

are very few things more bipartisan than that. They want it fixed, and they want it fixed now.

This bill is the first step to building back better. It will support vaccine distribution and research and provide relief to small businesses, schools, and Coloradans who are out of work. So let's get this done.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the American Rescue Plan.

#### NATIONAL FFA WEEK

(Mr. ROSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I proudly rise before you today in honor of National FFA Week.

As an eighth-generation farmer and former member of the Future Farmers of America myself, I have seen firsthand the positive difference that FFA makes in the lives of students by developing their potential for premier leadership, personal growth, and career success throughout agricultural education.

FFA members know that American agriculture truly is one of the best traditions of our national life and that service to one's community is a pillar of good leadership and citizenship.

I am confident that the future of our Nation's agriculture is in good hands because it is being shaped by members of the National FFA Organization.

I wish a happy FFA Week to the 28,000 members in my home State of Tennessee and to the 760,000 members across the country.

#### COVID RELIEF

(Mr. HORSFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the expanded Child Tax Credit and Federal unemployment assistance included in the American Rescue Plan.

In my State of Nevada and across the country, hardworking families are suffering. The United States has lost more than 10 million jobs since the beginning of this pandemic, with a particularly devastating effect on women and people of color. Americans need help, and they are counting on the Members of this body to deliver.

Interestingly, my colleagues on the other side say this bill does not have bipartisan support.

Whom are they listening to?

Seventy-six percent of Americans support this bill, including 60 percent of Republicans. So I would urge my colleagues on the other side to actually listen to their constituents and to deliver on their behalf.

In just a 2-week period, more than 8 million American children go hungry because their families can't afford enough to eat. That should not happen

in the wealthiest country on Earth. By passing an expanded Child Tax Credit, we can bring millions of children above the poverty line and put money in their parents' pockets.

By passing my legislation to increase and expand Federal unemployment insurance, we will provide critical relief to those who have lost their jobs in this pandemic.

So while we are working to recover and rebuild, we must invest in the American people. Stop the lies and listen to your constituents.

□ 0915

#### PPP FLEXIBILITY FOR FARMERS AND RANCHERS

(Mr. HAGEDORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HAGEDORN. Mr. Speaker, the CARES Act allowed farmers and ranchers to apply for the Paycheck Protection Program by utilizing only net income in their loan calculations. This has prevented many agricultural partnerships from receiving the maximum loan amount possible.

My bipartisan bill that I have introduced today, the PPP Flexibility for Farmers and Ranchers Act, allows the use of gross income to calculate the loan and includes a retroactive provision to enable farm partnerships that initially used net income to recalculate unforgiven PPP loans.

Ag producers throughout the Nation have suffered greatly from historic drops in demand during the pandemic. As we push to reopen our economy, we must ensure that our farmers and ranchers have access to the resources needed to maintain operations through the end of the pandemic.

I am grateful to my colleagues and an array of national agricultural groups who join me in this commonsense effort to boost our farmers, ranchers, and agricultural economy.

I encourage Members to cosponsor my bill.

#### COLORADO WILDERNESS ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 803) to designate certain lands in the State of Colorado as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Each further amendment printed in part B of House Report 117-6 not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 147, shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only 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, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Natural Resources or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting further amendments printed in part B of House Report 117-6, not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. NEGUSE OF COLORADO

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, Pursuant to House Resolution 147, I offer amendments en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 1 consisting of amendment Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 10, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 28, printed in part B of House Report 117-6, offered by Mr. NEGUSE of Colorado:

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. BARRAGAN OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of the bill, add the following:

#### TITLE IX—OUTDOORS FOR ALL ACT

##### SEC. 901. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Outdoors for All Act".

##### SEC. 902. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term "eligible entity" means—

(i) a State;

(ii) a political subdivision of a State, including—

(I) a city; and

(II) a county;

(iii) a special purpose district, including park districts; and

(iv) an Indian tribe (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304)).

(B) POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS AND INDIAN TRIBES.—A political subdivision of a State or an Indian tribe shall be considered an eligible entity only if the political subdivision or Indian tribe represents or otherwise serves a qualifying urban area.

(2) OUTDOOR RECREATION LEGACY PARTNERSHIP GRANT PROGRAM.—The term "Outdoor Recreation Legacy Partnership Grant Program" means the program established under section 903(a).

(3) QUALIFYING URBAN AREA.—The term "qualifying urban area" means an area identified by the Census Bureau as an "urban area" in the most recent census.

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

##### SEC. 903. GRANTS AUTHORIZED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish an outdoor recreation legacy partnership grant program under which the Secretary may award grants to eligible entities for projects—

(1) to acquire land and water for parks and other outdoor recreation purposes; and

(2) to develop new or renovate existing outdoor recreation facilities.

## (b) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of receiving a grant under subsection (a), an eligible entity shall provide matching funds in the form of cash or an in-kind contribution in an amount equal to not less than 100 percent of the amounts made available under the grant.

(2) SOURCES.—The matching amounts referred to in paragraph (1) may include amounts made available from State, local, nongovernmental, or private sources.

**SEC. 904. ELIGIBLE USES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—A grant recipient may use a grant awarded under this title—

(1) to acquire land or water that provides outdoor recreation opportunities to the public; and

(2) to develop or renovate outdoor recreational facilities that provide outdoor recreation opportunities to the public, with priority given to projects that—

(A) create or significantly enhance access to park and recreational opportunities in an urban neighborhood or community;

(B) engage and empower underserved communities and youth;

(C) provide opportunities for youth employment or job training;

(D) establish or expand public-private partnerships, with a focus on leveraging resources; and

(E) take advantage of coordination among various levels of government.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON USE.—A grant recipient may not use grant funds for—

(1) grant administration costs;

(2) incidental costs related to land acquisition, including appraisal and titling;

(3) operation and maintenance activities;

(4) facilities that support semiprofessional or professional athletics;

(5) indoor facilities such as recreation centers or facilities that support primarily non-outdoor purposes; or

(6) acquisition of land or interests in land that restrict access to specific persons.

**SEC. 905. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE REQUIREMENTS.**

In carrying out the Outdoor Recreation Legacy Partnership Grant Program, the Secretary shall—

(1) conduct an initial screening and technical review of applications received; and

(2) evaluate and score all qualifying applications.

**SEC. 906. REPORTING.**

(a) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than 30 days after the last day of each report period, each State lead agency that receives a grant under this title shall annually submit to the Secretary performance and financial reports that—

(1) summarize project activities conducted during the report period; and

(2) provide the status of the project.

(b) FINAL REPORTS.—Not later than 90 days after the earlier of the date of expiration of a project period or the completion of a project, each State lead agency that receives a grant under this title shall submit to the Secretary a final report containing such information as the Secretary may require.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

At the end of the bill, insert the following:

**TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS****SEC. 901. PROMOTING HEALTH AND WELLNESS FOR VETERANS AND SERVICEMEMBERS.**

The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are encouraged to ensure servicemember and veteran access to public lands designated by this Act for the purposes of outdoor recreation and to participate in outdoor-related volunteer and wellness programs.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO OF OREGON

At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

**TITLE IX—SOUTHWESTERN OREGON WATERSHED AND SALMON PROTECTION****SEC. 901. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Southwestern Oregon Watershed and Salmon Protection Act of 2021”.

**SEC. 902. WITHDRAWAL OF FEDERAL LAND, CURRY COUNTY AND JOSEPHINE COUNTY, OREGON.**

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE FEDERAL LAND.—The term “eligible Federal land” means—

(A) any federally owned land or interest in land depicted on the Maps as within the Hunter Creek and Pistol River Headwaters Withdrawal Proposal or the Rough and Ready and Baldface Creeks Mineral Withdrawal Proposal; or

(B) any land or interest in land located within such withdrawal proposals that is acquired by the Federal Government after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) MAPS.—The term “Maps” means—

(A) the Bureau of Land Management map entitled “Hunter Creek and Pistol River Headwaters Withdrawal Proposal” and dated January 12, 2015; and

(B) the Bureau of Land Management map entitled “Rough and Ready and Baldface Creeks Mineral Withdrawal Proposal” and dated January 12, 2015.

(b) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the eligible Federal land is withdrawn from all forms of—

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

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

(3) operation under the mineral leasing and geothermal leasing laws.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF MAPS.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Maps shall be made available to the public at each appropriate office of the Bureau of Land Management.

(d) EXISTING USES NOT AFFECTED.—Except with respect to the withdrawal under subsection (b), nothing in this section restricts recreational uses, hunting, fishing, forest management activities, or other authorized uses allowed on the date of enactment of this Act on the eligible Federal land in accordance with applicable law.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. DESAULNIER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

**TITLE IX—ROSIE THE RIVETER/WORLD WAR II HOME FRONT NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK ADDITIONS****SEC. 901. ROSIE THE RIVETER/WORLD WAR II HOME FRONT NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK ADDITIONS.**

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Rosie the Riveter National Historic Site Expansion Act”.

(b) ADDITIONS.—The Rosie the Riveter/World War II Home Front National Historical Park Establishment Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 410ggg et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) In section 2(b), by adding at the end the following: “Not later than 180 days after areas are added to the park administratively or by Federal law, the Secretary shall update the map to include the added areas.”

(2) By adding at the end of section 2, the following:

“(c) ADDITIONAL AREAS INCLUDED.—In addition to areas included under subsection (b), the park shall include the following:

“(1) The Nystrom Elementary School—The Maritime Building, as listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

“(2) Such other areas as the Secretary deems appropriate.”

(3) By amending section 3(e)(2) to read as follows:

“(2) OTHER PROPERTY.—Within the boundaries of the park, the Secretary may acquire lands, improvements, waters, or interests therein, by donation, purchase, exchange or transfer. Any lands, or interests therein, owned by the State of California or any political subdivision thereof, may be acquired only by donation. When any tract of land is only partly within such boundaries, the Secretary may acquire all or any portion of the land outside of such boundaries in order to minimize the payment of severance costs. Land so acquired outside of the boundaries may be exchanged by the Secretary for non-Federal lands within the boundaries.”

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of the bill, add the following:

**TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS****SEC. 901. SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA.**

Section 6001(a)(4)(A) of the John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act (Public Law 116-9) is amended by adding at the end the following: “In addition, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area shall include the area depicted as ‘Rio Vista/Expansion Area’ on the map entitled ‘Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area Proposed Boundary Expansion’ and dated February 2021.”

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the bill, add the following:

**TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS****SEC. 901. CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE ADVISORY COMMISSION.**

Effective September 26, 2018, section 8(a) of Public Law 87-126 (16 U.S.C. 459b-7(a)) is amended in the second sentence by striking “2018” and inserting “2028”.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. LIEU OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of the bill, add the following:

**TITLE IX—SANTA MONICA MOUNTAINS NATIONAL RECREATION AREA BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT STUDY ACT****SEC. 901. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area Boundary Adjustment Study Act”.

**SEC. 902. RESOURCE STUDY OF THE LOS ANGELES COASTAL AREA, CALIFORNIA.**

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

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

(2) STUDY AREA.—The term “study area” means the coastline and adjacent areas to the Santa Monica Bay from Will Rogers State Beach to Torrance Beach, including the areas in and around Ballona Creek and the Baldwin Hills and the San Pedro section of the City of Los Angeles, excluding the Port of Los Angeles north of Crescent Avenue.

(b) SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDY.—

(1) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a special resource study of the study area.

(2) CONTENTS.—In conducting the study under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) evaluate the national significance of the study area;

(B) determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the study area as a unit of the National Park System;

(C) consider other alternatives for preservation, protection, and interpretation of the study area by the Federal Government, State or local government entities, or private and nonprofit organizations;

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

(E) identify cost estimates for any Federal acquisition, development, interpretation, operation, and maintenance associated with the alternatives.

(3) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—The study required under paragraph (1) shall be conducted in accordance with section 100507 of title 54, United States Code.

(4) **REPORT.**—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are first made available for the study under paragraph (1), 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 that describes—

(A) the results of the study; and

(B) any conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. MCEACHIN OF VIRGINIA

At the end of the bill, add the following:

**TITLE IX—GREAT DISMAL SWAMP NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA ACT**

**SEC. 901. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Great Dismal Swamp National Heritage Area Act”.

**SEC. 902. DEFINITIONS.**

In this title:

(1) **HERITAGE AREA.**—The term “Heritage Area” means the Great Dismal Swamp National Heritage Area.

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

(3) **STATES.**—The term “States” means the States of Virginia and North Carolina.

(4) **STUDY AREA.**—The term “study area” means—

(A) the cities of Chesapeake, Norfolk, Portsmouth, and Suffolk in the State of Virginia;

(B) Isle of Wight County in the State of Virginia;

(C) Camden, Currituck, Gates, and Pasquotank counties in the State of North Carolina; and

(D) any other areas in the States that—

(i) have heritage aspects that are similar to the areas described in subparagraphs (A), (B), or (C); and

(ii) are adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, those areas.

**SEC. 903. STUDY.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, in consultation with State and local organizations and governmental agencies, Tribal governments, non-profit organizations, and other appropriate entities, shall conduct a study to assess the suitability and feasibility of designating the study area as a National Heritage Area, to be known as the “Great Dismal Swamp National Heritage Area”.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The study shall include analysis, documentation, and determinations on whether the study area—

(1) has an assemblage of natural, historic, and cultural resources that—

(A) represent distinctive aspects of the people and cultures of the United States;

(B) are worthy of recognition, conservation, interpretation, and continuing use; and

(C) would be best managed—

(i) through partnerships among public and private entities; and

(ii) by linking diverse and sometimes non-contiguous resources and active communities;

(2) reflects traditions, customs, beliefs, and folklore that are a valuable part of the story of the United States;

(3) provides outstanding opportunities—

(A) to conserve natural, historic, cultural, or scenic features; and

(B) for recreation and education;

(4) contains resources that—

(A) are important to any identified themes of the study area; and

(B) retain a degree of integrity capable of supporting interpretation;

(5) includes residents, business interests, nonprofit organizations, and State, local, and Tribal governments, and other appropriate entities that—

(A) are involved in the planning of the Heritage Area;

(B) have developed a conceptual financial plan that outlines the roles of all participants in the Heritage Area, including the Federal Government; and

(C) have demonstrated support for the designation of the Heritage Area;

(6) has a potential management entity to work in partnership with the individuals and entities described in paragraph (5) to develop the Heritage Area while encouraging State and local economic activity; and

(7) has a conceptual boundary map that is supported by the public.

**SEC. 904. REPORT.**

Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are first made available to carry out this title, 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 that describes—

(1) the findings of the study under section 3; and

(2) any conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY OF WEST VIRGINIA

At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

**TITLE IX—NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA**

**SEC. 901. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “National Heritage Area Act of 2021”.

**SEC. 902. DEFINITIONS.**

In this title:

(1) **FEASIBILITY STUDY.**—The term “feasibility study” means a study conducted by the Secretary, or conducted by one or more other interested parties and reviewed and approved by the Secretary, in accordance with the criteria and processes required by section 905, to determine whether a study area meets the criteria to be designated by Federal statute as a National Heritage Area.

(2) **INDIAN TRIBE.**—The term “Indian Tribe” means any Indian or Alaska Native tribe, band, nation, pueblo, village, or other community the name of which is included on the list most recently published by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to section 104 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 5131).

(3) **LOCAL COORDINATING ENTITY.**—The term “local coordinating entity” means the entity designated by Federal statute to—

(A) carry out, in partnership with other individuals and entities, the management plan for a National Heritage Area; and

(B) operate a National Heritage Area, including through the implementation of projects and programs among diverse partners in a National Heritage Area.

(4) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—The term “management plan” means the management plan for a National Heritage Area required under this title.

