outreach and involvement of our Nation's veterans, so I would agree with the amendment and ask that my colleagues vote "yes" on this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. TIPTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 116-264.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 79, line 11, strike "or".

Page 79, line 15, strike the period and insert "; or".

Page 79, after line 15, insert the following: (F) constitutes an express or implied Federal reservation of any water or water rights with respect to the National Recreation area.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 656, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chair, I rise today to speak in support of my amendment addressing water rights in the Curecanti National Recreation Area.

For years, my staff and I have engaged in numerous conversations regarding the Curecanti National Recreation Area, and there has been bipartisan agreement in these discussions that water rights in the region should remain intact.

This area brings in millions of visitors each year and provides recreation opportunities that include fishing, hiking, camping, and more. While it might be an outdoor enthusiast's paradise, it is also a source of Colorado's most precious resource: water.

This amendment ensures that there are no unintended consequences in this legislation for longstanding water rights in the impacted area.

Mr. Chair, I would like to encourage my colleagues to be able to support this, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, though I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chair, the section of the bill that the Representative referenced, in my reading of the bill and in my understanding of the bill, already includes some language that is nearly identical regarding Federal water rights.

But, that being said, I made a pledge to the distinguished gentleman from Utah just a few moments ago in the debate that we would continue working to try to get to consensus. So I will support this amendment, and I will encourage my colleagues on this side of the aisle in good faith to support this amendment as well, and I hope the sponsor of this amendment would take that good faith and recognize the same.

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for his support for the amendment.

One of the important points of it, as with some of the subsequent amendments that we have, is to make sure that we are codifying the language so that it is understood.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. TIPTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 116-264.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 53, after line 15, insert the following:

(c) GRAZING.—The grazing of livestock on covered land, if established before the date of enactment of this Act, shall be allowed to continue subject to such reasonable regulations as are considered to be necessary by the Secretary with jurisdiction over the covered land.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 656, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chair, I rise today to support my amendment to be able to protect longstanding grazing rights in the Thompson Divide.

Since the days of Colorado's pioneers, grazing rights have always played an essential role in the economy and the way of life. Generations of Coloradans have followed suit and continued to build a robust ranching community, including around the Thompson Divide.

In my roundtable discussions with local communities affected by Federal public lands, I routinely hear how important ranching is and the importance of protecting grazing rights, and this is true of the Thompson Divide. The permanent withdrawal of mineral and energy development in the region should not suppress any existing grazing rights.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chair, I would like to claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, this amendment would add language regarding existing grazing to a public land withdrawal that protects a sensitive landscape and its ranchers from mining.

As a reminder, the CORE Act is supported by many ranchers who have been involved with the Thompson Divide Coalition over the years and by the North Thompson and Coal Basin Cattlemen's Association because the bill would protect their ranching heritage on these lands for future generations.

So, ultimately, I don't think that this amendment is necessary, and I do worry about the potential for unintended consequences. For example, I hope that adding it does not somehow imply that the many withdrawals that Congress routinely enacts without such language would somehow restrict grazing; although, I know that that is not my colleague's intent.

Mr. Chair, I would ask the gentleman—I mean, if the gentleman is

willing to support the underlying bill if his amendment is adopted, then I would be happy to support it.

Mr. Chair, with that, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

I think what is actually important is precisely the words that the gentleman used: unintended consequences that can come.

This is a perfecting amendment to be able to make sure that we are codifying the importance of those grazing rights within those communities, something that is important to not only the Thompson Divide area but many of our ranchers who happen to have some grazing leases on public lands throughout the western slope of Colorado, something that is going to be important, but specifically to this bill, to make sure that we are codifying the right to have grazing within the Thompson Divide area with the mineral rights withdrawal that the gentleman is proposing.

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

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chair, while I appreciate my colleague's statement—and I don't know that I heard a particular answer to the fundamental question as to whether or not he would be supportive of this bill were his amendment to pass—again, I think we are trying to approach this in a good faith way. We want to find consensus.

So, if the Representative from the Third Congressional District believes that this amendment is necessary to protect the ranching heritage on these lands for future generations, which is obviously a goal that he and I both share, I will support the amendment.

Mr. Chair, I am no longer in opposition and will encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's comments and appreciate his support, actually, for this. This actually shows how we can make progress when we do have communication.

