

**ALASKA NATIVE VILLAGE MUNICIPAL LANDS RESTORATION ACT OF 2025**

A bill (H.R. 43) to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to provide that Village Corporations shall not be required to convey land in trust to the State of Alaska for the establishment of Municipal Corporations, and for other purposes, was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

**APEX AREA TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT**

A bill (H.R. 618) to amend the Apex Project, Nevada Land Transfer and Authorization Act of 1989 to include the City of North Las Vegas and the Apex Industrial Park Owners Association, and for other purposes, was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

**SALEM MARITIME NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK REDESIGNATION AND BOUNDARY STUDY ACT**

A bill (H.R. 2215) to redesignate the Salem Maritime National Historic Site as the “Salem Maritime National Historical Park”, and for other purposes, was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I know of no further debate on the bills en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

The bills having been read the third time, en bloc, the question is, Shall the bills pass en bloc?

The bills were passed en bloc, as follows:

The bill (S. 154) was passed, as follows:

S. 154

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the “Colorado River Basin System Conservation Extension Act”.

**SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF COLORADO RIVER SYSTEM CONSERVATION PILOT PROGRAM.**

Section 206 of the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2015 (43 U.S.C. 620 note; Public Law 113-235), is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2), by striking “this Act” and inserting “the Colorado River Basin System Conservation Extension Act”;

(2) in subsection (c)(2), by striking “2024” and inserting “2026”; and

(3) in subsection (d), by striking “2025” and inserting “2027”.

The bill (S. 282) was passed, as follows:

S. 282

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the “Katahdin Woods and Waters National Monument Access Act”.

**SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.**

In this Act:

(1) **AUTHORIZED ACQUISITION AREA.**—The term “authorized acquisition area” means the designated area outside the boundary of the National Monument depicted as “Authorized Acquisition Area” on the map entitled “Katahdin Woods and Waters National Monument Proposed Boundary Adjustment”, numbered 686/193,181 and dated March 2024.

(2) **NATIONAL MONUMENT.**—The term “National Monument” means the Katahdin Woods and Waters National Monument in the State of Maine established by the Proclamation.

(3) **PROCLAMATION.**—The term “Proclamation” means Presidential Proclamation Number 9476, dated August 24, 2016 (54 U.S.C. 320301 note).

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

**SEC. 3. ACQUISITION OF ADDITIONAL LAND FOR NATIONAL MONUMENT.**

(a) **BOUNDARY.**—The boundaries of the National Monument shall be the boundaries established by the Proclamation.

(b) **ACQUISITION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary may acquire, by purchase from a willing seller, donation, or exchange, land or interests in land within the authorized acquisition area.

(2) **PROHIBITION ON USE OF EMINENT DOMAIN.**—Nothing in this Act authorizes the use of eminent domain to acquire land or an interest in land.

(c) **TREATMENT OF ACQUIRED LAND; BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.**—On acquisition by the Secretary of any land pursuant to subsection (b)—

(1) the land shall be included in the National Monument; and

(2) the boundaries of the National Monument shall be adjusted accordingly.

**SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATION OF NATIONAL MONUMENT.**

(a) **ADMINISTRATION.**—The Secretary shall administer the National Monument (including the land added to the National Monument under this Act) in accordance with—

(1) this Act;

(2) the Proclamation; and

(3) the laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System.

(b) **HUNTING, FISHING, AND OUTDOOR RECREATION ON ACQUIRED LAND.**—The Secretary shall allow hunting, fishing, or any other outdoor recreation activity on land acquired pursuant to section 3(b)—

(1) if that activity was in existence on the day before the date of acquisition of the land; and

(2) consistent with the management of that activity under the Proclamation.

(c) **COLLECTION OF FIDDLEHEAD FERNS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary shall allow the gathering by hand of fiddlehead ferns (*Matteuccia struthiopteris*) in the National Monument for noncommercial personal use and consumption by the general public.