(5) **NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA.**—The term “National Heritage Area” means—

(A) each National Heritage Area, National Heritage Corridor, Natural Preservation Commission, National Heritage Canalway, National Heritage Route, Heritage Corridor, Cultural Heritage Corridor, Heritage Partnership, and National Heritage Partnership,

the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District, or other area designated by Federal statute with the explicit purpose of establishing a national heritage area designated by Congress before or on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) each National Heritage Area designated by Federal statute after the date of enactment of this Act, unless the law designating the area exempts that area from the National Heritage Area System by specific reference to this title.

(6) **NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA SYSTEM.**—The term “National Heritage Area System” means the system of National Heritage Areas established by this title.

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

(8) **STUDY AREA.**—The term “study area” means a specific geographic area that is the subject of a feasibility study under section 905.

(9) **TRIBAL GOVERNMENT.**—The term “Tribal government” means the governing body of an Indian Tribe.

**SEC. 903. NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA SYSTEM.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In order to recognize certain areas of the United States that tell nationally significant stories and to conserve, enhance, and interpret the areas’ natural, historic, scenic, and cultural resources that together illustrate significant aspects of our country’s heritage, there is established a National Heritage Area System through which the Secretary may provide technical and financial assistance to local coordinating entities to support the establishment, development, and continuity of National Heritage Areas.

(b) **NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA SYSTEM.**—The National Heritage Area System shall be composed of all National Heritage Areas.

(c) **RELATIONSHIP TO THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM.**—

(1) **RELATIONSHIP TO NATIONAL PARK UNITS.**—The Secretary shall encourage participation and assistance by any unit of the National Park System located near or encompassed by any National Heritage Area in local initiatives for that National Heritage Area that conserve and interpret resources consistent with an approved management plan for the National Heritage Area.

(2) **APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.**—National Heritage Areas shall not be—

(A) considered to be units of the National Park System; or

(B) subject to the authorities applicable to units of the National Park System.

**SEC. 904. NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA SYSTEM MANAGEMENT.**

(a) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 3 years after a National Heritage Area is included in the National Heritage Area System outlined by this title, the local coordinating entity of the National Heritage Area shall submit to the Secretary for approval a management plan for the National Heritage Area.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The management plan shall—

(A) incorporate an integrated and cooperative approach for the protection, enhancement, and interpretation of the natural, cultural, historic, scenic, and recreational resources of the National Heritage Area;

(B) be developed using a comprehensive planning approach that includes—

(i) opportunities for stakeholders, including community members, local and regional governments, Tribal governments, businesses, nonprofit organizations, and other interested parties—

(I) to be involved in the planning process; and

(II) to review and comment on draft management plans; and

(ii) documentation of the planning and public participation processes, including a description of—

(I) the means by which the management plan was prepared;

(II) the stakeholders involved in the process; and

(III) the timing and method of stakeholder involvement;

(C) include—

(i) an inventory of—

(I) the resources located in the National Heritage Area; and

(II) any other property in the National Heritage Area that—

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

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

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

(iii) a description of actions that the Federal, Tribal, State, and local governments, private organizations, and individuals have agreed to take to protect the natural, historical, cultural, scenic, and recreational resources of the National Heritage Area;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(3) EXCEPTIONS.—The requirements in paragraph (2) shall not apply to management plans in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) EVALUATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year before the authorization for Federal funding expires for a National Heritage Area, the Secretary shall—

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

(B) prepare and submit a report detailing the evaluation required by subparagraph (A) to—

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

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

(2) EVALUATION COMPONENTS.—An evaluation prepared under paragraph (1) shall—

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

(i) accomplishing the purposes of the authorizing legislation for the National Heritage Area; and

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

(B) analyze the Federal, Tribal, State, local, and private investments in the National Heritage Area to assess the impact of the investments; and

(C) review the management structure, partnership relationships, and funding of the National Heritage Area.

(3) RESULTS OF EVALUATION.—Based upon the evaluation under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall prepare a report with recommendations for the National Park Service's continued role, if any, with respect to the National Heritage Area. If the report recommends that Federal funding for the National Heritage Area be—

(A) continued, the report shall include an analysis of—

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

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

(iii) justification for the continued funding in light of other National Park Service core responsibilities and priorities; or

(B) eliminated, the report shall include a description of potential impacts on conservation, interpretation, and sustainability of the National Heritage Area.

(4) UPDATES; ADDITIONAL EVALUATIONS.—

(A) UPDATES.—The Secretary may satisfy the requirement under paragraph (1) for a National Heritage Area by updating an evaluation that was completed for that National Heritage Area not more than 5 years before another evaluation would otherwise be required under paragraph (1).

(B) ADDITIONAL EVALUATIONS.—The Secretary may conduct additional evaluations as the Secretary deems appropriate.

(c) COORDINATION.—The head of any Federal agency planning to conduct activities that may have an impact on a designated National Heritage Area is encouraged to consult and coordinate these activities with the Secretary and the local coordinating entity to the maximum extent practicable.

#### SEC. 905. STUDY AREAS.

(a) FEASIBILITY STUDIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may carry out or certify a study to assess the suitability and feasibility of designating a specific geographic area as a National Heritage Area to be included in the National Heritage Area System.

(2) PREPARATION.—The feasibility study shall be carried out—

(A) by the Secretary in consultation with Tribal, State, and local historic preservation officers, State and local historical societies, State and local tourism offices, and other appropriate organizations and governmental agencies; or

(B) by interested individuals or entities, if the Secretary certifies that the completed study meets the requirements of paragraph (4).

(3) CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 1 year after receiving a study carried out by interested individuals or entities under paragraph (2)(B) the Secretary shall review and certify whether the study meets the requirements of paragraph (4).

(4) REQUIREMENTS.—A study under paragraph (1) shall include analysis, documentation, and determination on whether the study area—

(A) has an assemblage of natural, historic, and cultural resources that—

(i) represent distinct aspects of the heritage of the United States;

(ii) are worthy of recognition, conservation, interpretation, and continuing use; and

(iii) would be best managed—

(I) through partnerships among public and private entities; and

(II) by linking diverse and sometimes non-contiguous resources;

(B) reflects traditions, customs, beliefs, and folklife that are a valuable part of the story of the United States;

(C) provides outstanding opportunities—

(i) to conserve natural, historic, cultural, or scenic features; and

(ii) for recreation and education;

(D) contains resources that—

(i) are important to any identified themes of the study area; and

(ii) retain a degree of integrity capable of supporting interpretation;

(E) includes Tribal governments, residents, business interests, nonprofit organizations, and State and local governments that—

(i) are involved in the planning of the study area;

(ii) have developed a conceptual financial plan that outlines the roles of all participants in the study area, including the Federal Government; and

(iii) have demonstrated support for the designation of the study area;

(F) has a potential local coordinating entity to work in partnership with the individuals and entities described in paragraph (1) to develop the study area while encouraging State and local economic activity; and

(G) has a conceptual boundary map that is supported by the public.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For each study carried out under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that describes—

(A) the findings of the study described in subsection (a) for that study area; and

(B) any conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary.

(2) TIMING.—

(A) With respect to a study carried out by the Secretary in accordance with paragraph (2)(A)(i), the Secretary shall submit a report under subparagraph (A) not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are first made available to carry out the study.

(B) With respect to a study carried out by interested individuals or entities in accordance with paragraph (2)(A)(ii), the Secretary shall submit a report under subparagraph (A) not later than 180 days after the date on which the Secretary certifies under paragraph (2)(B) that the study meets the requirements of paragraph (3).

#### SEC. 906. LOCAL COORDINATING ENTITIES.

(a) DUTIES.—For any year that Federal funds have been made available under this title for a National Heritage Area, the local coordinating entity for that National Heritage Area shall—

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

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

(3) require, with respect to all agreements authorizing expenditure of Federal funds by other organizations, that the organizations receiving the funds make available to the Secretary for audit all records concerning the expenditure of the funds.

(b) AUTHORITIES.—The local coordinating entity may, subject to the prior approval of the Secretary, for the purposes of preparing and implementing the approved management

plan for the National Heritage Area, use Federal funds made available through this title to—

(1) make grants to Indian Tribes, a State, a local government, nonprofit organizations, and other parties within the National Heritage Area;

(2) enter into cooperative agreements with or provide technical assistance to the Indian Tribes, State, a local government, nonprofit organizations, Federal agencies, and other interested parties;

(3) hire and compensate staff, which may include individuals with expertise in natural, cultural, and historic resources conservation; economic and community development; and heritage planning;

(4) obtain money or services, including those provided under other Federal laws or programs;

(5) contract for goods or services; and

(6) support activities of partners and any other activities that further the purposes of the National Heritage Area and are consistent with the approved management plan.

(c) PROHIBITIONS ON THE ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY.—The local coordinating entity may not use Federal funds received under this title to acquire real property or any interest in real property.

(d) HERITAGE AREA COMMISSIONS.—

(1) Section 804(j) of division B of H.R. 5666 (Appendix D) as enacted into law by section 1(a)(4) of Public Law 106-554 (54 U.S.C. 320101 note; 114 Stat. 2763, 2763A–295; 123 Stat. 1294; 128 Stat. 3802) is amended by striking “shall terminate” and all that follows through the period and inserting “shall terminate on September 30, 2034.”

(2) Section 295D(d) of Public Law 109-338 (120 Stat. 1833; 130 Stat. 962) is amended by striking “shall terminate” and all that follows through the period and inserting “shall terminate on September 30, 2034.”

#### SEC. 907. PROPERTY OWNERS AND REGULATORY PROTECTIONS.

Nothing in this title shall be construed to—

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

(2) require any property owner to permit public access (including Federal, Tribal, State, or local government access) to such property or to modify any provisions of Federal, Tribal, State, or local law with regard to public access or use of private lands;

(3) alter any duly adopted land use regulation or any approved land use plan or any other regulatory authority of any Federal, Tribal, or State, or local government, or to convey any land use or other regulatory authority to any local coordinating entity;

(4) authorize or imply the reservation or appropriation of water or water rights;

(5) diminish the authority of the State to manage fish and wildlife including the regulation of fishing and hunting within the National Heritage Area;

(6) create any liability, or have any effect on any liability under any other law, of any private property owner with respect to any persons injured on such private property;

(7) affect the authority of any Federal official to provide technical or financial assistance under any other law;

(8) modify any law or regulation authorizing Federal officials to manage Federal land under their control or limit the discretion of Federal land managers to implement approved land use plans within the boundaries of a National Heritage Area, nor shall this title be construed to modify, alter, or amend any authorized uses of these Federal lands; or

(9) enlarge or diminish the treaty rights of any Indian Tribe within the National Heritage Area.

#### SEC. 908. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2037, there is authorized to be appropriated not more than \$750,000 for each National Heritage Area.

(b) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts made available under subsection (a) shall remain available until expended.

(c) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.—

(1) FEDERAL SHARE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including any law designating a National Heritage Area, the Federal share of the total cost of any activity funded with appropriations authorized by subsection (a) shall not be more than 50 percent.

(2) FORM OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the total cost of any activity funded with appropriations authorized by subsection (a) may be in the form of in-kind contributions of goods or services fairly valued.

(3) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding section 909(b), for each National Heritage Area established before the date of the enactment of this Act without a non-Federal cost share requirement or with a non-Federal cost share requirement of less than 50 percent—

(A) the non-Federal cost share requirement, or lack thereof, shall remain at the previously enacted level for 2 full fiscal years after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) after the period referred to in subparagraph (A), the non-Federal cost share requirement shall increase by 10 percent annually until the non-Federal share is consistent with paragraph (1).

(d) AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may provide assistance to a National Heritage Area during any fiscal year for which appropriations are authorized under subsection (a).

#### SEC. 909. STATUTORY CLARIFICATION.

(a) AUTHORIZATION LIMITATIONS.—Any provision of law enacted before the date of the enactment of this Act that provides for a termination, expiration, or other time limitation on the authorization for a National Heritage Area is hereby superceded and shall have no effect.

(b) FUNDING LIMITATIONS.—Any provision of law enacted before the date of the enactment of this Act that provides for a termination, expiration, or other limitation on the time or amount of an authorization of appropriations for a National Heritage Area is hereby superceded and shall have no effect.

(c) EVALUATIONS.—Any provision of law enacted before the date of the enactment of this Act that requires the Secretary to conduct an evaluation of or submit a report on the accomplishments of a National Heritage Area is hereby superceded and shall have no effect.

(d) OTHER AUTHORITIES.—Any provision of law enacted before the date of the enactment of this Act that provides for the establishment, management, administration, operation, or otherwise affects a National Heritage Area and is not explicitly otherwise provided for in this title shall not be affected by this title.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR.  
O’HALLERAN OF ARIZONA

At the end of the bill, insert the following new title:

### TITLE IX—CASA GRANDE RUINS NATIONAL MONUMENT BOUNDARY MODIFICATION

#### SEC. 901. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Casa Grande Ruins National Monument Boundary Modification Act of 2021”.

#### SEC. 902. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) Casa Grande Ruin Reservation was—

(A) set aside on March 2, 1889;

(B) proclaimed as the first archaeological preserve in the United States on June 22, 1892; and

(C) redesignated as the “Casa Grande Ruins National Monument” on August 3, 1918;

(2) the Casa Grande Ruins National Monument protects 1 of the finest architectural examples of 14th century Hohokam culture in the Southwest, which was known to early Spanish explorers as the “Great House”;

(3) Casa Grande is only part of the story of an ancient town that may have covered 2 square miles; and

(4) recent surveys and research have determined that the area of the Great House and the village surrounding the Great House extends beyond the existing boundary of the Casa Grande Ruins National Monument.

#### SEC. 903. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) BIA LAND.—The term “BIA land” means the approximately 7.41 acres of Federal land administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, to be transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the National Park Service, as generally depicted on the map.

(2) BLM LAND.—The term “BLM land Parcel A” means the approximately 3.8 acres of Federal land administered by the Bureau of Land Management, for which administrative jurisdiction is to be transferred to the National Park Service, as generally depicted on the map.

(3) BLM LAND PARCEL B.—The term “BLM land parcel B” means the approximately 3.7 acres of Federal land administered by the Bureau of Land Management for which administrative jurisdiction is to be transferred to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, as generally depicted on the map.

(3) MAP.—The term “map” means the map entitled “Casa Grande Ruins National Monument Proposed Boundary Adjustment”, numbered 303-120,734B, and dated June 2020.

(5) MONUMENT.—The term “Monument” means the Casa Grande Ruins National Monument in the State.

(6) NPS LAND.—The term “NPS land” means the approximately 3.5 acres of Federal land administered by the National Park Service, for which administrative jurisdiction is to be transferred to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, as generally depicted on the map.

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

(6) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of Arizona.

#### SEC. 904. ACQUISITION AND TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN LAND.

(a) ACQUISITION OF LAND.—The Secretary may acquire by donation, exchange, or purchase with donated or appropriated funds, from willing sellers only, lands or interests in land generally depicted on the map as State land or private land, as generally depicted on the map, to be administered as part of the Monument.

(b) TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.—

(1) WITHDRAWAL.—The BIA land, BLM land parcel A and BLM land parcel B are withdrawn from—

(A) all forms of 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 and geothermal leasing laws and mineral materials laws.

(2) TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.—

(A) BLM LAND PARCEL A.—Administrative jurisdiction over the BLM land parcel A is transferred from the Bureau of Land Management to the National Park Service.

(B) BLM LAND PARCEL B.—Administrative jurisdiction over BLM land parcel B is transferred from the Bureau of Land Management to the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

(C) BIA LAND.—Administrative jurisdiction over the BIA land is transferred from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the National Park Service.

(D) NPS LAND.—Administrative jurisdiction over the NPS land is transferred from the National Park Service to the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

(c) ADMINISTRATION; BOUNDARY MODIFICATION.—Upon the acquisition of land or an interest in land pursuant to subsection (a), and with respect to the lands transferred by subsection (b), the Secretary shall—

(1) administer any acquired land or interest in land, and land transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the National Park Service, as part of the Monument, in accordance with the laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including applicable provisions of division A of subtitle I of title 54, United States Code; and

(2) modify the boundary of the Monument to reflect the transfers of lands, and any acquired lands or interests in lands.