In terms of what was going on, something was lacking on some of these issues going into the CORE Act. Unfortunately, another eight amendments which I had proposed were not allowed to be discussed on this floor tonight. We have other concerns that have been expressed through our counties, through our communities, through individuals to be able to address as well.

But I am appreciative of the gentleman's support on this amendment and for recognizing the importance of grazing rights in not only Garfield County but throughout the West.

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

□ 1930

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. PAPPAS). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. TIPTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 116-264.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 82, line 3, strike "2,560" and all that follows through line 8, and insert "915 acres of land identified on the map titled 'Curecanti National Recreation Area U.S. Forest Service/National Park Service Inter-agency Agreement Exhibit Map, Soap Creek Area' dated June 2017 is transferred to the Secretary, to be administered by the Director of the National Park Service as Part of the National Recreation Area."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 656, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the opportunity to address the Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act on the floor. We want to be able to ensure that the land being transferred from the Forest Service to the National Park Service management comply with the current memorandum of understanding.

During testimony before the Committee on Natural Resources committee hearing on the CORE Act on April 2, 2019, Acting Deputy Chief of the U.S. Forest Service, Chris French, identified the Soap Creek area within the Curecanti National Recreation Area as appropriate for continued active forest management, including fuel treatments, under the existing memorandum of understanding between the Forest Service and the National Parks Service.

This is a good amendment to be able to support. I would encourage my colleagues to get behind this and hope we can continue to have the continued cooperation that we are finally starting to be able to see on the floor.

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

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment. It does not reflect agency recommendations or on-the-ground support of title IV of this bill. Veiled behind the claim of compliance with existing management, this amendment is contrary to a long-standing agreement to transfer 2,560 acres of Forest Service land to the National Park Service, which is reflected in the CORE Act as written.

Both agencies have agreed that the transfer would benefit both the national recreation area and the national

forest, and the proposal has long enjoyed broad public support. This amendment is an attempt to both reduce the acreage included in the national recreation area and to prevent the most effective management of these lands.

And I think it is important, Mr. Chair, because we have talked a lot about stakeholder involvement, community-driven processes, and we have yet to receive any letter opposing a provision of the bill impacting a county in which that county ultimately has acreage involved; any letter of opposition. The only letter, in fact, that we have received of communication is from Gunnison County. Gunnison County strongly opposes this amendment. They were never consulted by the sponsor on this amendment, despite the area in question being in their county.

So ultimately, I would oppose this amendment, and I would encourage all members, respectfully, to vote against it.

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, this is a current memorandum of understanding, something that the Forest Service itself, Chief Deputy Chris French, identified as an appropriate area for continued activities.

You know, one of the big challenges that we have in the Third Congressional District of Colorado happens to be forest management. We have seen forests literally burn to the ground. Simply to be able to have active, good forest management, to make sure that we are standing up, being able to protect our communities seems to me to be a sensible approach to be able to address something within something as expansive as the CORE Act.

The gentleman mentioned conversations with, I assume, a county commissioner out of Gunnison County. We did have some contact with him today. We are going to be citing back to him conversations he had with our legislative director on this issue. So there was communication that had taken place on this. I would invite the gentleman to actually come to Montrose County to be able to visit with people who deal in the forest products areas, to be able to see how they are going to responsibly be able to deal with some of the treatment areas, to be able to protect our communities, to be able to protect our watersheds, to be able to protect endangered species.

I think this is an appropriate amendment to the CORE Act, and I will encourage its adoption.

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

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chairman, with much respect to my colleague from the Third Congressional District, I have been to Montrose many times. It is a beautiful part of our State and there are wonderful people who call that community home. What I would say, again, I find it a bit ironic, with all of

the discussion around local support and whether or not local communities support provisions of the bill or do not, on the one hand, we don't have a single communication that I am aware of from a county that is impacted by a provision of this bill opposing the title that impacts that county. We do not have one.

The only letter of opposition, or the only communication that we have from a county opposing any of the matters that we are discussing today happens to be a communication from a county that opposes the amendment offered by the gentleman. And so, again, I struggle to understand the consistency there, but nonetheless, contextually I just want to make sure we fully explain the rationale behind the 2017 interagency agreement that my distinguished friend mentioned, because ironically enough, the agreement that the sponsor mentioned that ultimately the amendment is grounded in for the purposes of, "managing recreational facilities while congressional action is expected to legislatively establish the Curecanti National Recreation Area."

