



Legislative Bulletin.....March 4, 2008

Contents:

- H.R. 1143**—To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain lands in Virgin Islands National Park, and for other purpose
- H.R. 1311**—Nevada Cancer Institute Expansion Act
- H.R. 3111**—Port Chicago Naval Magazine National Memorial Enhancement Act of 2007
- H.R. 5137**—To ensure that hunting remains a purpose of the New River Gorge National River
- H.Res. 845**—Recognizing the 60th anniversary of Everglades National Park
- H.Res. 807**—Honoring the life of Marjory Stoneman Douglas, champion of the Florida Everglades and founder of Florida’s environmental movement
- H.R. 816**—Orchard Detention Basin Flood Control Act
- H.R. 3473**—Bountiful City Land Consolidation Act
- H.Res. 698**—Commemorating the 200th anniversary of Congressional Cemetery
- H.R. 1922**—Jupiter Inlet Lighthouse Outstanding Natural Area Act of 2007
- H.R. 419**—Wright Brothers-Dunbar National Historical Park Designation Act

Summary of the Bills Under Consideration Today:

Total Number of New Government Programs: 1

Total Cost of Discretionary Authorizations: \$200,000 annually

Effect on Revenue: \$0

Total Change in Mandatory Spending: \$0

Total New State & Local Government Mandates: \$0

Total New Private Sector Mandates: 0

Number of Bills Without Committee Reports: 2

Number of Reported Bills that Don’t Cite Specific Clauses of Constitutional Authority: 5

H.R. 1143—To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain lands in Virgin Islands National Park, and for other purposes (*Del. Christensen, D-VI*)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, March 4, 2008, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.R. 1143 would authorize the Secretary of Interior to lease certain lands in Virgin Island National Park to the Caneel Bay Resort on the island of St. John. The bill would require that the lease agreement:

- Requires the resort to maintain and operate the land in a manner consistent with the preservation and conservation objectives of the park.
- Does not exceed 40 years.
- Prohibits any transfer of the land without approval of the Secretary of the Interior.
- Prohibits any increase in the number of guest accommodations.
- Prohibits any increase in the overall size of the resort.
- Prohibits the sale of timeshares in the resort.
- Facilitates the transfer of all property to the federal government at the end of the lease.

H.R. 1143 would also require the resort to pay the U.S. government a fair market value rent based on an appraisal conducted pursuant to the [Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisition](#). Eighty percent of the resort's payments would be given to the Department of Interior, while the remaining twenty percent would be deposited in the U.S. Treasury.

Additional Background: According to [Committee Report 110-532](#), the Caneel Bay Resort currently maintains a luxury resort within the Virgin Island National Park pursuant to a Retained Use Estate (RUE) through 2023. When the RUE expires, all the resort's land and property will revert back to the federal government. The resort is currently undertaking a major renovation and improvement project that would significantly increase the value of the resort. The current RUE holder, CBI Acquisitions, LLC, has complained that the length of the RUE does not provide enough time for the resort to retain long-term financing for the improvements. This bill would allow the Secretary of Interior to enter into a lease with the RUE holder for up to 40 years, through 2048.

Committee Action: H.R. 1143 was introduced on February 16, 2007, and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources. On February 23, 2007, the bill was referred to the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands, which held hearings on October 30, 2007. On February 13, 2007, a full committee mark-up was held and the bill was reported, as amended, by voice vote.

Cost to Taxpayers: According to CBO, H.R. 1143 would increase offsetting receipts by requiring lease payments and increase direct spending as those payments are spent by the federal government. CBO estimates that the net effect on the budget would be “negligible.”

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government? No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates? No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits? According to [House Report 110-532](#), H.R. 1143 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e) or 9(f) of rule XXI.

Constitutional Authority: [House Report 110-532](#) cites constitutional authority in Article I, Section 8 and Article IV, Section 3, but does not cite a specific clause. House Rule XIII, Section 3(d)(1), requires that all committee reports contain a statement citing the *specific* powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the law proposed by the bill or joint resolution.
[emphasis added]

RSC Staff Contact: Andy Koenig; andy.koenig@mail.house.gov; 202-226-9717.