(d) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map shall be on file and available for inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior.

(e) COMPENSATION.—Except in a case in which land or an interest in land is acquired by donation, as consideration for the acquisition of land or an interest in land or under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) pay fair market value for the land or interest in land; or

(2) convey to the State or private landowner, as applicable, Federal land or an interest in Federal land, of equal value located in the State.

#### SEC. 905. ADMINISTRATION OF STATE TRUST LAND.

The Secretary may enter into an agreement with the State to provide for the cooperative management by the Secretary and the State of the approximately 200 acres of State land, as generally depicted on the map.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. O'HALLERAN OF ARIZONA

At the end of the bill, insert the following new title:

#### TITLE IX—SUNSET CRATER VOLCANO NATIONAL MONUMENT BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT

##### SEC. 901. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Sunset Crater Volcano National Monument Boundary Adjustment Act”.

##### SEC. 902. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) FEDERAL LAND.—The term “Federal land” means the approximately 97.71 acres of Forest Service land identified as “Proposed transfer from USDA Forest Service to National Park Service” on the Map.

(2) MAP.—The term “Map” means the map entitled “Sunset Crater Volcano National Monument Draft Proposed Boundary Adjustment”, numbered 039/80.053d, and dated March 2020.

(3) MONUMENT.—The term “Monument” means the Sunset Crater Volcano National

Monument established by Presidential Proclamation 1911 (54 U.S.C. 320301 note; 46 Stat. 3023) and redesignated by section 15 of the Smith River National Recreation Area Act (Public Law 101-612; 104 Stat. 3222).

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the National Park Service.

#### SEC. 903. SUNSET CRATER VOLCANO NATIONAL MONUMENT BOUNDARY MODIFICATION.

(a) BOUNDARY MODIFICATION.—The boundary of the Monument is modified to include the Federal land.

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

(c) TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION TO NATIONAL PARK SERVICE.—Administrative jurisdiction over the Federal land is transferred from the Forest Service to the National Park Service.

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Secretary shall administer the Federal land added to the Monument under subsection (a)—

(1) as part of the Monument; and

(2) in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations).

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. PANETTA OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of the bill add the following:

#### TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS

##### SEC. 901. FIRE, INSECTS, AND DISEASES.

Nothing in this Act may be construed to limit the authority of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture under section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)), in accordance with existing laws (including regulations).

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MS. PINGREE OF MAINE

At the end of the bill, add the following:

#### TITLE IX—YORK RIVER WILD AND SCENIC RIVER

##### SEC. 901. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as “York River Wild and Scenic River Act”.

##### SEC. 902. WILD AND SCENIC RIVER DESIGNATION.

Section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“( ) YORK RIVER, MAINE.—Segments of the main stem and its tributaries in the State of Maine, Bass Cove Creek, Cider Hill Creek, Cutts Ridge Brook, Dolly Gordon Brook, Libby Brook, Rogers Brook, Smelt Brook, totaling approximately 30.8 miles, to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, as a recreational river:

“(A) The approximately 0.95-mile segment of Bass Cove Creek from the outlet of Boulder Pond in York, Maine, and extending downstream to its confluence with the York River in York, Maine.

“(B) The approximately 3.77-mile segment of Cider Hill Creek from the Middle Pond dam in York, Maine, and extending downstream to its confluence with the York River in York, Maine.

“(C) The approximately 2.15-mile segment of Cutts Ridge Brook from its headwaters in Kittery, Maine, and extending downstream to its confluence with the York River in York, Maine.

“(D) The approximately 3.17-mile segment of Dolly Gordon Brook from its headwaters in York, Maine, and extending downstream to its confluence with the York River in York, Maine.

“(E) The approximately 1.65-mile segment of Libby Brook from its headwaters in Kittery, Maine, and extending downstream

to its confluence with Dolly Gordon Brook in York, Maine.

“(F) The approximately 2.43-mile segment of Rogers Brook from its headwaters in Eliot, Maine, and extending downstream to its confluence with the York River in York, Maine.

“(G) The approximately 4.54-mile segment of Smelt Brook from the Bell Marsh Reservoir dam in York, Maine, and extending downstream to its confluence with the York River in York, Maine.

“(H) The approximately 12.14-mile segment of the York River from the outlet of York Pond in Eliot, Maine, and extending downstream to the Route 103 Bridge in York, Maine, including Barrell Mill Pond in York, Maine.”.

#### SEC. 903. MANAGEMENT OF YORK RIVER, MAINE SEGMENTS.

(a) PROCESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The York River, Maine segments shall be managed in accordance with—

(A) the stewardship plan; and

(B) such amendments to the stewardship plan as the Secretary determines are consistent with this section and as are approved by the Stewardship Committee.

(2) COMPREHENSIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The stewardship plan shall be considered to satisfy the requirements for a comprehensive management plan under section 3(d) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(d)).

(b) COMMITTEE.—The Secretary shall coordinate management responsibilities under this title with the Stewardship Committee, as specified in the stewardship plan.

(c) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to provide for the long-term protection, preservation, and enhancement of the York River, Maine segments, the Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements pursuant to sections 10(e) and 11(b)(1) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1281(e) and 1282(b)(1)) with—

(A) the State of Maine;

(B) the municipalities of Eliot, Kittery, South Berwick, and York in Maine; and

(C) appropriate local, regional, or State planning, environmental, or recreational organizations.

(2) CONSISTENCY.—Each cooperative agreement entered into under this subsection shall be consistent with the stewardship plan and may include provisions for financial or other assistance from the United States.

(d) LAND MANAGEMENT.—

(1) ZONING ORDINANCES.—For the purpose of the York River, Maine segments, the zoning ordinances adopted by the municipalities named in subsection (c)(1)(B), including provisions for conservation of floodplains, wetlands, and watercourses associated with the York River, Maine segments, shall be deemed to satisfy the standards and requirements of section 6(c) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1277(c)).

(2) ACQUISITION OF LANDS.—The authority of the Secretary to acquire land for the purposes of the York River, Maine segments shall be—

(A) limited to acquisition by donation or acquisition with the consent of the owner of the land; and

(B) subject to the additional criteria set forth in the stewardship plan.

(3) NO CONDEMNATION.—No land or interest in land within the watersheds of the York River, Maine segments may be acquired by condemnation.

(e) RELATION TO THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM.—Notwithstanding section 10(c) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1281(c)), the York River, Maine segments shall not—

(1) be administered as a unit of the National Park System; or

(2) be subject to regulations that govern the National Park System.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

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

(2) STEWARDSHIP COMMITTEE.—The term “Stewardship Committee” means the York River Stewardship Committee.

(3) STEWARDSHIP PLAN.—The term “stewardship plan” means the York River Watershed Stewardship Plan, dated August 2018, developed pursuant to the study described in section 5(b)(21) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1276(b)(21)).

(4) YORK RIVER, MAINE SEGMENTS.—The term “York River, Maine segments” means the river segments described by the amendment made by section 902.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MS. PLASKETT  
OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

At the end of the bill, add the following:

**TITLE IX—ST. CROIX NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA**

**SEC. 901. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “St. Croix National Heritage Area Act”.

**SEC. 902. DEFINITIONS.**

In this title:

(1) NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA.—The term “National Heritage Area” means the St. Croix National Heritage Area established by section 903(a).

(2) LOCAL COORDINATING ENTITY.—The term “local coordinating entity” means the local coordinating entity for the National Heritage Area designated by section 903(d).

(3) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The term “management plan” means the management plan for the National Heritage Area required under section 905.

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

(5) ST. CROIX.—The term “St. Croix” means St. Croix, Virgin Islands of the United States.

(6) STATE.—The term “State” means the Virgin Islands of the United States.

**SEC. 903. ST. CROIX NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA.**

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the State the St. Croix National Heritage Area.

(b) CONCEPTUAL BOUNDARIES.—The National Heritage Area shall consist of the entire island of St. Croix.

(c) MAP.—A map of the National Heritage Area shall be—

(1) included in the management plan; and

(2) on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(d) LOCAL COORDINATING ENTITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The local coordinating entity for the National Heritage Area shall be the Virgin Islands State Historic Preservation Office.

(2) CONSULTATION REQUIREMENT.—The Virgin Islands State Historic Preservation Office shall consult with a broad cross section of businesses, individuals, agencies, and organizations within the conceptual boundaries of the National Heritage Area described in subsection (b) that were involved in the planning and development of the National Heritage Area before the date of the enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 904. ADMINISTRATION.**

(a) AUTHORITIES.—For purposes of carrying out the management plan, the Secretary, acting through the local coordinating entity, may use amounts made available under this section to—

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

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

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

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

(5) contract for goods or services; and

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

(b) DUTIES.—The local coordinating entity shall—

(1) in accordance with section 905, prepare and submit a management plan for the National Heritage Area to the Secretary;

(2) assist Federal agencies, the State or a political subdivision of the State, Indian Tribes, regional planning organizations, nonprofit organizations, and other interested parties in carrying out the approved management plan by—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(5) for any year that Federal funds have been received under this title—

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

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

(C) require, with respect to all agreements authorizing expenditure of Federal funds by other organizations, that the organizations receiving the funds make available to the Secretary for audit all records concerning the expenditure of the funds; and

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

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

**SEC. 905. MANAGEMENT PLAN.**

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

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The management plan shall—

(1) incorporate an integrated and cooperative approach for the protection, enhancement, and interpretation of the natural, cultural, historic, scenic, and recreational resources of the National Heritage Area;

(2) take into consideration Federal, State, and Tribal plans and treaty rights;

(3) include—

(A) an inventory of—

(i) the resources located in the National Heritage Area; and

(ii) any other property in the National Heritage Area that—

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

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

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

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

(D) a program of implementation for the management plan by the local coordinating entity that includes a description of—

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

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

(E) the identification of sources of funding for carrying out the management plan;

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

(G) an interpretive plan for the National Heritage Area; and

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

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

(d) APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL OF MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

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

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

(A) the local coordinating entity is representative of the diverse interests of the National Heritage Area;

(B) the local coordinating entity has afforded adequate opportunity, including public hearings, for public and governmental involvement in the preparation of the management plan; and

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

(3) ACTION FOLLOWING DISAPPROVAL.—If the Secretary disapproves the management plan under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) advise the local coordinating entity in writing of the reasons for the disapproval;

(B) make recommendations for revisions to the management plan; and

(C) not later than 180 days after the receipt of any proposed revision of the management plan from the local coordinating entity, approve or disapprove the proposed revision.

(4) AMENDMENTS.—

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

(B) USE OF FUNDS.—The local coordinating entity shall not use Federal funds authorized by this title to carry out any amendments to the management plan until the Secretary has approved the amendments.

**SEC. 906. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.**

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

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

(c) OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Nothing in this title—

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

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

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

**SEC. 907. PRIVATE PROPERTY AND REGULATORY PROTECTIONS.**

Nothing in this title—

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

(2) requires any property owner—

(A) to permit public access (including access by Federal or State agencies) to the property of the property owner; or

(B) to modify public access or use of property of the property owner under any other Federal or State law;

(3) alters any duly adopted land use regulation, approved land use plan, or other regulatory authority of any Federal or State agency;

(4) conveys any land use or other regulatory authority to the local coordinating entity;

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

(6) enlarges or diminishes the treaty rights of any Indian Tribe within the National Heritage Area;

(7) diminishes—

(A) the authority of the State to manage fish and wildlife, including the regulation of

fishing and hunting within the National Heritage Area; or

(B) the authority of Indian Tribes to regulate members of Indian Tribes with respect to fishing, hunting, and gathering in the exercise of treaty rights; or

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

**SEC. 908. EVALUATION AND REPORT.**

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

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

(2) prepare a report in accordance with subsection (c).

(b) EVALUATION.—An evaluation conducted under subsection (a)(1) shall—

(1) assess the progress of the local coordinating entity with respect to—

(A) accomplishing the purposes of the authorizing legislation for the National Heritage Area; and

(B) achieving the goals and objectives of the approved management plan for the National Heritage Area;

(2) analyze the Federal, State, and private investments in the National Heritage Area to determine the impact of the investments; and

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

(c) REPORT.—Based on the evaluation conducted under subsection (a)(1), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report that includes recommendations for the future role of the National Park Service, if any, with respect to the National Heritage Area.

**SEC. 909. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

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

(b) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts made available under subsection (a) shall remain available until expended.

(c) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of the total cost of any activity under this title shall be not more than 50 percent.

(2) FORM.—The non-Federal contribution of the total cost of any activity under this title may be in the form of in-kind contributions of goods or services fairly valued.

**SEC. 910. TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.**

The authority of the Secretary to provide assistance under this title terminates on the date that is 15 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. POCAN OF WISCONSIN

After section 227, insert the following:

**SEC. 228. ICE AGE NATIONAL SCENIC TRAIL.**

Section 5(a)(10) of the National Trails System Act (16 U.S.C. 1244(a)(10)) is amended by striking the third and fourth sentences and inserting “The trail shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior as a unit of the National Park System.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MS. SPANBERGER OF VIRGINIA

At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

**TITLE IX—ADDITIONS TO ROUGH MOUNTAIN AND RICH HOLE WILDERNESSES**

**SEC. 901. ADDITIONS TO ROUGH MOUNTAIN AND RICH HOLE WILDERNESSES.**

(a) ROUGH MOUNTAIN ADDITION.—Section 1 of Public Law 100-326 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 102 Stat. 584; 114 Stat. 2057; 123 Stat. 1002) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(21) ROUGH MOUNTAIN ADDITION.—Certain land in the George Washington National Forest comprising approximately 1,000 acres, as generally depicted as the ‘Rough Mountain Addition’ on the map entitled ‘GEORGE WASHINGTON NATIONAL FOREST – South half – Alternative I – Selected Alternative Management Prescriptions – Land and Resources Management Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement’ and dated March 4, 2014, which is incorporated in the Rough Mountain Wilderness Area designated by paragraph (1).”.

(b) RICH HOLE ADDITION.—

(1) POTENTIAL WILDERNESS DESIGNATION.—In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), certain land in the George Washington National Forest comprising approximately 4,600 acres, as generally depicted as the “Rich Hole Addition” on the map entitled “GEORGE WASHINGTON NATIONAL FOREST – South half – Alternative I – Selected Alternative Management Prescriptions – Land and Resources Management Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement” and dated March 4, 2014, is designated as a potential wilderness area for incorporation in the Rich Hole Wilderness Area designated by section 1(2) of Public Law 100-326 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 102 Stat. 584; 114 Stat. 2057; 123 Stat. 1002).

(2) WILDERNESS DESIGNATION.—The potential wilderness area designated by paragraph (1) shall be designated as wilderness and incorporated in the Rich Hole Wilderness Area designated by section 1(2) of Public Law 100-326 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 102 Stat. 584; 114 Stat. 2057; 123 Stat. 1002) on the earlier of—

(A) the date on which the Secretary publishes in the Federal Register notice that the activities permitted under paragraph (4) have been completed; or

(B) the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) MANAGEMENT.—Except as provided in paragraph (4), the Secretary shall manage the potential wilderness area designated by paragraph (1) in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.).

(4) WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—To enhance natural ecosystems within the potential wilderness area designated by paragraph (1) by implementing certain activities to improve water quality and aquatic passage, as set forth in the Forest Service document entitled “Decision Notice for the Lower Cowpasture Restoration and Management Project” and dated December 2015, the Secretary may use motorized equipment and mechanized transport in the potential wilderness area until the date on which the potential wilderness area is incorporated into the Rich Hole Wilderness Area under paragraph (2).