(2) **LIMITATION.**—If the Secretary determines that the gathering of fiddlehead ferns (*Matteuccia struthiopteris*) under paragraph (1) may adversely affect resources of the National Monument, the Secretary may limit the gathering of fiddlehead ferns (*Matteuccia struthiopteris*) under that paragraph in accordance with applicable regulations.

(d) **PUBLIC EDUCATION.**—In accordance with the mission of the National Park Service, the Secretary shall collaborate with local communities and Tribal governments to educate the public regarding the natural environment and history of land management in the National Monument, including the shaping of that landscape by Native communities and practices, successive generations of timber management, and other activities.

(e) **FORESTRY.**—In accordance with the management plan for the National Monument, the Secretary may conduct such non-commercial timber harvests as the Secretary determines to be necessary.

(f) **PROTECTION OF EXISTING ACCESS.**—Nothing in this Act affects valid existing rights, including existing rights of access through the National Monument for the removal of timber outside the boundaries of the National Monument.

(g) **PUBLIC SAFETY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall provide to the public appropriate safety education and notification materials to ensure safe interactions between visitors and logging trucks, equipment, and operations on roads in or adjacent to the National Monument.

(2) **PROCEDURES.**—The Secretary shall collaborate with affected stakeholders to establish procedures to meet the needs of visitors to the National Monument, logging and trucking operations, and other users of roads in or adjacent to the National Monument to ensure safe interactions between active logging operations and visitors.

**SEC. 5. ADMINISTRATIVE SITES AND VISITOR FACILITIES.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—To facilitate the administration of the National Monument, the Secretary may acquire, by purchase from a willing seller, donation, or exchange, not more than 10 acres of land or interests in land, including improvements, for the administration of the National Monument and visitor services outside the boundaries, but within the vicinity, of the National Monument.

(b) **AGREEMENTS.**—The Secretary may enter into agreements with State of Maine, units of Tribal or local government, or private entities—

(1) to carry out this section; and

(2) to develop a cooperative information center for the National Monument.

The bill (S. 356) was passed, as follows:

S. 356

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the “Secure Rural Schools Reauthorization Act of 2025”.

**SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT OF 2000.**

(a) **SECURE PAYMENTS FOR STATES AND COUNTIES CONTAINING FEDERAL LAND.**—

(1) **SECURE PAYMENTS.**—Section 101 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7111) is amended—

(A) in subsections (a) and (b), by striking “2023” each place it appears and inserting “2026”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(e) **SPECIAL RULE FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024 AND 2025 PAYMENTS.**—

“(1) **STATE PAYMENT.**—If an eligible county in a State that will receive a share of the State payment for fiscal year 2024 or 2025 has already received, or will receive, a share of the 25-percent payment for that fiscal year distributed to the State before the date of enactment of this subsection, the amount of the State payment shall be reduced by the amount of the share of the eligible county of the 25-percent payment.

“(2) **COUNTY PAYMENT.**—If an eligible county that will receive a county payment for fiscal year 2024 or 2025 has already received a 50-percent payment for that fiscal year, the amount of the county payment shall be reduced by the amount of the 50-percent payment.

“(3) PROMPT PAYMENT.—Not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make all payments under this title for each of fiscal years 2024 and 2025.”.

(2) DISTRIBUTION OF PAYMENTS TO ELIGIBLE COUNTIES.—Section 103(d)(2) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7113(d)(2)) is amended by striking “2023” and inserting “2026”.

(b) PAYMENTS TO STATES AND COUNTIES.—Section 102 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7112) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following:

“(E) PAYMENTS FOR EACH OF FISCAL YEARS 2024 AND 2025.—The election otherwise required by subparagraph (A) shall not apply for each of fiscal years 2024 and 2025.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following:

“(C) FISCAL YEARS 2024 AND 2025.—The election described in paragraph (1)(A) applicable to a county in fiscal year 2023 shall be effective for each of fiscal years 2024 and 2025.”; and

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following:

“(G) PAYMENTS FOR EACH OF FISCAL YEARS 2024 AND 2025.—The election made by an eligible county under subparagraph (B), (C), or (D) for fiscal year 2023, or deemed to be made by the county under paragraph (3)(B) for that fiscal year, shall be effective for each of fiscal years 2024 and 2025.”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by adding at the end the following:

“(E) PAYMENTS FOR EACH OF FISCAL YEARS 2024 AND 2025.—This paragraph does not apply for each of fiscal years 2024 and 2025.”.