H.R. 1311—Nevada Cancer Institute Expansion Act (*Berkley, D-NV*)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, March 4, 2008, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.R. 1311 would authorize the Secretary of Interior to accept 80 acres of land known as the Alta-Hualapai site from the City of Las Vegas, Nevada. The bill would then require the Secretary to convey the same land back to Las Vegas for the creation of the Nevada Cancer Institute within 180 days of the request of the Institute.

The bill would require that the Nevada Cancer Institute pay any costs associated with the land transfer. Finally the bill would stipulate that any land conveyed to the Institute would revert to the federal government if it were to be used for any purpose other than that mentioned in this bill.

Additional Background: According to [House Report 110-533](#), the Alta-Hualapai site was conveyed to the City of Las Vegas by the Bureau of Land Management in 1963. Under that agreement the site was to be used for “recreational area site purposes only.” If the land were to be used for any other purpose it would automatically revert to the federal government. Recently the city has proposed using the site for the creation of the Nevada Cancer Institute. In order to use the land for a new purpose, it must be transferred back to the federal government and then back to the city with different land use specifications.

Committee Action: H.R. 1311 was introduced on March 5, 2007, and referred Committee on Natural Resources. On February 13, 2008, a mark-up was held and the bill was reported, as amended, by voice vote.

Cost to Taxpayers: According to CBO, H.R. 1311 would have a “negligible” net effect on the federal budget.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government? No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates? No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits? According to [House Report 110-533](#), H.R. 1311 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e) or 9(f) of rule XXI.

Constitutional Authority: [House Report 110-533](#) cites constitutional authority in Article I, Section 8 and Article IV, Section 3, but does not cite a specific clause. House Rule XIII, Section 3(d)(1), requires that all committee reports contain a statement citing the *specific* powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the law proposed by the bill or joint resolution. *[emphasis added]*

RSC Staff Contact: Andy Koenig; andy.koenig@mail.house.gov; 202-226-9717.

H.R. 3111—Port Chicago Naval Magazine National Memorial Enhancement Act of 2007 (*Miller, D-CA*)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, March 4, 2008, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.R. 3111 would authorize the Secretary of Interior to take over administration of the Port Chicago Naval Magazine National Memorial, near Concord, California, as a unit of the National Park Service (NPS). The bill would require that the Secretary of the Defense to determine that the five acre National Memorial is no longer needed by the military before it is transferred. The bill would also require the Secretary of the Defense to perform any and all necessary environmental remediation actions.

H.R. 3111 would allow the Secretary of Interior to enter into an agreement with the City of Concord to establish and operate a visitor's center and administrative building for the memorial.

Finally, the bill would express the sense of Congress that the Secretaries of Defense and Interior should work together to "repair storm damage to the Port Chicago site and develop a process by which future repairs and necessary modifications to the site can be achieved in as timely and cost-effective a manner as possible."

Additional Background: According to [House Report 110-506](#), the Port Chicago Naval Magazine National Memorial commemorates the site of the single largest homeland disaster during WWII. On the site in 1944, 320 men were killed (the majority of whom were African-American) during an explosion at the ammunition loading station. Following the explosion, Port Chicago became the site of another controversial incident when 258 of the battalion's 328 sailors

refused to go back to work until conditions were improved. After the incident, 208 sailors faced court martial charges, while 50 men served prison sentences for mutiny. In 1992, the site was designated as the Port Chicago Naval Magazine National Memorial by Congress.

Committee Action: H.R. 3111 was introduced on July 19, 2007, and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources and the Committee on Armed Services. On October 10, 2007, the Committee on Natural Resources held a mark-up and reported the bill by unanimous consent. On February 1, 2008, the Committee on Armed Services discharged the bill.

Cost to Taxpayers: According to CBO, H.R. 3111 would require the NPS to spend \$200,000 annually for additional park staff.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government? No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates? No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits? According to [House Report 110-506](#), H.R. 3111 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e) or 9(f) of rule XXI.