(B) REQUIREMENT.—In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Secretary, to the maximum extent practicable, shall use the minimum tool or administrative practice necessary to carry out that subparagraph with the least amount of adverse impact on wilderness character and resources.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MS. TLAIB OF MICHIGAN

At the end of the bill, add the following new title:



**TITLE IX—AGENCY REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR SPECIAL RECREATION PERMITS BENEFITS TO ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE COMMUNITIES**

**SEC. 901. AGENCY REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR SPECIAL RECREATION PERMITS BENEFITS TO ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE COMMUNITIES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years following the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate on the following:

(1) Estimated use of Department of the Interior special recreation permits by recreation service providers serving environmental justice communities.

(2) Any national, regional, State, local, or site-specific policies that facilitate public lands access for recreational service providers serving environmental justice communities.

(3) Any case studies that may provide illustrative examples of how Department of the Interior special recreation permits, partnerships, or cooperative agreements are being effectively used by land managers for the purposes of providing public lands access to recreation service providers serving environmental justice communities.

(4) Identification of any barriers to public lands access for recreation service providers serving environmental justice communities.

(5) Any recommendations for agency policy, or if necessary, action by Congress to encourage and simplify public lands access for recreational service providers serving environmental justice communities.

(b) VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION BY SPECIAL RECREATION PROVIDERS.—The Secretary—

(1) shall contact all current or prospective special recreation providers to request a voluntary estimation of how many user days are used by individuals from environmental justice communities;

(2) shall request from recreational service providers and interested members of the public any other information that supports the reporting requirements in subsection (a); and

(3) shall not use participation or information provided as a condition in approving or rejecting a Department of the Interior special recreation permit.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this title:

(1) The term “environmental justice community” means a community with significant representation of communities of color, low-income communities, or Tribal and indigenous communities, that experiences, or is at risk of experiencing, higher or more adverse human health or environmental effects than other communities.

(2) The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 147, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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

I rise in strong support of en bloc No. 1. These 18 amendments demonstrate the strong and bipartisan support for protecting our wilderness and our public lands.

The amendments in this package include bipartisan legislation from Rep-

resentatives MCKINLEY and TONKO to unify the way National Heritage Areas are established and managed around the country.

Other amendments would seek to improve the diversity and representation on our public lands, including the Great Dismal Swamp NHA, by Representative MCEACHIN; ensuring all Americans have access to healthy outdoor recreation, especially in urban and low-income cities, such as the Outdoors for All Act by Representative BARRAGAN; and promote outdoor recreation and wellness among servicemembers and veterans, which is pursued by the Brown amendment.

We clarify also our intention regarding wilderness and wildfire with the inclusion of the Panetta amendment, and we even add some small number of wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, and mineral withdrawals with the inclusion of amendments from Representatives SPANBERGER, PINGREE, and DEFAZIO, respectively.

The inclusion of these amendments would not only improve the bill but improve protections for our public lands and environmental justice communities far beyond the places already covered in Colorado, California, Washington, and Arizona.

Simply put, this amendment reinforces that our public lands are for the benefit and enjoyment of all Americans. I urge support for this en bloc No. 1, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today in opposition to this package of en bloc amendments, which is bad for our environment, kills jobs, locks up more lands, and does nothing to reduce our dependence on hostile foreign nations for critical minerals.

One of the amendments in this package is a feasibility study for the Great Dismal Swamp National Heritage Area. Now, the Great Dismal Swamp may technically be located on the Virginia-North Carolina border, but House Democrats attempting to ram through dozens of amendments completely unrelated to the underlying bill, without going through regular order, sure makes it seem like the Great Dismal Swamp is actually located right here in Washington, D.C.

Much like the underlying bill, many of these amendments have not gone through regular order, are not supported by local stakeholders, and do not have the support of the Members whose districts are directly impacted.

One such amendment creates the Ice Age National Scenic Trail as a unit of the National Park Service in Wisconsin. This amendment was offered without the consultation of my colleague on the Natural Resources Committee, Representative TIFFANY, and does not have his support. Unlike other trail designation bills that have passed the House by voice vote in previous Congresses, this amendment lacks basic protections to ensure these trails

do not have unintended consequences for neighboring communities.

Similarly, the Casa Grande Ruins National Monument Boundary Expansion Act ignores the will and voices of local stakeholders. The Arizona State Land Department expressed concerns to the committee regarding the cooperative agreement language of this amendment and shared that they have encountered numerous problems with these types of agreements in the past. These are exactly the types of concerns that should be vetted through the committee process with testimony from local stakeholders and the affected agencies.

I would like to briefly discuss one amendment offered by my friend and colleague, Representative PANETTA from California, that would simply reinforce the status quo policy of forest management in wilderness areas.

I have worked with Representative PANETTA on forest management policies in the past, particularly on the wildland-urban interface. I know his heart. I know he has the right intent and wants to do the right thing. But I also know that he is greatly restricted by his own conference on forestry management issues.

While I appreciate his intent, over the past 10 years, we have had nearly seven million acres of wilderness and wilderness study areas burn up in catastrophic wildfires. Land managers and wilderness areas must rely on century-old techniques, like handsaws and shovels when millions of acres of forest are in desperate need of treatment.

Mr. Speaker, 1910 called and it wants its forest management policy back.

Clearly, the status quo isn't working and unfortunately, his amendment won't actually allow for proper forest management and won't stop this bill from hurting our environment.

Michael Jordan once wisely advised: “If you do the work you get rewarded. There are no shortcuts in life.”

House Democrats are looking to take the shortcut with this amendment package and the underlying bill. Unfortunately, our economy and environment will have to bear the consequences of these misguided policy decisions.

I would strongly urge my colleagues to oppose these amendments, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from the State of Colorado (Mr. CROW).

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Protecting America's Wilderness Act.

I would first like to thank my friends and colleagues in the Colorado delegation, Congressman JOE NEGUSE, Congresswoman DIANA DEGETTE, and Senator MICHAEL BENNET for their leadership on this package.

Colorado's identity is closely tied to nature. Colorado is home to four national parks, 42 State parks, and a wide variety of outdoor activities ranging from hiking, to camping, and skiing. Our public lands are central to the Colorado way of life, and I want to ensure

that future generations can enjoy these treasures just as my children do now.

The conservation package we are considering today will grow the outdoor recreation economy, help create jobs, and protect hundreds of thousands of acres of Colorado land for future generations.

The Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act will establish the first-ever national historic landscape at Camp Hale. Now, Camp Hale was the training ground of the storied 10th Mountain Division, an elite unit trained in mountain climbing and skiing. They fought valiantly in World War II, and many of them later returned to Colorado, where they helped establish the U.S. ski industry.

This is particularly important to my family as my wife's grandfather served in the initial 10th Mountain during World War II and was actually wounded in fighting in Italy. As a veteran, and a Coloradan, I believe it is important to honor their service and their legacy, and to preserve this historic landscape so that we can tell the story to future generations.

I commend my Colorado colleagues for their work on this effort and their commitment to our public lands, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TIFFANY).

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment, specifically, a provision in here taking a trail in Wisconsin and turning it into National Park Service unit status.

This proposal before us has not been introduced as a standalone bill this Congress and has not been heard by the Natural Resources Committee. We have not discussed the impacts of elevating this trail to National Park Service unit status, and there have been no hearings to afford local officials or adjacent landowners the opportunity to express their views.

Too often in this body, we see Members who represent urban constituencies rushing to expand Federal control over rural communities far from their own homes. And too often, these decisions marginalize the voices of people in the affected communities who must live with the consequences: Federal land management agencies in Washington, D.C., imposing new limitations on access, use, and impacts to private property owners.

Mr. Speaker, we have also spent much time in this body discussing the Park Service maintenance backlog, which is significant. We should be mindful of that backlog and the fact that land managers lack sufficient resources to care for the units already under their supervision.

I am also concerned that the passage of measures like this one will further fuel the Federal Government's insatiable appetite to annex yet more private

property. And more Federal land ownership means further erosion of the property tax base, higher local property tax burdens, and strained local budgets.

Let me give you this analogy. A homeowner, their roof is falling in. The lot next to them comes up for sale and they say, gosh, I have got to buy that lot, and they don't take care of their own home. That is, in effect, what we are doing with our national parks here in the United States of America.

To be clear, I believe that Wisconsin is home to some of this country's most special places, including this scenic and picturesque trail. On this fact, my Wisconsin colleagues and I agree.

But I believe this amendment is the wrong approach, Mr. Speaker, and I would encourage a "no" vote on the amendment and the bill.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING).

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 803, Protecting America's Wilderness and Public Lands Act, which will reauthorize the Cape Cod National Seashore Advisory Commission until the year 2028.

The park that would eventually become the Cape Cod National Seashore was first conceived as a way to protect one of the last truly unspoiled barrier beaches in New England. From Chatham in the south to Provincetown in the north, the seashore resides within the six towns that form the outer Cape Cod area.

And since the creation of the seashore, the fate of that outer cape community has been uniquely intertwined with the success of the national seashore.

□ 0930

Today, more than 4 million visitors from around the world come every year to experience the natural beauty and recreational opportunities that the seashore provides. In this way, the seashore is a crucial, pivotal point to local businesses that depend on the cape's tourism industry for their own livelihoods and those that reside there.

Last year, the Great American Outdoors Act was signed into law. Our landmark conservation legislation will bring millions of dollars to rebuild and protect the national seashore in the coming years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Last year, the Great American Outdoors Act was signed into law. Our landmark legislation will bring millions of dollars that will be used to rebuild and protect the national seashore in the coming years. The advisory commission's role is greater than ever.

The Cape Cod National Seashore, the vision of then-Senator John F. Ken-

nedy, continues to be a success. Working together, making sure that this model of cooperation between the Federal Government and local governments in this time of necessary cooperation with governmental interaction, is more important than ever as well.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for including this in our bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to focus on wilderness areas. I know it sounds great to have a wilderness area. I have enjoyed spending time myself in wilderness areas, and forestry and wilderness areas are very important to me. Mr. Speaker, I have a degree in forestry, and I have actually been licensed to practice forestry, taken exams to do that. I can tell you, Republicans, Democrats, and independents alike, we all, I think, can appreciate a healthy forest because we know that it provides clean air, it provides clean water, it provides wildlife habitat, and it also provides great places for us to do recreation.

There are certain places where we need wilderness areas, but there are certain places where we do not need wilderness areas. Seven million acres of wilderness area went up in wildfire in the last 10 years. I would love to be able to take my colleagues out to the forest. They say a picture is worth a thousand words, but I can promise you, actually being in the forest tells a much bigger picture, a much better story.

I would love to go to an area that has been properly managed and then go to a wilderness area that hasn't been managed and be able to make the case that although we can pass these bills and create wilderness areas right now that aren't going to affect us, because it takes a long time for a forest to grow and it takes a long time for a forest to degrade, but our children and our grandchildren are going to suffer the consequences of us locking these lands up and making them subject to catastrophic wildfire in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the sentimental value, the emotional value, in wanting to make more wilderness areas. But I wish we would have a long-term look and think about the impact that this is going to have on the future. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to say that I have great respect for my colleague, the ranking member, and I know that he is well intentioned with respect to addressing wildfire issues. I would note, for my colleague, that we just recently created a Bipartisan Wildfire Caucus with Representative CURTIS to address some of the issues that he describes.

But, look, with respect to the bill that is before the House today, there is

simply no question. This bill does not create any further risks from wildfire, far from it. As I said yesterday, the law as it stands today, section 4(d) provides for the flexibility, ultimately, for measures to be taken as may be necessary for the control of insects, disease, and fire, subject to such conditions as the Secretary of the Interior may deem desirable.

So, there is flexibility within existing law to address any potential issues that might arise. For that reason, I would hope that my colleague's concerns would be alleviated and that he would support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY).

Ms. BROWNLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 803, the Protecting America's Wilderness and Public Lands Act.

This bill incorporates two important pieces of legislation that will preserve the natural beauty of public lands and improve access to recreational opportunities in my congressional district in Ventura County and California.

The first is the Central Coast Heritage Protection Act, which I joined Congressman SALUD CARBAJAL in introducing. The Central Coast Heritage Protection Act will protect more than 25,000 acres in the Los Padres National Forest and the Carrizo Plain National Monument by designating these lands as wilderness.

It also designates the Condor Trail within Los Padres as a National Recreational Trail. This is a beautiful trail that is 400 miles long. You can hike from Ventura County to Santa Barbara County surrounded by great and unique beauty.

The second piece of legislation is the Rim of the Valley Corridor Preservation Act, which would add more than 191,000 acres to the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreational Area. If you ever want to hike to a beautiful 180-degree view of the Pacific Ocean, this is your place. Much of the land is in Ventura County, and I am grateful for Congressman ADAM SCHIFF's efforts to advance this bill through the years.

Overall, H.R. 803 is an important downpayment on a commitment that many of us made to help conserve 30 percent of U.S. lands by 2030.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY).

Ms. BROWNLEY. Mr. Speaker, in Ventura County, my constituents and I are so fortunate to be surrounded by beautiful public spaces. The public lands provisions in this bill will strengthen our region's commitment to sound environmental stewardship and preserve an important part of our natural heritage for future generations to enjoy.

I know we all agree on the importance of being good stewards of our

country's natural lands. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 803.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Colorado has 3 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER).

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 803.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, we have seen the renewed importance of having safe and accessible public lands for our families and communities. As a proud Virginian, I know that Virginia's public lands not only provide opportunities for recreation and reflection but they are key to our tourism industry and our overall economy.

My amendment would strengthen protections for two beautiful areas of the George Washington National Forest, the Rough Mountain and Rich Hole wilderness areas, following recommendations from the U.S. Forest Service in 2014. These areas offer outstanding scenic views, rare and endangered plants, age-old hardwood forests, and a dense population of black bears.

This legislation, the Virginia Wilderness Additions Act, would allow these irreplaceable areas to remain open to recreation while also protecting their wildlife, natural resources, and trails for generations to come.

I would like to thank Senators KAINE and WARNER for their leadership on this issue in the Senate, as well as Representatives LURIA and McEachin for working with me on this important amendment.

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

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB), the newest member of our Natural Resources Committee.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking Chairman GRUJALVA, Congresswoman DEGETTE, and the committee staff for working with me on this amendment and for the continued leadership on this bill.

The amendment incorporates environmental justice communities like mine into this space. It would require a report on permits by providers serving environmental justice communities.

This measure, first introduced last Congress by the soon-to-be first Native American Cabinet Secretary and the Secretary of the Interior, Congresswoman HAALAND, is an important step in identifying and removing barriers to access our public lands. Communities of color, low-income communities, indigenous communities, and those most impacted by pollution and climate change often have the least access to our national parks and Federal lands.

My 13th District Strong is an environmental justice community, an area that the State calls the epicenter of the asthma burden due to corporate polluters. Folks in my district deserve the same opportunity to enjoy clean air and public lands as anyone else so they don't grow up like me, thinking that sulfur dioxide and rotten eggs was just how the air smelled.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to please support this amendment.

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

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining, if I might inquire?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I will just simply say that these amendments are common sense. They have been vetted by the various stakeholders and constituents in the communities that support the respective amendments that have been proposed as part of this package, and my hope is that my colleagues could support them. Several of them are bipartisan, as we have mentioned, and they go to the heart of this bill, which is ultimately protecting the most scenic places in our country.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from Colorado's love for the outdoors. I appreciate his passion to do what is right.

He mentioned the provisions in the Wilderness Act to address insects, disease, and wildfire. Mr. Speaker, that is a Band-Aid. That is what you do after the fact.

What we are proposing is proactive forest management so that you don't have the insects, the disease, and the wildfires. An ounce of prevention is definitely worth a pound of cure.

I would challenge my colleagues to enjoy those scenes and those vistas. I encourage them to take pictures so they can show their children and grandchildren what they looked like before they locked them away in a wilderness area.