(c) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT SPECIAL PROJECTS ON FEDERAL LAND.—

(1) COMMITTEE COMPOSITION WAIVER AUTHORITY.—Section 205(d)(6)(C) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7125(d)(6)(C)) is amended by striking “2023” and inserting “2026”.

(2) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.—Section 208 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7128) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “2025” and inserting “2028”; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “2026” and inserting “2029”.

(d) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO EXPEND COUNTY FUNDS.—Section 305 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7144) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “2025” and inserting “2028”; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “2026” and inserting “2029”.

### SEC. 3. RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE PILOT PROGRAM EXTENSION.

Section 205(g) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7125(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking “2023” and inserting “2026”; and

(2) by striking paragraph (6).

### SEC. 4. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—Section 205 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7125) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “concerned,” and inserting “concerned”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “the date of the enactment of this Act” and inserting “October 3, 2008”; and

(2) in subsection (d)(4), by striking “to extend” and inserting “to the extent”.

(b) USE OF PROJECT FUNDS.—Section 206(b)(2) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7126(b)(2)) is amended by striking “concerned,” and inserting “concerned”.

The bill (S. 1112) was passed, as follows:

S. 1112

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Big Bend National Park Boundary Adjustment Act”.

#### SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) MAP.—The term “map” means the map entitled “Big Bend National Park, Proposed Boundary Adjustment”, numbered 155/167,296, and dated November 2022.

(2) PARK.—The term “Park” means the Big Bend National Park established under the Act of June 20, 1935 (49 Stat. 393, chapter 283; 16 U.S.C. 156).

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

#### SEC. 3. BIG BEND NATIONAL PARK BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.

(a) LAND ACQUISITION.—The Secretary may acquire approximately 6,100 acres of land or interests in land generally depicted on the map as “Tracts to Include in Boundary” by donation or exchange.

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

(c) BOUNDARY REVISION AND ADMINISTRATION.—On acquisition of any land or interests in land under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) revise the boundary of the Park to include the acquired land or interests in land; and

(2) administer the acquired land or interests in land as part of the Park in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations).

(d) EMINENT DOMAIN OR CONDEMNATION.—In carrying out this Act, the Secretary may not use eminent domain or condemnation.

The bill (H.R. 42) was passed.

The bill (H.R. 43) was passed.

The bill (H.R. 618) was passed.

The bill (H.R. 2215) was passed.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Nevada.

#### APEX AREA TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, we just passed a bipartisan package of bills. Some of them were passed by the Senate in the last Congress, and recently some of them were passed by the House.

The package includes one of my pieces of legislation which was needed in Nevada, which was H.R. 618, the Apex Area Technical Corrections Act. This bill will cut through redtape at the Apex Industrial Park in North Las Vegas and speed up the cumbersome and unnecessary permitting process for businesses looking to build or expand there. Here is how:

All Nevada developers know that the Federal Government owns more than 80

percent of the land in our State. That requires us to have this Federal partnership. Every time a company wants to develop a project on public land, they need a permit from the Bureau of Land Management. That process, as we all know, can take years, and in that time, we are losing out on economic growth and on new job creation. That is what is currently happening at the Apex Industrial Park in North Las Vegas.

APEX has over 7,000 acres of developable land where various companies are building new sites. That includes Air Liquide’s largest hydrogen plant in the world, an 885,000 square foot distribution center for the grocery chain Smith’s, and a 1 million square foot distribution center for the footwear company Crocs. The Smith’s center is projected to add 250 jobs for Nevadans, while the Crocs center could create up to 1,200 jobs.