Constitutional Authority: [House Report 110-506](#) cites constitutional authority in Article I, Section 8, but does not cite a specific clause. House Rule XIII, Section 3(d)(1), requires that all committee reports contain a statement citing the *specific* powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the law proposed by the bill or joint resolution. [*emphasis added*]

RSC Staff Contact: Andy Koenig; andy.koenig@mail.house.gov; 202-226-9717.

H.R. 5137—To ensure that hunting remains a purpose of the New River Gorge National River (*Rahall, D-WV*)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, March 4, 2008, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.R. 5137 would specify that hunting is the purpose of the New River Gorge National River by replacing the phrase “The Secretary **may** permit hunting and fishing on lands” with the phrase “The Secretary **shall** permit hunting and fishing on lands” in the river’s designation.

Additional Background: According to the National Park Service (NPS), the New River Gorge National River is a NPS designation designed to protect 53 miles of river in West Virginia. The New Rive Gorge was designated an American Heritage River in 1998. There are currently 14 other American Heritage Rivers across the U.S.

Committee Action: H.R. 5137 was introduced on January 28, 2008, and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources. On January 31, 2008, the bill was referred to the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands, which took no official action.

Cost to Taxpayers: A CBO cost estimate for H.R. 5137 was not available at press time.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government? No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates? No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits? A Committee report designating compliance with clause 9 of rule XXI is unavailable.

Constitutional Authority: A Committee report citing Constitutional authority is unavailable. House Rule XIII, Section 3(d)(1), requires that all committee reports contain a statement citing the *specific* powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the law proposed by the bill or joint resolution. [*emphasis added*]

RSC Staff Contact: Andy Koenig; andy.koenig@mail.house.gov; 202-226-9717.

H.Res. 845—Recognizing the 60th anniversary of Everglades National Park (Hastings, D-FL)

Order of Business: H.Res. 845 is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, March 4, 2008, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution.

Summary: H.Res. 845 would express the sense that the House

- “Recognizes the 60th anniversary of Everglades National Park; and
- “Dedicates itself to the success of the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan.”

The resolution lists a number of findings, including:

- “When President Harry S. Truman dedicated Everglades National Park on December 6, 1947, he stated: ‘Here is land, tranquil in its quiet beauty, serving not as the source of water, but as the last receiver of it. To its natural abundance we owe the spectacular plant and animal life that distinguishes this place from all others in our country’;
- “Marjory Stoneman Douglas gave the Everglades the name ‘River of Grass’ stating, ‘There are no other Everglades in the world’;
- “The greater Everglades ecosystem is also an international center for business, agriculture, and tourism, with a rapidly growing population of varied ethnic, economic, and social values, all of which are dependent on a fully functioning ecosystem for an

adequate freshwater supply, a healthy and sustainable economy, and overall quality of life;

- “Everglades National Park is the subject of the most extensive ecosystem restoration plan in the history of mankind, the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan; and
- “Everglades National Park will celebrate its 60th anniversary on December 6, 2007.”

Committee Action: H.Res. 845 was introduced on December 5 2007, and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. On January 16, 2008, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reported the resolution, as amended, by voice vote.

Cost to Taxpayers: The resolution does not authorize expenditures.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government? No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates? No.

RSC Staff Contact: Andy Koenig; andy.koenig@mail.house.gov; 202-226-9717.

H.Res. 807—Honoring the life of Marjory Stoneman Douglas, champion of the Florida Everglades and founder of Florida’s environmental movement (Ros-Lehtinen, R-FL)

Order of Business: H.Res. 807 is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, March 4, 2008, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution.

Summary: H.Res. 807 would express the sense that the House of Representatives “honors the life, achievements, and distinguished career of Marjory Stoneman Douglas, pioneer in the field of conservation, on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the publication of ‘The Everglades: River of Grass.’”