Mr. Speaker, this random assortment of amendments does nothing but make a bad bill three times worse. The only difference is that instead of having a package of eight bills that haven't been through regular order that will harm our environment and that will kill jobs in rural communities, we now have a package of 23 bills that haven't been through regular order, will harm the environment, and will kill jobs in rural communities.

No amendment in this package reduces our dependence on hostile foreign nations or critical minerals, improves our supply chains, or bolsters American energy security. No amendment in this package changes how we currently treat forest and wilderness areas with century-old technology like handsaws and shovels. No amendment in this

package creates new jobs or bolsters our economic growth.

What does this package do? It just adds more wilderness, more wild and scenic river designations, and more provisions that haven't gone through regular order and do not have the support of Members of Congress directly impacted by those amendments.

Needless to say, this isn't how we should be managing our resources, and it isn't how we should be legislating in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this package of en bloc amendments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment from Mr. TONKO and Mr. MCKINLEY to reauthorize and standardize the management of the National Heritage Areas, and salute them for their commitment across multiple sessions of Congress to institute critical, lasting protections for our nation's National Heritage Areas.

This amendment would address the haphazard and confusing patchwork of authorizations for National Heritage Areas across the country, with two right here in my neck of the woods, by instituting a universal timeline to ensure these natural treasures are not subject to arbitrary lapses in authorization. These heritage areas create jobs, establish destinations that people want to visit and vacation to, and are a smart investment in both the economy and the natural environment.

Support from the federal government is what provides these areas with the foundation needed to preserve and protect these natural spaces, but the work just starts there—from that federal support, these National Heritage Areas leverage countless dollars and volunteer hours to promote the environment and identity of their surrounding regions.

Two of those treasures are especially close to my heart and would be reauthorized for 15 years under this amendment—the Last Green Valley National Heritage Corridor and the Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area. Both areas are incredible assets to eastern Connecticut and the Northeast with the Last Green Valley encompassing 35 towns stretching from eastern Connecticut to Massachusetts. First designated as a National Heritage Corridor by Congress in 1994, the area spans 1,100 miles in Connecticut alone, remains 77 percent forest and farm, and is the last stretch of dark night sky in the sprawl between Boston and Washington, D.C.

My colleagues from Connecticut and Massachusetts know that investments in our open spaces provide an enormous value for taxpayers, and I salute our neighbor and friend for his amendment which would ensure that these wonders are protected for future generations to enjoy.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, my amendment (Garamendi No. 6) to the "Protecting America's Wilderness and Public Lands Act" (H.R. 803) would adjust the Congressionally designated boundary of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area to include approximately 62 acres of adjacent publicly owned land in unincorporated Solano County.

I thank Rules Chairman MCGOVERN (D-MA) for making my noncontroversial amendment in order and Natural Resources Chairman GRI-

JALVA (D-AZ) for including it in the en bloc #1 amendments today, offered by Congressman NEGUSE (D-CO).

My amendment is identical to H.R. 1230, which I introduced on February 23, 2021, at the request of the City of Rio Vista. It would include the decommissioned United States Army Reserve Center (Rio Vista), U.S. Coast Guard Station Rio Vista, Beach Drive Wastewater Treatment Plant (City of Rio Vista), and Sandy Beach County Park (Solano County) in the National Heritage Area.

Two of these parcels—the decommissioned United States Army Reserve Center and Beach Drive Wastewater Treatment Plant—are owned by the City of Rio Vista but technically outside the city limits. As such, it appears these parcels were omitted inadvertently when the National Park Service prepared the legislative map for the then-proposed Delta National Heritage Area in 2010. Including these parcels within the National Heritage Area's boundary supports the City of Rio Vista's proposed redevelopment of the decommissioned United States Army Reserve Center, now owned by the City.

In March 2019, Congress enacted into law (Public Law 116-9) my legislation with U.S. Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN (D-CA) designating the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta as California's first national heritage area. The Delta is a crown jewel of our state and an iconic working landscape, which my family has been fortunate to call home for over 40 years. It is the most productive watershed in the western United States and among the most ecologically important in the Western Hemisphere.

Together, we must safeguard the Delta and the historic communities that make it such a special place, including Rio Vista. Expanding the Delta National Heritage Area will ensure that the proposed redevelopment of the decommissioned Rio Vista Army base and similar projects on the adjacent publicly owned land are eligible to apply for the \$10 million in federal grant funding available until 2034.

I urge all Members to support my amendment and the underlying bill, which I will work to enact into law before California's Delta Protection Commission completes the management plan for the National Heritage Area.

□ 0945

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 147, the previous question is ordered on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE).

The question is on the amendments en bloc.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CURTIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 117-6.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

**TITLE IX—RENEWABLE ENERGY INPUTS ACCESS STUDY**

**SEC. 901. STUDY.**

The Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and Secretary of Commerce, shall conduct a study to determine whether the acreage to be withdrawn under this Act contains geothermal resources, or minerals needed for battery storage, renewable energy technology, and electric vehicles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 147, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my amendment to require a study of any land impacted by the legislation to determine if these areas contain geothermal resources or minerals needed for battery storage, renewable energy technology, or electric vehicles.

We agree that we want to reduce human emissions that are polluting our ecosystem. Renewable energy will play a role long into the future, and we must ensure we have the resources needed to make solar panels, wind turbines, and batteries here in America.

President Biden agrees. Just yesterday he issued an executive order to ensure the United States has access to domestic critical minerals. President Biden's fact sheet on the executive order says: "While the U.S. is a net exporter of electric vehicles, we are not a leader in the supply chain associated with electric battery production. The U.S. could better leverage our sizable lithium reserves and manufacturing know-how to expand domestic battery production."

To state the obvious, if we are accidentally locking up lithium with this bill while President Biden says we should do the opposite, this is something Congress should know. This amendment does not prevent any part of the lands package from being implemented, as currently drafted.

I am a strong supporter of the local-driven public lands legislation, which is why I ensured my amendment would not impact any of the bills on the ground level. There is parts of this package I actually support. Mr. HUFFMAN's bill included in the public lands bill was supported by me last year.

This amendment is not a criticism of this lands package. It is about listening to science and combating climate change. More information is always better, more science is better. That is all this amendment does, give us more science-backed information as Congress faces the issues of producing renewable energy in the future.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to say, first, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks on this amendment. My friend from Utah, I know from our work together last Congress and this Congress and from our bipartisan work on the Congressional Wildfire Caucus that the gentleman is sincere in his intent that he, too, wants to help address the climate crisis and the threat that it poses to our communities, and I thank him for that.

However, to that end, I would encourage the gentleman and his colleagues to continue to work with us across the aisle on opportunities to create clean, green, well-paying jobs for all Americans. Ultimately, I will be opposing the gentleman's amendment because I don't believe it is in the best interest of this particular legislation.

As we have heard over the course of the debate this morning and yesterday, of course, on the bill, the various areas that are protected in this bill were included at the request of local communities who want to see these lands protected for future generations.

One example, perhaps the most salient in my view, is the Thompson Divide region in my bill, the CORE Act, which has faced years of pressure to develop certain mineral interests that local stakeholders, including the ranching community, oppose.

The largest individual withdrawal area in this bill actually surrounds the Grand Canyon, a region with few identified critical mineral resources, but one that I believe we can all agree is of enormous importance to the American public. That importance, that value of the Grand Canyon, as well as every area included in this bill, is ultimately why we are here today.

It is why my colleagues have gone through years of painstaking work developing a consensus with those local communities to identify those lands of such exceptional value that they believe and the communities believe should be protected for future generations.

The bottom line is this: We believe that some places should be set aside permanently from extraction because some landscapes, like the Grand Canyon, are simply too special to be mined, drilled, or excavated.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I respectfully oppose the gentleman's amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, to my friend from Colorado, I welcome his invitation to work together on many of these issues. I point out that we are simply asking for a study so that we know what is there. We are not stop-

ping anything. We are simply asking for a study.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah for his tireless work on doing what is right for the environment. I use that word "environment," and not the word "climate," because I want people to understand that those two things are different.

Climate is very narrowly focused. Climate is an issue that has made carbon, a necessary element, arch enemy number one. Republicans are about a cleaner, safer, and healthier environment. We are concerned not just about carbon in the atmosphere, but we are concerned about forest health, about air quality, about water quality, about wildlife habitat, about having great places for recreation.

Mr. Speaker, nobody wants to mine inside the Grand Canyon. Nobody is mining inside the Grand Canyon. Nobody ever will mine inside the Grand Canyon. We have already got the Grand Canyon National Park that establishes those boundaries, and these mineral withdrawals are far outside of the actual Grand Canyon.

Mr. Speaker, we want a clean environment. We want a healthy environment. We are all for cleaner technology, but that cleaner technology takes certain things. It takes minerals and elements. It takes research and development. It takes using all of the energy sources that we have.

Why can't we talk about creating more next-generation nuclear power?

It has zero carbon. If your concern is about climate, your concern is about carbon. And nuclear energy doesn't emit carbon.

Why not put hydroelectric plants on existing dams?

We don't have to build new dams. We can add 12,000 megawatts of clean, carbon-free hydropower on existing dams. We can use the natural resources that we have and develop cleaner ways to use them.

As we develop more electrical components and devices that, again, run on carbon-free energy, unless that energy is produced from carbon sources, but we have to have a stable and reliable supply of energy, and we can't have that without developing these resources.

I appreciate the gentleman's concern about not locking up these resources and doing a study to make sure that when we lock them up, we are not locking away our future, we are not taking away the ability for this country to produce our own energy supply, that we are not further relying on a foreign supply chain that is controlled by Communist parties.

Mr. Speaker, we are blessed with a resource-rich country, but we are right now at the mercy of foreign suppliers, especially China, to meet our mineral needs. Resources like lithium, cobalt,

gallium, and dozens more will be needed in the billions of pounds to meet the projected growth in electric vehicles and other renewable technologies. Even commodities like copper, which have historically been produced in surplus, are now falling short of demand.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage supporting the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my colleague might engage in just a brief colloquy so I understand the scope of the amendment. What is the most common way to assess geothermal or other mineral resources? I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague. I suspect you have an answer ready to tell me, and I would love to hear that.

Mr. NEGUSE. The gentleman is correct, I do have an answer. The most common way is to drill. That is the most common way to assess geothermal and mineral resources.

With much respect to the gentleman, because, again, I know his intent is sincere, but this amendment is not simply a study amendment. This study amendment, ultimately, if it were to succeed, would have the Interior Department drilling countless wells throughout these wilderness areas to ultimately ascertain the information that the distinguished gentleman seeks, and I just don't think that is a prudent way forward.

I would say to the distinguished ranking member, with respect to the areas around the Grand Canyon, that the southwest United States, as I know some of my colleagues are certainly familiar, is littered with remnants of abandoned uranium mines and mill sites that poison the water and the air to this day, and those mines have hit Tribal nations the hardest.

So you can understand why the distinguished chairman of our committee, Chairman GRIJALVA, would feel so compelled by local communities in the State that he represents to move forward with the Grand Canyon protections that are a part of this important wilderness package.

Mr. Speaker, while I very much respect my colleague and look forward to working with him on future proposals, we respectfully oppose this amendment and would ask for a "no" vote.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 147, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS).

The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appear to have it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The

SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. NEGUSE

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 147, I rise to offer amendments en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 2, consisting of amendment Nos. 7, 8, 9, 11, 15, 16, 17, 25, 26, 27, and 29, printed in part B of House Report 117-6, offered by Mr. NEGUSE of Colorado:

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR OF ARIZONA

At the end of title VIII, add the following:  
**SEC. 803. EXEMPTION.**

The withdrawal under section 802 shall not apply to any Federal land depicted on the Map as "Federal Mineral Estate to be Withdrawn" located in the 4th Congressional District of Arizona, as configured on the date of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR OF ARIZONA

At the end of title VIII, add the following:  
**SEC. 803. SUPPORTING SCIENCE-BASED LAND MANAGEMENT.**

The withdrawal under section 802 shall not go into effect until the Secretary of the Interior completes a mineral survey of the area proposed for withdrawal, including uranium, rare earth elements, geothermal and oil and gas resources, and determines that there are no mineral resources, geothermal resources, or critical minerals present other than uranium.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. HERRELL OF NEW MEXICO

Strike subsection (i) of section 103.  
Strike section 233.  
Strike subsection (c) of section 302.  
Strike section 404.  
Strike section 407.  
Strike section 713.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN OF COLORADO

Page 330, after line 6, insert the following:  
**TITLE IX—SAVINGS CLAUSE**

**SEC. 901. UTILITY FACILITIES AND RIGHTS OF WAY.**

Nothing in this Act shall—

(1) affect the use, operation, maintenance, repair, construction, destruction, reconfiguration, expansion, inspection, renewal, reconstruction, alteration, addition, relocation, improvement, removal, or replacement of a utility facility or appurtenant right of way within or adjacent to any wilderness areas or potential wilderness areas designated in this Act;

(2) affect access to a utility facility or right-of way within or adjacent to a wilderness area or potential wilderness area designated in this Act; or

(3) preclude the establishment of a new utility facility or right-of-way (including instream sites, routes, and areas) within a wilderness area or potential wilderness area designated in this Act if such a facility or right-of-way is necessary for public health and safety, electricity supply, or other utility services.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. MOORE OF UTAH

Page 330, after line 6, add the following:

**TITLE IX—RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF LOCAL INPUT**

**SEC. 901. COUNTY APPROVAL.**

No wilderness or potential wilderness designation under this Act shall be effective in any county where the county has not formally approved such designation.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. NEWHOUSE OF WASHINGTON

At the end of the bill, add the following:

**TITLE IX—PROTECTIONS**

**SEC. 901. RENEWABLE ENERGY JOBS.**

This Act shall not take effect until the Secretary of the Interior certifies that no renewable energy jobs have been lost as a result of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. NEWHOUSE OF WASHINGTON

At the end of the bill, add the following:

**TITLE IX—PROTECTIONS**

**SEC. 901. RENEWABLE HYDROPOWER DEVELOPMENT.**

Nothing in this Act shall prohibit development of new renewable hydroelectric energy and associated transmission lines and rights-of-way in the wild and scenic designations, wilderness designations, or wilderness study area designations under this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. STAUBER OF MINNESOTA

Page 330, after line 6, add the following:

**TITLE IX—RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF LOCAL INPUT**

**SEC. 901. COUNTY APPROVAL.**

No mineral withdrawal under this Act shall be effective in any county where the county has not formally approved such withdrawal.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. STAUBER OF MINNESOTA

Page 30, after line 2, insert the following:

**SEC. 107. APPLICATION.**

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

Page 329, after line 4, insert the following:

**Subtitle E—Local Input**

**SEC. 761. APPLICATION.**

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

Page 330, after line 6, insert the following:

**SEC. 803. APPLICATION.**

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, this Act shall not apply to any lands, waters, or minerals in the Fourth Congressional Districts of Arizona as in existence on the date of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. STAUBER OF MINNESOTA

Page 30, after line 2, insert the following:

**SEC. 107. 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.

Page 329, after line 4, insert the following:

**Subtitle E—Local Input**

**SEC. 761. 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. WESTERMAN OF ARKANSAS

Page 330, after line 6, add the following:

**TITLE IX—PRESERVING WILDERNESS CHARACTER AND WILD AND SCENIC RIVER CHARACTER**

**SEC. 901. PRESERVING WILDERNESS AND WILD AND SCENIC RIVER CHARACTER.**

(a) WILDERNESS.—The Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior, as appropriate, may exempt from any wilderness or potential wilderness designated under this Act any area determined by that Secretary not to meet the definition of wilderness under the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.).

(b) WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS.—The Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior, as appropriate, may exempt from any wild and scenic river designated under this Act any area determined by that Secretary not to meet the qualifications for a wild, scenic or recreational river under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271 et seq.).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 147, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the en bloc amendments that would offer important improvements to the underlying bill.