Unfortunately, because of an outdated permitting law, too many businesses that want to set up shop at APEX are bogged down by burdensome obstacles.

When the Apex Industrial site was created in 1989, Congress passed legislation to transfer Federal land to private ownership, but the Bureau of Land Management maintained control over large utility corridors that crisscrossed throughout the whole development. That means every business that wants to start constructing or even expand at APEX has to go through the complicated Federal permitting process if they want to access necessities like gas, power, sewage, access roads, and broadband lines across those BLM-controlled corridors.

In the initial law passed in 1989, Congress gave Clark County, NV, the authorization to speed up the permitting process, but since then, APEX’s primary management has changed to the city of North Las Vegas and the Apex Industrial Park Owners Association as well. Unfortunately, these two entities don’t have the authority to permit new pipelines, power connections, or roads for businesses and their facilities. That has caused delays that could last years.

That is why I am fighting to pass the Apex Area Technical Corrections Act. This bill will give the city of North Las Vegas and the Apex Industrial Park Owners Association the authority they need to issue permits and get new and existing businesses the utilities they need to operate.

This legislation cuts through unnecessary government obstacles and allows our businesses to grow at a sustainable pace. It is essential to ensure businesses can efficiently continue to build and expand in Nevada, including at the Apex Industrial Park, bring new jobs to North Las Vegas, and continue to strengthen our economy.

This bill has already passed through the House of Representatives, and I look forward to the President signing it into law soon.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I am really very glad we were able to reach agreement today to pass these four bills by unanimous consent and will send them to the President to be signed into law.

I want to acknowledge and thank my colleague and friend from Nevada Senator CORTEZ MASTO. I also want to acknowledge Senator MARKEY from Massachusetts. They worked with us to try to get us to the place we are today in which we were able to move these bills across the floor.

I also want to thank the chairman of the Energy Committee and the ranking member, Chairman LEE and Ranking Member HEINRICH. Their teams worked with us on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, as well as the cloakroom teams, to make sure we were able to be successful today.

The Senate passed all four of these measures last December, so we have seen them once. Now we have seen them twice. But the House ran out of time at the end of the last Congress to take them up, so we are where we are. But now these bills are going to be going to the President for his signature.

Two of the bills we just passed are important for Alaska Natives, and I am proud to have been able to work on these important measures. It has been a multiyear effort to get them to the President's desk. Again, I don't care, really, if we send an H.R. or if we send a Senate bill to the President; we just want to get it accomplished. We want to get some things done for Alaska.

The first measure, which is H.R. 42, amends the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, or ANCSA. It amends it to ensure that when Alaska Native elders, the blind, and the disabled receive dividends from their settlement trusts, they do not inadvertently become, then, ineligible to participate in Federal needs-based assistance programs.

This is pretty common sense. You have a situation where Alaska Natives who are aged, blind, or disabled should not have to choose between accepting the settlement trust income they are entitled to or qualifying for Federal benefits such as supplemental security income, SSI, or SNAP, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, as well as housing assistance. Now, with this bill, they are not going to have to make that choice.

The second measure is H.R. 43, the Alaska Native Village Municipal Lands Restoration Act. What this does is eliminate a requirement under ANCSA, section 14(c)(3), that Alaska Native village corporations convey land to the State of Alaska to be held in trust for future municipalities, which are not likely to ever be established.

So what we are doing with this measure is sunseting this requirement and allowing village corporations to regain title to conveyed lands. This will allow village corporations to fully utilize

their lands for the benefit of their communities. This is what we want to see happen. Again, it has been a long time coming. So I am pleased that we are here.

I am hopeful that the Senate can pass more of these similar, very non-controversial bills through the unanimous consent process. We shouldn't get into the practice where we wait until the end of a Congress or perhaps even multiple Congresses for a package to be knit together. People in these communities are waiting on us, as Senator CORTEZ MASTO noted in her State of Nevada and in my State of Alaska. They are waiting on us to deliver these small legislative priorities that will allow them to move forward, whether it is economic development or just making sure that there is a level of equity and fairness.