So in 2008 and 2009 these agencies all agreed that the transfer of the full acreage, 2,560 acres, that that was something they supported, and they were hoping that Congress would do something about it. Ten years later, it is 2019, and we have done nothing. Ultimately, the agencies came together on an interagency agreement in 2017 to at least do something in the interim with the hopes that Congress would step up and fill the void and codify those protections, which is precisely the opportunity that we have now before us. That is why I oppose this amendment and would encourage others to do the same.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, once again, I appreciate my colleague's comments, his passion. I am glad he has been to Montrose to be able to be there. I hope he spent a lot of money while he was there. We would appreciate that.

But it is interesting, going back to a comment that the gentleman made earlier, that just saying it doesn't make it so. We are hearing comments that there is broad-based support, there is no opposition. However, Montrose County, which the gentleman just cited, they may support a provision, but they oppose the CORE Act. So to be able to say there is broad, unanimous support is probably something that I think is not taking into consideration some of the concerns that we have heard.

I have just held round tables throughout our district, and there were concerns. And as I noted in my floor speech earlier, to be able to see some support, there is—because there is a lot of common ground in Colorado. It is just that we have not gone through all of the elements to be able to get this bill to the point where we will have

what I think we would all like to be able to have, and that is unanimous consent to be able to move forward.

When we are looking at this specific amendment—again, this is something that is being recommended, not by me but by the Forest Service, when we are talking about those management provisions to be able to maintain that current memorandum of understanding. This is, I think, something that is probably important for our area, an area where I travel, happen to live, and something that I hope that you will consider, and you will support.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chairman, I would say, with respect to the technicalities in terms of active forest management and the interagency agreement, I suppose we will have to agree to disagree. And I appreciate the gentleman's point and, ultimately, we have clearly landed on different sides of that issue.

But, again, and I hate to belabor the point, it is important for those, you know, who may be watching these proceedings thousands of miles away back home in our home State for them to just appreciate the facts.

So we are clear, there are nine counties directly impacted by this legislation. There is one county, in my understanding, that my friend from the Third Congressional District is citing when he mentions potential opposition to the bill. But what he is not clarifying, or rather what has not been clarified, is there is no county of those nine that oppose the provision of the bill that impacts their community; not one. We have been here for an hour, and I have yet to hear of a single county, or a town, or a city council for that matter.

Facts matter. This bill has local support, and that local support extends to this title of the bill. The Gunnison County commissioners and the community in Gunnison have made that clear, which is why I would urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, we often hear the comment on this floor on public lands bills: These lands belong to all Americans. I appreciate and I do respect the support for the CORE Act in terms of the individual communities, but I think it belies the lifestyle on the western slope of Colorado, in particular. The people that traverse, work within different counties, feel the impacts on their businesses, have the impact of water flowing through those communities coming from another county, those are the issues that I think, unfortunately, are not taken into consideration by this bill.

I urge support of this amendment. It is a good piece of work to be able to

make sure that we are dealing with good forest management.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. CROW

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 116-264.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 37, after line 19, insert the following:

(g) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that military aviation training on Federal public lands in Colorado, including the training conducted at the High-Altitude Army National Guard Aviation Training Site, is critical to the national security of the United States and the readiness of the Armed Forces.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 656, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. CROW) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to highlight the Colorado Army National Guard's High-Altitude Aviation Training Site, or HAATS, a program that all members of the Colorado delegation value deeply and support.

HAATS offers a hands-on experience for helicopter pilots in the science of flying at high altitudes where air pressure is significantly lower, and engines run hotter. Learning these skills is critical to successfully execute military operations and rescue missions in mountain terrain.

Each year HAATS trains over 400 air crews from all branches and components, including the National Guard, the Army, Army Reserves, and allies around the globe.

As a combat veteran, I served three tours in Iraq and Afghanistan, two of which were in Afghanistan where the terrain is rugged, unforgiving, and high altitude. The pilots with whom I served received HAATS training. Their skill, composure under pressure, and dedication is worthy of our praise.

With this amendment we honor the HAATS mission and recognize how crucial that mission is to our national security and the readiness of our Armed Forces.

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1945

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chair, I genuinely appreciate my colleague's position on this. In fact, he will probably recall, and I believe he voted for—and our colleague from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE) did as well—my amendment, to be able to recognize the importance of this issue to the national defense of the United States. We passed that through. 417-6, as I recall, was the vote total that was on there.

So I applaud the recognition of the importance of high-altitude training facilities.

Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague, Mr. CROW, for his service to this country. That is the importance of people being able and willing to put their lives on the line for this Nation, but we do need, I think, ultimately, to be able to go one step further.

While this recognizes the importance of it, it does not codify it. That is something that I think is really essential to making sure that the men and women in the United States military have the safest opportunities to be able to do the training that they need to be able to carry out the missions of this country.

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

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the comments of my friend from Colorado. This is certainly an example of the Colorado delegation working together, talking and collaborating, trying to figure out the best path forward for our State and the interests of all of our districts.

This is an issue, as I talked about earlier, that is very personal to me. I served in Afghanistan, and like I mentioned earlier, the pilots with whom I served received this critical training. My life and the life of my soldiers relied on this training being conducted and the important mission that HAATS performs every year for all of our services.

But I also learned something else in the Army that—and you don't have to take my word for it—one of the best ways to get information, the best way to figure out what the soldiers and the troops need, is you talk to the folks on the ground, you talk to the folks on the front line.

Mr. Chair, I applaud the work of Senator BENNET and my very good friend and colleague Congressman JOE NEGUSE for doing just that, reaching out to our military commanders.

I want to read, very briefly, a letter that was sent to them by Major Gen-

eral Michael Loh, who not only is a pilot but is the commander of the Colorado National Guard. He said:

I am writing to express the support of the Colorado Department of Military and Veterans Affairs for the Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act through the diligent efforts of staff within the department, the offices of the bill's sponsors, and the Department of Defense, who have mitigated prior concerns related to military overflight of the potential wilderness areas identified in the bill.

That is our commander. That is our top commander of the Colorado National Guard that manages this facility, the pilots, and the training that occurs, saying: Thank you. You did your work. The delegation reached out. You have mitigated our concerns. Move forward.

What else do we need other than that word of our commanders? JOE NEGUSE and MICHAEL BENNET worked very hard to make sure they were addressing the concerns, and we should take their word for it, not ours.

Mr. Chair, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE), my friend.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chair, I want to say a deep note of gratitude to my distinguished colleague and my good friend from Colorado (Mr. CROW), who served our country so bravely and so honorably. We are all deeply grateful for his service in the Armed Forces and, of course, his service today in this Chamber.

I don't know that I could say it any better than he did. I believe that this amendment reaffirms the support that we have for HAATS across our Colorado delegation and for the reasons he already so eloquently stated.

I think, ultimately, any further codification, as my colleague from the Third Congressional District had referenced, would be a solution in search of a problem.

Mr. Chair, I encourage every Member of this Chamber to support Mr. CROW's important amendment.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chair, in closing, I would like to stress again the importance of honoring HAATS and its critical mission.

In July, I was pleased to join 416 of my colleagues, including Mr. TIPTON, in voting for an amendment that has language that we can all get behind.

Again, I reiterate the fact that you don't have to take anyone's word for it sitting here having this debate tonight. The commanders on the ground, the people managing this facility, managing the pilots, in fact, the pilot himself with the responsibility to make sure that this mission has to go forward, have blessed this effort and said that their concerns are mitigated and that they are happy to support this effort.

So we, I think, owe it to our generals, to our soldiers, and to our troops to defer to their better judgment on this because they know this better than we do.

Mr. Chair, I am very happy to support this amendment, and I urge all others to support it.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. CROW).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado will be postponed.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CROW) having assumed the chair, Mr. PAPPAS, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 823) to provide for the designation of certain wilderness areas, recreation management areas, and conservation areas in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECOGNIZING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. BURCHETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, October is Domestic Violence Awareness Month, and I rise today in support of those who have experienced domestic abuse.

Over 73,000 Tennesseans were victims of domestic violence last year. Sadly, many victims struggle for support after experiencing violence.

In Tennessee, and across America, victims of domestic violence are often-times afraid to speak up about their abuse. Even worse, sometimes victims are not able to receive the help they need. This is unacceptable.

Communities across America must create safe environments for victims of domestic violence and encourage them to seek assistance.

Local organizations and shelters are always ready to help. As elected officials, we have a responsibility to make sure our constituents are aware of these resources.

I am proud to partner with the YWCA, which employs a good friend of mine, Maggie McNally, whose father I worked with for over 15 years in Nashville and who now is the speaker of the Tennessee State Senate, to raise awareness for Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

The YWCA and organizations like it are committed to ending domestic violence in our communities, and I fully support them in their mission.