The resolution lists a number of findings, including:

- “Marjory Stoneman Douglas was born on April 7, 1890, in Minneapolis, Minnesota, as the daughter of Frank Stoneman and the first publisher of The Miami Herald;
- “Marjory Stoneman Douglas graduated from Wellesley College in 1912 where she was a member of the literary group Scribblers, editor-in-chief of the yearbook, and served on the executive board of the Equal Suffrage League;
- “Marjory Stoneman Douglas served in the Red Cross in Europe during World War I;
- “Marjory Stoneman Douglas moved to Miami in 1915 and became a reporter and writer at The Miami Herald where she wrote about progressive issues such as the fight for women’s rights, racial justice, and environmental conservation;

- “Marjory Stoneman Douglas wrote dozens of short stories that were published in the Saturday Evening Post, Collier’s, and Woman’s Home Companion throughout the 1920s, 30s, and 40s;
- “In 1947 Marjory Stoneman Douglas wrote a ground-breaking book titled The Everglades: River of Grass that helped to draw national attention to a vast and little-known area that South Florida developers had deemed a worthless swamp;
- “In the same year, Marjory Stoneman Douglas’ book mustered the public support to guard this subtropical marshland through a declaration from President Harry Truman, officially protecting the Everglades as a National Park;
- “At the age of 78, Marjory Stoneman Douglas founded the Friends of the Everglades, an educational and advocacy group dedicated to the protection and restoration of this ecosystem that continues to be at forefront of Florida conservation;
- “In November 1993, President Bill Clinton awarded Marjory Stoneman Douglas the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the highest honor given to a civilian;
- “This year marks the 60th anniversary of the publication of her book, The Everglades: River of Grass; and
- “Marjory Stoneman Douglas passed away in 1998 living to the age of 108, her ashes scattered in the Everglades she worked so tirelessly to preserve.”

Committee Action: H.Res. 807 was introduced on November 7, 2007, and referred to the Committee on House Committee on Natural Resources where no further action was taken.

Cost to Taxpayers: The resolution does not authorize expenditures.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government? No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates? No.

RSC Staff Contact: Sarah Makin; 202-226-0718; sarah.makin@mail.house.gov

H.R. 816—Orchard Detention Basin Flood Control Act (Porter, R-NV)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, March 4, 2008, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.R. 816 would provide for the release of approximately 65 acres of land known as the Orchard Detention Basin in the Sunrise Mountain Instant Study Area, Clark County, Nevada, from wilderness designation. H.R. 816 would direct the Secretary of the Interior to grant a right-of-way for the construction and maintenance of the Orchard Detention Basin Project (flood project) on that land.

Committee Action: H.R. 816 was introduced on February 5, 2007, and referred to the House Committee on Natural Resources. On February 13, 2008, the Committee held a mark-up and reported the bill, as amended, by unanimous consent.

Cost to Taxpayers: According to a CBO score of H.R. 816, the bill “would have no significant effect on the federal budget. According to the agency [Bureau of Land Management], the land that would be affected by the bill currently does not generate any significant receipts, and it is unlikely to do so in the next 10 years. Therefore, we estimate that altering the status of this land would not significantly affect federal offsetting receipts (a credit against direct spending). Enacting H.R. 816 would not affect federal revenues.”

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government? No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates? No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits? According to [House Report 110-531](#), “H.R. 816 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e) or 9(f) of rule XXI.”

Constitutional Authority: According to [House Report 110-531](#), “Article I, section 8 and Article IV, section 3, of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.”

RSC Staff Contact: Sarah Makin; 202-226-0718; sarah.makin@mail.house.gov

H.R. 3473—Bountiful City Land Consolidation Act (Bishop, R-UT)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, March 4, 2008, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.R. 3473 would allow the city of Bountiful, Utah, to acquire up to 220 acres of specified National Forest System land in the Wasatch-Cache National Forest, a part of which is used under permit for a shooting range, in exchange for the city conveying certain lands (1680 acres) in Bountiful to the United States through the Secretary of Agriculture.