So I thank my colleagues, I thank the Energy Committee, as well as the floor team, and my staff who helped us move these measures forward.

I yield the floor.

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

### NOMINATION OF RODNEY SCOTT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the nomination of Rodney Scott to lead the U.S. Customs and Border Protection Agency. In my view, this is yet another appalling nomination from the Trump administration.

As a senior Federal official, agents in Mr. Scott's direct chain of command tried to cover up their culpability in the beating death of a man in their custody with his help. His record, in my view, is disqualifying for someone seeking one of the most important law enforcement posts in the Nation.

U.S. Customs and Border Protection has extraordinary discretion to conduct searches of Americans' belongings and phones and to interrogate American citizens at border crossings and to seize illicit goods. The Agency has more than 60,000 employees. Leading this Agency requires someone whose judgment and character are unquestioned. Mr. Scott does not meet that bar.

In 2010, Mr. Scott led the San Diego sector of the Border Patrol, a position that included oversight of a unit that tampered with evidence after agents beat and tased Mr. Anastasio Hernandez-Rojas while in their custody. He died of those injuries soon after.

This unit taped over recordings of the incident and served an illegal subpoena on the hospital for the man's medical records and then refused to share them with local law enforcement. This is according to allegations filed with the Inter-American Human Rights Commission of the Organization of American States and by police investigators.

The actions were so egregious that the Human Rights Commission concluded a few weeks ago that the U.S. Government violated Mr. Rojas's family's right of access to justice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Critical Incident Team's and DHS Inspector General's reports about the incident, first obtained by the Project on Government Oversight, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL—REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

Case Number: I10-CBP-SND-00957.

Case Title: Use of Force Incident (Death of Anastacio Hernandez Rojas).

Report Status: Final.

Alleged Violation(s): 18 USC 242: Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law.

### SYNOPSIS

This investigation was initiated on May 29, 2010, based upon receipt of a referral from the Joint Intake Center, Washington, D.C., reporting that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C); Customs and Border Protection Officer (CBPO), CBP, San Diego, California, used a non-lethal, Electronic Control Device (ECD) commonly known as a "Taser," to subdue Anastacio Hernandez-Rojas, an undocumented alien (UDA), during an altercation on May 29, 2010, with several U.S. Department of Homeland Security officers. Hernandez-Rojas as subsequently lost consciousness and was transported to a local hospital, where he was placed on a ventilator and declared brain dead by medical personnel and subsequently died on May 30, 2010.

Our investigation, which included a review of the San Diego Police Department (SDPD), Homicide Detail Report Number 10-027149, did not disclose any evidence of misconduct or violations of Use of Force policies of CBP or Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) by the CBP and ICE employees involved in the incident. Our review revealed that during the voluntary return of Hernandez-Rojas, he became verbally and physically combative after he was released from his restraints at the pedestrian gate and assaulted the Border Patrol Agents (BPAs) who were escorting him. Even after he was restrained again in handcuffs after the assault, Hernandez-Rojas' resistance and combative behavior continued when DHS personnel attempted to place Hernandez-Rojas into a government vehicle which led to the deployment of the ECD by CBPO b6, b7c. The deployment of the ECD and the level of force utilized by the DHS personnel during the incident were found to be in accordance with both CBP and ICE use of force policies.

The U.S. Department of Justice (USDOJ), Civil Rights Division, Washington, D.C. declined prosecution of DHS personnel citing lack of prosecutorial merit.

### Reporting Agent

Name: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).  
Title: Special Agent.  
Signature: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Date: 7/8/11.

### Approving Official.

Name: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).  
Title: Special Agent-in-Charge.  
Signature: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).  
Date: 7/14/11.

### Distribution:

San Diego Field Office: Original.  
Headquarters: cc  
Componenet(s): cc  
Other: cc

### DETAILS

This investigation was initiated on May 29, 2010, based upon receipt of a referral from the Joint Intake Center, Washington, D.C., reporting that that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), Customs