Unfortunately, this en bloc is only a fraction of the amendments Republicans would have offered if Democrats had held a markup on the bill in the Natural Resources Committee.

It is egregious that House Democrats rejected every single Republican recreation and wildfire amendment offered at the Rules Committee. House Democrats also denied Representative BOEBERT of Colorado the chance to offer a single amendment to this legislation, despite the fact that one-third of all wilderness designations contained in the entire bill are in her district, and she has never had the chance to even debate it, as a new Member of Congress.

One amendment that I offered is included in this package, and it would rectify the fact that Democrats have arbitrarily included tens of thousands of acres of wilderness designations that have not been recommended for wilderness or do not meet the basic definition of wilderness in the Wilderness Act.

If my Democratic colleagues feel so confident that every single acre in this bill is actually worthy of a wilderness designation, they should have no problem supporting my simple amendment to reaffirm proper wilderness characteristics.

Also included in these amendments is a proposal from one of our freshmen members of the Natural Resources Committee, Representative MOORE from Utah. It will protect the rights of counties to have a say in local land use by requiring county approval of wilderness designations.

Representative STAUBER also offered a version of this amendment for mineral withdrawals and several amendments that would exclude congressional districts represented by Members of Congress who were not consulted on this legislation and strongly oppose it.

This should not be a difficult hurdle to overcome. In fact, it should be a desirable outcome for the sponsor of these bills. Forcing land management decisions upon local communities without their support is a bad idea.

□ 1000

Another one of our freshman committee members, Representative HERRELL of New Mexico, offered an amendment to remove all potential wilderness designations in the bill. This bill designates an amount of area equivalent to the size of President Biden's home State of Delaware, and it includes only one wilderness study area release. We shouldn't be adding potential wilderness to this bill without releasing an equivalent amount of wilderness study area first.

Finally, this package of amendments would improve our American energy security by ensuring continued development of critical energy infrastructure, promoting the responsible utilization of domestic critical minerals, facilitating rights-of-way for utilities, and protecting jobs in the energy sector. In contrast, the underlying bill is just an extension of the Biden ban and will hurt rural jobs and our national security.

Mr. Speaker, I wish that Democrats afforded us more than 10 minutes to consider these amendments that would actually improve our environment and economy through conservation and multiple use.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge all of my colleagues to strongly support this en bloc of amendments, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to en bloc No. 2.

The amendments in this bloc run the gauntlet of ideological opposition to wilderness, public lands protections, and our efforts that respond to the climate crisis. The amendments are not a good-faith effort to attempt to improve the bill or work with the Democratic sponsors of the committee. They simply seek to outright reverse or fundamentally weaken the various designations proposed in this bill.

In many cases, if these amendments were adopted and signed into law, the result would leave these areas with fewer protections than they currently have under the status quo.

Now, I heard a lot of wide-ranging arguments against this bill from the distinguished ranking member, but let me just begin by responding to two points specifically:

First, with respect to this notion of having local community support, I would simply say—and I welcome my colleague to come visit my district in

the State of Colorado. I represent a district that is the size of New Jersey—far bigger than Delaware—10 counties, stretches all the way to the Wyoming border, Grand County, half of Eagle County, Summit County. I look forward to taking the ranking member to my district in Colorado and showing him these incredible places that we seek to protect, because I believe if he has a chance to visit them, I may be able to convince him of the same.

I also just say, secondly, with respect to the process complaints, as I said yesterday, every title of this bill was heard, was marked up, passed out of committee, and passed this Chamber, on this floor in the 116th Congress—not once, twice.

So I understand the gentleman's desire to have more amendments. I think it is a bit odd to be arguing that he is unable to amend the bill when he is literally debating the amendments that he is offering as they exist today, that we are proceeding to debate in this fashion.

In any event, I will simply say that these amendments, as I said earlier, are not a good-faith attempt to improve this bill, and for that reason we would oppose them.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would love to visit the gentleman's district, take some photos so that we could show future generations what it looked like before it was locked away in wilderness, and maybe be able to talk about some of those forest management activities and how it could help improve the area.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the amendments contained in this en bloc package, which includes three of my own and two I offer on behalf of my good friend and colleague, Mr. GOSAR.

The amendments I offer restore control to locals who not only recreate in the areas impacted by the underlying bill, but live and earn their livelihoods there, too. This is about northern Arizona and western Colorado. This is about uranium formations in Representative GOSAR's district, and oil and gas in Representatives LAMBORN'S and BOEBERT'S districts. This is about local governance and listening to those who live and work in the area, not just those who make it a short weekend retreat.

The amendments I offer today move control of land back to those who govern best. These amendments exempt the bill from taking effect in Arizona's Fourth, Colorado's Third, and Colorado's Fifth Congressional Districts, and require county input. Those who represent these districts were not meaningfully consulted on these bills.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Mohave County Board of Supervisors in support of Represent-

ative GOSAR's amendment No. 7. These are the folks who know best for their families, their neighbors, and their land.

MOHAVE COUNTY BOARD  
OF SUPERVISORS,

Kingman, AZ, February 24, 2021.

Hon. PAUL GOSAR,  
Washington, DC.

CONGRESSMAN GOSAR: The Mohave County Board of Supervisors is writing to offer our support for your amendment to H.R. 803—Colorado Wilderness Act of 2021. As you know, the passage of this legislation will have a grave effect on Mohave County, Arizona, and our neighboring counties in Utah. Uranium mining in the past has been the forefront of our economic growth in Mohave County and if allowed to continue will bring in nearly \$29 billion to our local economy over a 42 year period. The passage of H.R. 803 would make permanent a 2012 moratorium on uranium mining in our area. The language of your amendment would help alleviate the permanent economic loss we would sustain under the passage of H.R. 803. We strongly support the passing of this amendment as presented in the Rules Committee and the House of Representatives. Without this amendment, the financial stability of our economy in Mohave County would drastically suffer.

In 2012, the Secretary of the Interior imposed a 20 year ban on over 1 million acres of land in the Arizona Strip Area for the purpose of Uranium mining. This ban included both public lands and National Forest System lands. This ban took away much needed growth and jobs from our area. Secretary Salazar at the time issued this withdrawal without complying with the law requiring coordination with local governments. The Federal Land Policy Management Act, 43 USC Section 1711 requires that the Secretary and his designees "coordinate" with local government as to development and implementation of any plan or management action. Coordination is defined in the Act as requiring prior notice of proposed plans and actions to the local government officials ("prior" meaning prior to public announcements, and early enough to provide "meaningful" participation by the local officials in the "development" of the plan or action.). The congressional mandate or coordination also requires the Secretary to use all practicable means to reach consistency between the federal plan/management action and local policy, plan or law. All of which Secretary Salazar did not do.

Making this ban permanent based on misinformation will have lasting effects on Mohave County. We respect and take a responsibility for protecting the Grand Canyon, but saying that the Grand Canyon will suffer because of mining is inaccurate. Secretary Salazar's reasoning behind the withdrawal was out of concern that it could damage the region's drinking water and the park's water quality. Bureau of Land Management officials contradicted those claims by explaining that their Arizona Strip field office had no evidence of contamination of water, and had no evidence of problems with the safe operation of the uranium mines in operation on the lands.

Uranium mining is important and useful for many reasons. The lands in the "Strip" contain the nation's high grade uranium deposits and enough uranium to provide power generation for the state of California for over 20 years. Uranium is useful in many ways. It is used by our military for national security and defense. Uranium metal is very dense and heavy. When it is depleted (DU), uranium is used by the military as shielding to protect Army tanks, and also in parts of

bullets and missiles. The military also uses enriched uranium to power nuclear propelled Navy ships and submarines, and in nuclear weapons. A permanent withdrawal of uranium mining from the "Strip" harms the American people by removing between 326–375 million lbs (the equivalent electricity generating capacity for the entire state of California's 40 million people for 22.4 years) of uranium.

From a national security standpoint, domestic utilities now import 90% of the uranium used to operate America's 104 nuclear reactors. Thirty years ago, these reactors used U.S. mined uranium for 100% of electricity production. The nation cannot be pro-nuclear and anti-nuclear fuel. In sum, these deposits represent the last available use of our public lands for economic growth in our region.

The opponents of uranium mining have chosen to ignore the fact that mining with environmentally sound reclamation was conducted from the early 1980s until the price of uranium collapsed in 1993. No mining at all occurred from 1993 until 2010, and the Denison mine which is now operating, is following and often exceeding all environmental and safety laws.

Arizona needs to go back to the roots that led to Arizona being developed, and that is mining. The strict federal and state environmental laws already on the books will protect the public from environmental damage to the Grand Canyon watershed. The mining of uranium however does not affect ground water nor destroy the natural resources of the land. It does not require open pit mining. Upon completion of mining one Breccia Pipe (4 years) the land is placed back into its native state.

We want to thank you for putting forward this amendment. Nuclear energy can be the future of clean energy. We have the resources in this Country to ensure that happens and we have the technology and means to ensure mining that energy is both environmentally safe and protects our natural resources. We stand in support of the amendment.

Sincerely,

BUSTER JOHNSON,  
*Chairman,*

*Mohave County Board of Supervisors.*

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on this bill, and a "no" vote on the underlying bill.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STANTON).

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and I also thank the chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources and my fellow Arizonan, dean of our delegation, Congressman RAÚL GRIJALVA, for their leadership.

Mr. Speaker, when people think of Arizona, they think of our Grand Canyon—perfectly chiseled over millions of years by the Colorado River. Its beauty and scale are humbling. But to us, it represents so much more than a natural wonder.

The Grand Canyon National Park welcomes 6 million visitors a year. It is the cornerstone of our State's tourism industry, directly supporting almost 10,000 jobs. Though it is special to all, it is sacred to the indigenous communities who call it home and who know better than anyone how critical it is to protect.

It is simple: This is no place for uranium mining. We can't risk the health

of the communities that rely on this land and water or the delicate ecosystems it contains. We cannot improve upon this wonder, and we should not play a part in its destruction.

Mr. Speaker, I support protecting the Grand Canyon, and I am proud of the vote we will take later today to safeguard it for future generations.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. HERRELL).

Ms. HERRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my amendments that would strike all potential wilderness designations from this bill. A wilderness designation is one of the most restrictive designations that the Federal Government can put on a piece of land. They put limits on forest management activities, access for emergency and military personnel, and limit access for the general public.

As we have seen across the West, areas designated as potential wilderness or wilderness study areas sit in limbo for decades. Criteria for what constitutes a wilderness area is very clear and straightforward. Keeping lands under potential wilderness or wilderness study area designations for extended periods of time is unnecessary and greatly handicaps rural communities in the West.

Mr. Speaker, let me emphasize: Many of the counties affected by these potential wilderness designations are already living in lands with over 80 percent publicly managed lands. Many of my Eastern colleagues may not appreciate what that means for local governments in the affected counties when I say a county is over 80 percent public land. Public lands are not taxable, meaning that the local tax base for counties that have high amounts of Federal lands is extremely small, therefore, their multiple use on these lands prevented by this legislation is crucial for economic success.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I would just note for the record with reference to "Eastern colleagues," I represent the State of Colorado, my colleague, Representative DEGETTE, represents the State of Colorado, the vast majority of the sponsors of this bill represents Western States. My district is not all that far from the gentlewoman's district in New Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), the dean of our delegation.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I just couldn't let this go. Insinuating that the sponsors of this legislation, on all the titles of this legislation have not been to these areas and that these designations do not have local support is simply untrue.

Two-thirds of the individuals in the affected areas in title 1 of my part of the bill, which have been mostly managed as wilderness study areas for 40 years, support wilderness. Scores of local public officials, scores of local mayors, city councils, and, yes, county

commissioners have supported this over the years.

I personally have been to almost every area in the legislation. I have met with scores of businesses, local elected officials, and citizens, and I challenge anybody to go look at these very special areas and tell me that they should not be preserved for future generations.

The same goes for every single title of this legislation. It has been vetted, it has been re-vetted, and it has been re-vetted again, and it has strong reasons for designation as public lands, and it has strong local support.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in support of these amendments. Utah ranks second in the country for percentage of land owned by the Federal Government, so we understand the challenges and opportunities that come with land designations.

Mr. Speaker, with Utah's interests in mind, I introduced a commonsense amendment that would require local land officials to approve wilderness designations, empowering the local communities to work with the Federal Government on major land decisions, and the previous comments actually emphasize the importance of that. And I appreciate that, and I respect that, the local input that the gentlewoman was mentioning.

Our system works best when there is close collaboration between all levels in government. Our State and local governments see firsthand obstacles to successfully managing their resources, and they are experts in their communities' unique needs and concerns. As policymakers, we have a responsibility to bring local officials to the table so that we can make the most informed land decisions possible.

Wilderness areas can be beautiful, but these designations bring many challenges. Our Federal lands will be best managed when we include our constituents' perspectives. Unfortunately, this process has denied my Republican colleagues and me the ability to do just that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for these very sensible and reasonable amendments.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my colleague: One, I want to welcome him to the United States Congress, and I thank him for his thoughtful recitation with respect to the amendment he offered.

But I just want to assure him, for example, with respect to the CORE Act, my provision of this bill, it has the support of every county in which a part of the bill is designated. That is to say, in the areas where there are protections being made in the bill, the counties in those areas support this bill. And that is why this bill has attracted such bipartisan support back home in



Colorado and why it has passed the House twice.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time both sides have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas has 3¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Colorado has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT), who, again, represents one-third of the area proposed in this wilderness area, to tell the House about how the people there really feel.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for yielding. I thank Mr. STAUBER for working with me on several amendments that protect Colorado's Third Congressional District. All 11 of my amendments to give voice to the people in my district were denied.

Mr. Speaker, this bill targets my district and would lock up more than 550,000 acres of it with new wilderness designations. The Mesa County Commissioners, Montezuma County Commissioners, Dolores County Commissioners, the Archuleta County Commissioners, White River and Douglas Creek Conservation Districts, the Colorado Farm Bureau, and numerous other constituencies in Colorado strongly oppose this bill because of the damage they know that it will cause and activities it will prevent.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD several of those letters of opposition.

COLORADO SNOWMOBILE  
ASSOCIATION,  
COHVCO, TRAILS PRESERVATION  
ALLIANCE,  
February 23, 2021.

Re 2021 Omnibus Wilderness & Amendments.

Congresswoman LAUREN BOEBERT,  
Att: Jeff Smalls & Ashley Higgins,  
Washington DC.

DEAR JEFF AND ASHLEY: Please accept this correspondence as the comments of the above referenced Organizations vigorously opposing the CORE Wilderness Proposal (HR 803) and the Colorado Wilderness Act (HR577) hereinafter referred to as "the Proposal". After a detailed review of the Proposal, the Organizations have concluded that every area expanded or created in the Proposal would result in significant lost recreational opportunities for the overwhelming portion of visitors to the Proposal area, both currently and in the future. While there are significant lost opportunities, there is also no additional protections for multiple use routes that might remain outside the Wilderness areas and no new areas are designated or released for multiple use recreational opportunities.

The Organizations have spent many years trying to hammer out something that works for everyone around these proposals, and have simply been stonewalled at every turn by the sponsors of this legislation in both Houses of Congress. This is despite the fact our groups were thanked by outgoing Senator Mark Udall for our collaboration and efforts around the development of the Hermosa Creek Watershed Management legislation signed into law on December 19, 2014 as Section 3062 in the Carl Levin and Howard P.

"Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (PL 113-291). This legislation released a WSA and specifically protected motorized usage in the area moving forward, designated a large special management area where multiple uses were protected and designated Wilderness in areas where that management was appropriate. We had hoped this collaboration was a roadmap for resolving many of the ongoing challenges we encounter around Wilderness designation and releases. Unfortunately, we were incorrect as exemplified by the efforts around HR 577 and HR 803 as phone calls are not returned, meetings are continued and ideological trench warfare has returned around these Proposals.