Committee Action: H.R. 3473 was introduced on September 5, 2007, and referred to the House Committee on Natural Resources. On February 13, 2008, the Committee held a mark-up and reported the bill, as amended, by unanimous consent.

Cost to Taxpayers: According to a CBO score of H.R. 3473, the bill “would have no significant effect on discretionary spending. The bill could increase offsetting receipts and direct spending, but we estimate that any such changes would offset each other over the next few years. Under H.R. 3473, the Forest Service would exchange land located in the Wasatch-Cache National Forest for lands of equal value owned by the city. If the agency does not have to exchange all of the 220 acres to receive the city land, it would be authorized to sell the remainder. As a result, enacting this legislation could increase offsetting receipts (a credit against direct spending). The

bill does not specify how those proceeds—an estimated \$1 million—should be treated. Based on the treatment of similar proceeds, however, CBO assumes that they would be available to the Forest Service without further appropriation. Therefore, enacting the bill would have no net impact on direct spending. Finally, the bill would not affect revenues.”

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government? No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates? No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits? According to [House Report 110-534](#), “H.R. 3473 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e) or 9(f) of rule XXI.”

Constitutional Authority: According to [House Report 110-534](#), “Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.”

RSC Staff Contact: Sarah Makin; 202-226-0718; sarah.makin@mail.house.gov

H.Res. 698—Commemorating the 200th anniversary of Congressional Cemetery (Walsh, R-NY)

Order of Business: H.Res. 698 is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, March 4, 2008, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution.

Summary: H.Res. 698 would express the sense that the House of Representatives “recognizes and honors the cultural and historical importance of Congressional Cemetery and the value of protecting and restoring this national treasure that on the 200th anniversary of the founding of Congressional Cemetery.”

The resolution lists a number of findings, including:

- “2007 is the 200th anniversary of the founding of Congressional Cemetery;
- “Congressional Cemetery, first called the Washington Parish Burial Ground, was founded in 1807 near the banks of the Anacostia River in the District of Columbia and served the new federal city and a young America as its first unofficial national cemetery, predating Arlington National Cemetery by 70 years;
- “Congress was the primary developer of the cemetery through appropriations for road grading, fencing, building of the Public Vault and its Slate Path, and construction of the original Gatehouse, and Congress ultimately attached its name to the burial ground as early as the 1830's, referring to it as Congressional Cemetery;
- “Within months of the establishment of the cemetery, the first burial of a Member of Congress took place when Senator Uriah Tracey (CT) died in Washington on July 19, 1807, and was interred the following day;

- “There are 19 Senators and 71 Representatives interred at Congressional Cemetery, and its cenotaphs, designed by second Architect of the Capitol Benjamin Latrobe, mark 165 sites to honor Members of Congress who died in office;
- “Congressional Cemetery holds more than 55,000 individuals in 30,000 burial sites marked by 14,000 headstones;
- “Several prominent Native Americans who died while in Washington were buried at Congressional Cemetery, including Push-Ma-Ta-Ha, Chief of the Choctaws and a Brigadier General of the U.S. Army, and Kan Ya Tu Duta (or Scarlet Crow), a delegate of the Dakota Sioux;
- “Among other significant figures in American history who are interred at Congressional Cemetery are Belva Lockwood, the first woman to practice law before the Supreme Court; conductor and composer John Philip Sousa; Adelaide Johnson, suffragette and sculptor of the ‘Portrait Monument’ to Lucretia Mott, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and Susan B. Anthony in the Rotunda of the Capitol; Civil War photographer Matthew Brady; silent film star Mary Fuller; and FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover;
- “The Congressional Cemetery was placed on the National Register of Historic Places on June 23, 1969;
- “The National Trust for Historic Preservation named Congressional Cemetery one of the 11 most endangered historical sites in America on June 16, 1997; and
- “For over 30 years the cemetery has been managed by the nonprofit Association for the Preservation of Historic Congressional Cemetery, whose mission is to preserve, interpret, and honor this national treasure, significant District of Columbia landmark, and unique Capitol Hill asset.”