It is worth noting, the Colorado Wilderness Act would heavily impact many recently developed trail networks that have enjoyed strong bi-partisan and community support or historical trail networks that serve a wide range of interests. Examples of these types of losses would include:

1. Bangs Canyon area, which developed an extensive multiple use trail network after a complete NEPA review and analysis and almost a million dollars in direct funding from users for the project. The Bangs Canyon SMA area is now to be designated as Wilderness.

2. Delores Canyon—this area has a large network of trails serving a wide range of interests that has existed for an extended period of time without controversy.

While the list above is far from exhaustive, these are examples of impacts we are seeing all too frequently.

#### A. OUR POSITION ON SPECIFIC AMENDMENTS

Please note that while we do not specifically address every Amendment, several of these are unrelated to recreational usages and outside our expertise to discuss in a meaningful manner. While we are not opposed to any of the Amendments on the list, we are not taking a position.

1. Rep. Boebert 30x30 Program Nullification Amendment #18:

Vigorously support. This Executive Order is a direct conflict with multiple mandates that have managed public lands successfully for decades. Not only does this EO conflict with these mandates, the application of these concepts to private property rights and interests is even more troubling.

2. Rep. Boebert—BLM headquarters—Amendment #16:

Vigorously support. Moving BLM national headquarters closer to lands owned and managed by BLM has greatly increased the responsiveness of the BLM to a wide range of issues. This amendment has garnered strong bipartisan support.

3. Rep. Boebert Native Americans, Other Minorities and Women Jobs Protection Act—Amendment #60:

No position.

4. Rep. Boebert CO, AZ, CA, WA Wilderness Study Act Amendment #56:

Vigorously support. The lingering designations around the Wilderness process create significant management challenges moving forward in areas that have never been suitable for designation as Wilderness. The loss of historical recreational opportunities due to the lingering designation of the West Needles WSA was a major issue driving the Hermosa Creek legislation.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,  
ARCHULETA COUNTY, COLORADO,  
Pagosa Springs, CO, February 24, 2021.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN: The Archuleta County Board of County Commissioners is opposed to H.R. 803, the "Protecting America's Wilderness and Public Lands Act". This bill would lock-up nearly 1.5 million acres

with new wilderness designations. We agree with Congressman Doug Lamborn's statements that the American people deserve to access our nation's public lands—not to be locked out of them and that a wilderness designation does not guarantee the protection of these lands.

We support Congresswoman Lauren Boebert's amendments to the bill and ask that the House allow local governments to make the right decisions for their communities, especially when it comes to managing our beautiful outdoors.

Please feel free to contact us if you want to discuss this matter further. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

ALVIN SCHAAF,  
Chairman, Board of County Commissioners.

GRAND JUNCTION AREA  
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,  
February 24, 2021.

Congresswoman LAUREN BOEBERT,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN BOEBERT: On behalf of the 900 small businesses employing 37,000 people that the Grand Junction Area Chamber of Commerce represents, I am writing to encourage you to oppose H.R. 803, a bill that would lock up public lands in Mesa County and negatively impact our local economy. Our community's economy is still reliant in part on the business activity generated by our legacy industries of agriculture and energy. This bill if passed will negatively impact our already fragile economy and jeopardize our economic recovery.

These are lands that are literally in our backyard in Mesa County yet Congresswoman DeGette continues to ignore us, does not meet with us, and does not even consider the consequences of her bill on the hard-working families of our areas.

In addition to opposing H.R. 803 our organization supports the various amendments you are proposing be added to the bill that include keeping the BLM Headquarters in Grand Junction, Colorado, requiring that affected counties must approve the Wilderness Designation and protects grazing and water rights.

We appreciate your efforts to help retain jobs and the diversity of our local economy by opposing H.R. 803 and offering amendments to help preserve the livelihood of our families and our way of life.

Sincerely,

DIANE SCHWENKE,  
President/CEO.

SAN JUAN TRAIL RIDERS,  
Durango, CO,

Congresswoman LAUREN BOEBERT,  
Att: Jeff Smalls & Ashley Higgins,  
Washington, DC.

Re 2021 Omnibus Wilderness & Amendments.

DEAR JEFF AND ASHLEY: Please accept this correspondence as support of comments submitted by Trails Preservation Alliance ("TPA"), Colorado Off Highway Vehicle Coalition ("COHVCO"), and Colorado Snowmobile Association ("CSA") in their vigorously opposing the CORE Wilderness Proposal (H.R. 803) and the Colorado Wilderness Act (H.R. 577).

San Juan Trail Riders ("SJTR") is a single-track motorized trail user group that has a membership of nearly 400 members within the Four Corners Area, California and Texas. These members provide significant positive economic impacts to a broad range of businesses and communities in cities and towns throughout the region. The organization has for over 30 years provided significant support to agencies like the BLM and USFS for recreational single-track motorized trail construction, maintenance and repair. Additionally, this agency is responsible for helping to

establish special grant applications from existing state OHV Funds. SJTR has headquarters in Durango, CO.

Submitted by,

DERIC HOOK,  
*Board Member, San Juan Trail Riders.*

MESA COUNTY,  
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,  
*Grand Junction, CO, February 25, 2021.*

Re Colorado Wilderness Act of 2021, H.R. 803.

Hon. DIANA DEGETTE,  
*House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DEGETTE: As the Board of County Commissioners ("Board") for Mesa County, Colorado, we are again writing in strong opposition to the Colorado Wilderness Act of 2021, H.R. 803 ("the Act"). Mesa County's opposition to additional Wilderness designation within Mesa County is clearly documented in "A Resolution of the Board Of County Commissioners of Mesa County, Colorado Opposing the Colorado Wilderness Act of 2015 (H.R. 3336) and Calling on Congress to Release All Wilderness Study Areas in Colorado" (attached) passed and adopted on September 21, 2015, and the letter of opposition to the Colorado Wilderness Act of 2019, dated June 24, 2019 (attached).

Wilderness designations are the most restrictive land management tool available and are in direct conflict with the multiple use mandate of our federally managed lands. As federally managed lands, these areas are subject to customized protections through various designations identified in area resource management plans, including prohibition of grazing, seasonal travel limitations and closures, and oil and gas lease stipulations.

Mesa County supports less restrictive federal designations that involve appropriate, special management protections determined through responsible land use planning that allow stakeholders to work together to identify and address issues with local solutions for each unique area, rather than a broad-brush approach that ends multiple use of these lands in perpetuity.

The Colorado Wilderness Act of 2021 egregiously fails to take into account several important considerations concerning necessary access, such as:

1. Three of the five proposed Wilderness areas in Mesa County have experienced wildfires over the past two decades. Lack of access for wildfire mitigation, proper extinguishment, and post-fire restoration increases the probability and severity of devastating wildfires. Lack of access also compounds the potential for life-safety emergencies as responding personnel will be obstructed when answering time-sensitive calls.

2. Based on the mapping provided by the Colorado Oil and Gas Commission, the proposed Little Book Cliffs Wilderness polygon includes the Laramie Energy, LLC Winter Flats well and the Maralex Resources, Inc. USA-610S98W well. These wells will need ongoing maintenance and monitoring. Should access be denied for these wells and the leases within the proposed Wilderness areas, the lessee should be fairly compensated.

3. The Bureau of Land Management (BLM), as the agency responsible for the health and well being of the wild horses of the Little Book Cliffs Wild Horse Area and their habitat, must access to this area to "sustain a healthy viable wild horse population while maintaining a thriving natural ecological balance of resources and uses." The BLM utilizes vehicles, and at times helicopters, for set-up and take down of traps and transportation of gathered horses, and to perform fertility control measures. Loss of access for

these events could lead to serious consequences for the wild horses, area habitat, and surrounding property owners.

4. More than 850 acres of Gunnison Sage-Grouse Habitat are included in the proposed South Bangs Canyon Proposed Wilderness area and The Palisade Proposed Wilderness area which could limit management activities, lek counting, and habitat restoration activities by the US Fish and Wildlife Service.

5. Non-motorized trail based recreation is critical for our region's quality of life and economy. The potential for exclusion of mechanized travel, e.g. bicycles, from thousands of acres of public lands in western Colorado is not supported by the Board. Of particular concern is the North and South Bangs Canyon Proposed Wilderness areas. Given the proximity to and importance of the Tabeguache Trail, the region is of interest to local trail groups for future trail based recreation growth.

6. The Act eliminates "development for any new irrigation and pumping facility, reservoir, water conservation work, aqueduct, canal, ditch, pipeline, well, hydropower project, transmission, other ancillary facility or other water, diversion, storage, or carriage structure" in the Wilderness designation. As Colorado's water resources require more astute management, eliminating the option to create and expand necessary water storage and delivery systems and the ability to improve critical drainages and watersheds indefinitely is imprudent.

In addition to ending critical access and multiple use of public lands, the Board believes Wilderness designations also:

1. unfairly discriminates against those that are unable to walk or ride horseback, including those with disabilities and the elderly;

2. creates additional hardships on adjacent property owners, lessees, and other nonrecreation users who face restricted travel; and,

3. abolishes future productive uses of all resources within the designated area, including those that enrich residents and visitors' lives, in perpetuity.

Mesa County is comprised of more than 72% public lands. Our economy and way of life are deeply reliant on these lands, and ensuring the proper management of them is of the highest concern for all who live here. To suggest that anyone in Mesa County would wish these lands destroyed is false and offensive. However, with more than 100,000 acres of designated Wilderness and more than 80,000 acres held in perpetual Wilderness Study Area limbo, residents of Mesa County do not want to see more of their public lands made inaccessible. Further, with the possible passage of the Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act ("CORE Act"), Colorado will see varying levels of conservation in counties that desire such protections.

We invite you to visit Mesa County and speak with those directly affected by the proposed legislation. Our door is always open, and we welcome the opportunity to discuss further this critical matter that can drastically change our residents' lives.

Sincerely,

JANET ROWLAND,  
*Chair, Board of County Commissioners.*

CODY DAVIS,  
*Commissioner.*

SCOTT MCINNIS,  
*Commissioner.*

FEBRUARY 25, 2021.

The Honorable,  
*House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the nearly six million Farm Bureau member

families across the United States, we write in strong opposition to H.R. 803, the Protecting America's Wilderness and Public Lands Act. Collectively this package of bills impacts lands in California, Colorado, Arizona and Washington by creating nearly 1.5 million acres of new wilderness, the most restrictive federal land use classification. Additionally, it would designate 1,200 miles of wild and scenic rivers and create 110,000 acres of National Monument expansion. Further, many of the wilderness and wild and scenic river designations contained in this bill are not suitable for these restrictive designations. To declare areas that do not possess these characteristics undermines the integrity of the Wilderness Act and the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act as well as the lands that possess those features.

Farmers and ranchers rely on federal forests and rangelands for economic and recreational opportunities. Livestock grazing on federal lands forms an integral part of ranching operations across the United States, especially in the West. But farmers also use national forests and rangelands throughout the United States in a variety of other ways. Federal lands throughout the country are important components of our nation's watersheds that provide water to a large number of Americans. Active land management practices such as timber production and livestock grazing are critical to protect against wildland fires which devastate range resources, damage watersheds, threaten wildlife and put rural communities at great risk.

American farmers and ranchers have a genuine interest in healthy and productive federal forest and rangelands. At the same time, we have a genuine interest in seeing lands managed in an environmentally sound manner. Farmers and ranchers understand and appreciate that active management of our federal lands is critical to the long-term viability of the ecosystem, the resource, and the communities they support. Designations included in H.R. 803 threaten multiple use areas by prohibiting the employment of motorized tools and mechanized vehicles in watershed management, trail maintenance, soil treatment, noxious weed control, waste management and fire protection.

Our nation's federal forests are facing serious threats from fires, insects and disease due to a lack of active forest management. The poor health of our federal forests also threatens wildlife populations and neighboring non-federal lands, as well as the vitality of rural, forested communities across the country. A vibrant livestock and forest products industry helps diversify rural economies in ways that compliment ranching and agricultural operations. Wilderness and National Monument designations eliminate federal land management agencies ability to effectively protect against the threat of catastrophic wildland fire.

Farmers, landowners, and grazing permittees should be fully involved as affected partners in any process to execute federal land use designations which restrict public use and access. Federal land use designations that lack local stakeholder input from agricultural and resource management professionals often generates significant controversy and economic hardship at the local level. The detrimental effects of a federal land use designation frequently causes residents, elected state and county officials, and local stakeholders significant reductions in economic activity and the loss of jobs in rural communities. Past designations have also affected water rights, public lands grazing and access to State and private lands.

Farm Bureau supports the multiple-use concept of federal lands, recognizing that definable land areas have dominant-use capability, which should be recognized with the

concept of multiple uses without the total exclusion of other uses. The Protecting America's Wilderness and Public Lands Act stands in clear violation of AFBF policy. Additionally, the California, Colorado, Arizona and Washington Farm Bureau's oppose passage of this legislation.

Farm Bureau urges you to oppose passage of H.R. 803, the Protecting America's Wilderness and Public Lands Act.

Sincerely,

American Farm Bureau Federation, Arizona Farm Bureau, California Farm Bureau, Colorado Farm Bureau, Washington Farm Bureau.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, Democrats have ignored our local communities and their needs with this land grab.

In their letter of opposition, Mesa County points out three of the five wilderness areas in Mesa County in this bill that have had large fires in recent years, and that wilderness designations harm active management and wildfire activities.

I hope that when Members visit my district on horseback, they are telling people that this land will soon burn, because if we do not actively manage our forest, Mother Nature will continue to manage it for us.

Mr. Speaker, the amendments that are offered today would protect energy production, local grazing rights, water rights, access to our public lands, and allow wildfire mitigation. Perhaps, and most importantly, these amendments give the people of my district a voice, ensuring local officials have a seat at the table when land use is changed in their respective counties.

□ 1015

The victory in my election showed the will of the people in Colorado's Third District. They want to keep their land open for public use.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Member for his thoughtful amendments, and I strongly encourage support on these amendments today.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, I want to note one thing for the record because there is a reference from my colleague to amendments that she proceeded to make on this bill.

There has been a lot of talk about local control and the support of communities back home. We received communications from various town commissioners regarding the amendments that my colleague proposed, and I will just give you a couple of examples of their responses.

To simply classify this as a land grab is deeply disrespectful to those who have worked long and hard to gather the facts, negotiate, and compromise. The issues are too important to let parties divide us.

That was a county commissioner from San Miguel.

A commissioner from Routt County:

The amendments were issued in a way that ignores our system of local control. They reject the liberty and freedom of local jurisdictions to express what is right and just within those jurisdictions.

The communities impacted by the provisions in this bill support the protections that we are seeking to enact into law. That is why we are here. So with respect, I would again say we oppose the amendments that have been submitted in en bloc No. 2.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the first en bloc amendment, which stipulates that nothing in this act shall limit the ability of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture to manage forest fires, insects, and diseases in designated wilderness areas under the Wilderness Act.

Land conservation is an investment in our future, but it is equally important that we continue to manage our wilderness areas responsibly. Over the past several years, my district and others across our great country have been hit hard by historically damaging wildfires.

To protect countless communities, the Federal Government must ensure wilderness areas are adequately managed to minimize the impacts of wildfires.

I want to thank Chairman GRIJALVA and Representatives PANETTA and LOFGREN for being champions of public lands and responsible land management.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join them on this amendment, and I strongly urge an "aye" vote on the first en bloc amendment.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD this letter from the Grand Junction Area Chamber of Commerce. It says that this bill, if passed, will negatively impact our already fragile economy and jeopardize our economic recovery.

GRAND JUNCTION AREA,  
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,  
February 24, 2021.

Congresswoman LAUREN BOEBERT,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN BOEBERT: On behalf of the 900 small businesses employing 37,000 people that the Grand Junction Area Chamber of Commerce represents, I am writing to encourage you to oppose H.R. 803, a bill that would lock up public lands in Mesa County and negatively impact our local economy. Our community's economy is still reliant in part on the business activity generated by our legacy industries of agriculture and energy. This bill if passed will negatively impact our already fragile economy and jeopardize our economic recovery.

These are lands that are literally in our backyard in Mesa County yet Congresswoman DeGette continues to ignore us, does not meet with us, and does not even consider the consequences of her bill on the hard-working families of our areas.

In addition to opposing H.R. 803 our organization supports the various amendments you are proposing be added to the bill that include keeping the BLM Headquarters in Grand Junction Colorado, requiring that affected counties must approve the Wilderness Designation and protects grazing and water rights.

We appreciate your efforts to help retain jobs and the diversity of our local economy

by opposing H.R. 803 and offering amendments to help preserve the livelihood of our families and our water life.

Sincerely,

DIANE SCHWENKE,  
President/CEO.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues that if you want to improve our environment, if you are worried about job losses in your district, if you think we should secure our supply chains and improve American energy independence, if you think our forests need to be properly managed to avoid catastrophic wildfires, and if you enjoy recreating in our public lands, you should vote for this amendment package.

The underlying bill is a feel-good bill that hurts our economy and environment. We won't have to suffer the consequences of that. It will be our children and our grandchildren who have to live with the fact that we don't have forests because we burned them all down and we don't have jobs because we outsourced our domestic mining industry to Russia and China.

It shouldn't be a surprise to anybody that the Democrats didn't want to put a package this disastrous for our economy and environment through regular order. They may be able to limit our ability to debate this package, but there is no hiding the truth: This legislation is a land grab that devastates the very communities and lands it claims to support and protect.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the en bloc amendments and oppose the underlying bill. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, again, I have great respect for my colleague, the ranking member, but what he purports this bill will do is just simply not the case. I would think that trying to prevent uranium mining in the Grand Canyon would not be controversial. I would hope that my colleagues could come to a consensus on that.

As lawmakers, we all know that strong policy requires compromise. It requires years of input and vigorous debate. I am happy to participate in this debate, and I appreciate the gentleman's participation.

When we think of some of the most iconic, protected places in the United States—Yellowstone, Yosemite, the Grand Canyon—it is difficult to imagine a time when they were not protected, but even those most treasured places in America underwent criticism from Members of Congress. The arguments, actually, that we heard today are nearly identical to those that we were hearing on the floor 100 years ago.

In 1882, Benjamin Harrison, who was then a Senator from Indiana, introduced a bill to designate land lying on the Colorado River in the territory of Arizona as a public park. The bill was forwarded to Interior Secretary Henry Teller, who was a Coloradan, and he opposed conservation of the site. He told

the Senate that the bill was unnecessary and that the area “does not require the creation of a public park to preserve it.”

Congress was unwilling to proceed in the face of opposition from the executive branch due to the interests of mining, westward territorial mining, and land use. Harrison pushed on. He reintroduced the bill in 1883, again in 1886.

And in 1903, the great conservationist Teddy Roosevelt visited the area he had advocated to protect. He declared that it is “beyond comparison, beyond description,” and “unparalleled.” “Let this great wonder of nature remain as it is now. Do nothing to mar its grandeur. . . . You cannot improve upon it. But what you can do is keep it for your children, your children’s children, and all who come after you.”

On February 26—on this very day—in 1919, President Wilson signed into law the Grand Canyon National Park Act, 101 years ago today.

Mr. Speaker, let’s make that choice again. We passed this bill with bipartisan support. I ask my colleagues to do it again, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, my amendment would require us to know what we are doing before we take the overwhelming radical step of withdrawing more than a million acres of federal lands from mineral development.

It may come as a shock but even today we know little about the geologic mineral makeup of our lands. Minerals that were very important in the past like gold and silver are not always the key to our future technologies.

Today, we are finding a whole new suite of minerals that are critically important to our future, while rare earths and lithium are the stars, important minerals like cobalt, manganese and copper are quickly becoming equally both important and challenging to find and produce.

However, this bill in front of us has no recognition of the importance of the breadth of minerals that may be included in the areas covered by this legislation. Which is why my amendment is so important today.

This amendment will require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a full mineral resource survey of the withdrawal areas prior to enacting this withdrawal. This is important because of the national security impacts of this proposed withdrawal that seeks to permanently ban oil, natural gas, geothermal, uranium and other critical minerals and rare earths on over a million acres of land in Arizona.

I will continue to make the case that the importance of the uranium alone is key for keeping these lands open, however I believe that without this amendment this bill will have a negative impact on our national security as it aims to permanently prohibit mining of rare earths and critical minerals on a massive, massive swath of land.

Earlier I mentioned the importance of lithium and there is no question that lithium is critically important to our technology and energy future. However, we don’t often know where all the lithium resources are in the United States. For example, in September of last year, the USGS funded an earth MRI program

in Arizona to study the lithium resources of the Big Sandy Valley in Arizona. I include in the RECORD the press release from USGS.

This study will help us to define and understand the lithium resources in this region. Yet it is important for us to reflect on the fact that we didn’t know about these resources until recently, had we closed off this area, like this bill proposes to do to more than one million acres of Arizona, we may have never known. Yet because we have the ability to examine this area, which is not subject to a withdrawal, we are going to study and hopefully find rich resources we can produce to secure our nation’s future.

Before I close Mr. Speaker, let me stress, the underlying bill represents one of the largest legislative land grabs ever considered by Congress. This effort to permanently lock away the highest grade and largest deposit of uranium in the country will further increase our reliance on foreign adversaries like Russia, China, Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan.

Instead of rushing headlong into the endeavor of permanently making this million acre area off limits, we should know what the true impacts of this legislation will be on the long-term national security of our country.

This amendment would not kill this legislation, instead it would ensure that the proposed withdrawal can only go ahead once we clearly access the region, clearly understand the picture of what we are withdrawing and what other resources may be impacted by this action.

I say to my colleagues, let’s slow down this process so we know what we are doing, what we are impacting and the real impacts of making such a large and bountiful parcel of land off limits could have on our mineral security.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

EARTH MRI FUNDS CRITICAL MINERALS  
PROJECTS IN ARIZONA  
[Sept. 28, 2020]

A TOTAL OF \$133,016 WILL FUND NEW RESEARCH AND PRESERVE IMPORTANT DATA ACROSS THE GRAND CANYON STATE

FLAGSTAFF, ARIZ.—The U.S. Geological Survey and the Association of American State Geologists are pleased to announce \$133,016 in funding for critical minerals projects in Arizona. These funds are for the fiscal year 2020 under the USGS Mineral Resources Program’s Earth Mapping Resources Initiative, or Earth MRI.

The funds include grants to the Arizona Geological Survey for geologic mapping and geochemical analyses for an area of the Big Sandy Valley with a focus on lithium and to preserve and publicly available information on critical mineral resources.

“These new projects in Arizona represent the next step in our ambitious effort to improve our knowledge of the geologic framework in the United States and to identify areas that may have the potential to contain undiscovered critical mineral resources,” said Jim Reilly, director of the USGS. “The identification and prioritization of prospective areas were done through our strong partnership with the state geological surveys in a series of workshops in Fall 2019.”

“This program will revitalize and update the science and geologic research and data compilation that is needed in many states for the United States to identify new geologic associations,” said John Yellich, director of the Michigan Geological Survey and president of AASG.

“The Earth MRI effort is an outgrowth of the strong partnership between the AASG

members and the USGS,” said Warren Day, Earth MRI lead scientist for the USGS. “The USGS is grateful for the scientific input and support from the state geological surveys, resulting in a robust body of information useful for many applications beyond mineral resources.”

The geologic mapping efforts, which are managed through the National Cooperative Geologic Mapping Program, will refine our scientific understanding of the geologic framework of areas of interest. In addition to helping identify mineral potential, these maps also support decisions about use of land, water, energy and minerals and help to mitigate the impact of geologic hazards on communities.

In 2017, President Trump issued Executive Order 13817, a Federal Strategy to Ensure Secure and Reliable Supplies of Critical Minerals. This executive order called on agencies across the federal government to develop a strategy to reduce the nation’s susceptibility to critical mineral supply disruptions.

In May of 2018, DOI released a list of 35 minerals deemed critical to the U.S. economy and security, based on a methodology by the USGS. This list forms the foundation of the full federal strategy.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, my amendment is very simple, it only asks Congress to do one thing, respect the will of the local people in the management of our lands.

This amendment would remove from the bill the lands included in my Congressional district from the massive mineral withdrawal included in the bill. My local constituents and counties support this amendment and I encourage my colleagues to respect our wishes. Under general leave, I include in the RECORD a letter from Mohave County opposing this legislation.

Mohave County Arizona, which is the primary area which this amendment would help protect, is currently facing nearly 10 percent unemployment and has a per capita income of less than thirty-five thousand dollars a year. These economic conditions should be proof enough that we need to be promoting economic development in these regions, not simply closing off an important path to economic security for the people of Mohave County.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle will argue that these lands belong to all the American people, which is true, but we must respect the local concerns.

When I highlight that offshore oil drilling in California would reduce our dependence on foreign oil, stop us from subsidizing Russia and Saudi Arabia, my colleagues from California scream out “respect our wishes, we don’t want drilling”.

So I call on them here today, join me in supporting my constituents who are crying out for the chance, just the chance to keep the potential of high paying jobs open and support this amendment.

It may come as a shock but even today we know little about the geologic mineral makeup of our lands. Minerals that were very important in the past like gold and silver are not always the key to our future technologies.

Today, we are finding a whole new suite of minerals that are critically important to our future, while rare earths and lithium are the stars, important minerals like cobalt, manganese and copper are quickly becoming equally both important and challenging to find and produce.

This area in Mohave County has tremendous potential and keeping that potential open and available to the people of the county is critical to ensuring a rich economic future.

This amendment only removes the area within my district, it will allow other members to do with their regions as they will.

This amendment would not kill this legislation, instead it would ensure that the people I represent in Arizona have their wishes respected and the land managed in a manner consistent with the will of the local communities.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

MOHAVE COUNTY  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,  
February 24, 2021.

Hon. PAUL GOSAR,  
U.S. Congress,  
Washington, DC.

CONGRESSMAN GOSAR: The Mohave County Board of Supervisors is writing to offer our support for your amendment to H.R. 803—Colorado Wilderness Act of 2021. As you know, the passage of this legislation will have a grave effect on Mohave County, Arizona, and our neighboring counties in Utah. Uranium mining in the past has been the forefront of our economic growth in Mohave County and if allowed to continue will bring in nearly \$29 billion to our local economy over a 42 year period. The passage of H.R. 803 would make permanent a July 2012 moratorium on uranium mining in our area. The language of your amendment would help alleviate the permanent economic loss we would sustain under the passage of H.R. 803. We strongly support the passing of this amendment as presented in the Rules Committee and the House or Representatives. Without this amendment, the financial stability of our economy in Mohave County would drastically suffer.

In 2012, the Secretary of the Interior imposed a 20 year ban on over 1 million acres of land in the Arizona Strip Area for the purpose of Uranium mining. This ban included both public lands and National Forest System lands. This ban took away much needed growth and jobs from our area. Secretary Salazar at the time issued this withdrawal without complying with the law requiring coordination with local governments. The Federal Land Policy Management Act, USC Section 171 requires that the Secretary and his designees “coordinate” with local government as to development and implementation of any plan or management action. Coordination is defined in the Act as requiring prior notice of proposed plans and actions to the local government officials (“prior” meaning prior to public announcements, and early enough to provide “meaningful” participation by the local officials in the “development” of the plan or action.). The congressional mandate of coordination also requires the Secretary to use all practicable means to reach consistency between the federal plan/management action and local policy, plan or law. All of which Secretary Salazar did not do.

Making this ban permanent based on misinformation will have lasting effects on Mohave County. We respect and take a responsibility for protecting the Grand Canyon, but saying that the Grand Canyon will suffer because of mining is inaccurate. Secretary Salazar’s reasoning behind the withdrawal was out of concern that it could damage the region’s drinking water and the park’s water quality. Bureau of Land Management officials contradicted those claims by explaining that their Arizona Strip field office had no evidence of contamination of water, and had no evidence of problems with the safe operation of the uranium mines in operation on the lands.

Uranium mining is important and useful for many reasons. The lands in the “Strip”

contain the nation’s high grade uranium deposits and enough uranium to provide power generation for the state of California for over 20 years. Uranium is useful in many ways. It is used by our military for national security and defense. Uranium metal is very dense and heavy. When it is depleted (DU), uranium is used by the military as shielding to protect Army tanks, and also in parts of bullets and missiles. The military also uses enriched uranium to power nuclear propelled Navy ships and submarines, and in nuclear weapons. A permanent withdrawal of uranium mining from the “Strip” harms the American people by removing between 326–375 million lbs (the equivalent electricity generating capacity for the entire state of California’s 40 million people for 22.4 years) of uranium.

From a national security standpoint, domestic utilities now import 90 percent of the uranium used to operate America’s 104 nuclear reactors. Thirty years ago, these reactors used U.S. mined uranium for 100 percent of electricity production. The nation cannot be pro-nuclear and anti-nuclear fuel. In sum, these deposits represent the last available use of our public lands for economic growth in our region.

The opponents of uranium mining have chosen to ignore the fact that mining with environmentally sound reclamation was conducted from the early 1980s until the price of uranium collapsed in 1993. No mining at all occurred from 1993 until 2010, and the Denison mine which is now operating, is following and often exceeding all environmental and safety laws.

Arizona needs to go back to the roots that led to Arizona being developed, and that is mining. The strict federal and state environmental laws already on the books will protect the public from environmental damage to the Grand Canyon watershed. The mining of uranium however does not affect ground water nor destroy the natural resources of the land. It does not require open pit mining. Upon completion of mining one Breccia Pipe (4 years) the land is placed back into its native state.

We want to thank you for putting forward this amendment. Nuclear energy can be the future of clean energy. We have the resources in this Country to ensure that happens and we have the technology and means to ensure mining that energy is both environmentally safe and protects our natural resources. We stand in support of the amendment.

Sincerely,

BUSTER JOHNSON,  
Chairman, Mohave County  
Board of Supervisors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 147, the previous question is ordered on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE).

The question is on the amendments en bloc.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 803 is postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 10 o’clock and 23 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1033

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR) at 10 o’clock and 33 minutes a.m.

COLORADO WILDERNESS ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 803) to designate certain lands in the State of Colorado as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. NEGUSE OF COLORADO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on amendments en bloc No. 1, printed in part B of House Report 117–6, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendments en bloc.

The Clerk redesignated the amendments en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 198, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 41]

YEAS—229

Adams	Castro (TX)	Doyle, Michael
Aguilar	Chu	F.
Allred	Cicilline	Escobar
Auchincloss	Clark (MA)	Eshoo
Axne	Cleaver	Espallat
Barragán	Clyburn	Evans
Bass	Cohen	Fitzpatrick
Beatty	Connolly	Fletcher
Bera	Cooper	Foster
Beyer	Correa	Frankel, Lois
Bishop (GA)	Costa	Fudge
Blumenauer	Courtney	Gallego
Blunt Rochester	Craig	Garamendi
Bonamici	Crist	Garcia (IL)
Bourdeaux	Crow	Garcia (TX)
Bowman	Cuellar	Golden
Boyle, Brendan	Davidson (KS)	Gomez
F.	Davis, Danny K.	Gonzalez,
Brown	Dean	Vicente
Brownley	DeFazio	Gottheimer
Bush	DeGette	Green, Al (TX)
Bustos	DeLauro	Grijalva
Butterfield	DelBene	Grothman
Carbajal	Delgado	Haaland
Cárdenas	Demings	Harder (CA)
Carson	DeSaulnier	Hastings
Cartwright	Deutch	Hayes
Case	Dingell	Higgins (NY)
Casten	Doggett	Himes
Castor (FL)		Horsford