Committee Action: H.Res. 698 was introduced on October 1, 2007, and referred to the Committee on House Committee on Natural Resources where no further action was taken.

Cost to Taxpayers: The resolution does not authorize expenditures.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government? No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates? No.

RSC Staff Contact: Sarah Makin; 202-226-0718; sarah.makin@mail.house.gov

H.R. 1922—Jupiter Inlet Lighthouse Outstanding Natural Area Act of 2007 (Mahoney, D-FL)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, March 4, 2008, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.R. 1922 would establish the Jupiter Inlet Lighthouse and 126 acres surrounding the area in Jupiter, Florida, as an Outstanding Natural Area, managed by the Bureau of Land

Management (BLM). The purpose of the designation would be to protect and conserve natural, scenic, and recreational use of the federal land surrounding the lighthouse.

The bill would require the BLM, in coordination with state and local entities, to establish a management plan to provide long-term guidance for all public land inside the Outstanding Natural Area. H.R. 1922 would also require the BLM to ensure that Coast Guard activities within the designation are not impeded by any aspect of the designation.

H.R. 1922 would authorize the Secretary of Interior to acquire land for inclusion in the Outstanding Natural Area if the land is adjacent to the area or has been identified by the management plan as appropriate land for acquisition. The bill would authorize the Secretary to obtain land through donation, exchange with a willing party, or purchase from a willing party. Finally, the bill would authorize “such sums as are necessary” to carry out the provisions in this Act.

Additional Background: According to the Bureau of Land Management, “The Outstanding Natural Area designation was established by Congress primarily to protect unique scenic, scientific, educational, and recreational values for the enjoyment of current and future generations. Recreation activities center on those that foster education and interpretation of the Outstanding Natural Area’s unique resources. The Bureau of Land Management’s first and only Outstanding Natural Area was established by law in 1980 along Oregon’s coast.” Thus, the Jupiter Inlet Lighthouse Outstanding Natural Area would be the nation’s second Outstanding Natural Area.

According to [House Report 110-536](#), the 156-foot Jupiter Lighthouse was built on land that had been taken by the U.S. government for military use in 1854. The lighthouse was first lit in 1860. The lighthouse was transferred from the Navy to the Coast Guard in 1939. By that time 126 acres of land had been reserved as federal land around the site. In 1986 the majority of the land was transferred to the BLM—the entity that manages the land today.

Committee Action: H.R. 5137 was introduced on April 18, 2008, and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources’ Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands. On February 13, 2008, a full committee mark-up was held and the bill was reported, as amended, by unanimous consent.

Cost to Taxpayers: According to CBO, H.R. 1922 would have “no significant impact on the federal budget.”

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government? No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates? No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits? According to [House Report 110-536](#), H.R. 1922 does not contain any

congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e) or 9(f) of rule XXI.

Constitutional Authority: [House Report 110-536](#) cites constitutional authority in Article I, Section 8, but does not cite a specific clause. House Rule XIII, Section 3(d)(1), requires that all committee reports contain a statement citing the *specific* powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the law proposed by the bill or joint resolution. *[emphasis added]*

RSC Staff Contact: Andy Koenig; andy.koenig@mail.house.gov; 202-226-9717.

H.R. 4191— Wright Brothers-Dunbar National Historical Park Designation Act (Turner, R-OH)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, March 4, 2008, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.R. 4191 would amend the Dayton Aviation Heritage Preservation Act of 1992 to rename the Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park as the Wright Brothers-Dunbar National Historic Park, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make grants to public and private organizations relating to the preservation, development, use, and interpretation of properties within the Park.

Conservative Concerns: Some conservatives may be concerned that H.R. 4191 would create a new grant program for construction and development of non-federal property within the park.

Committee Action: H.R. 4191 was introduced on November 15, 2007, and referred to the House Committee on Natural Resources, which took no official action.

Cost to Taxpayers: There is no CBO score available for H.R. 4191.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government? Yes, H.R. 4191 directs the Secretary of the Interior to make grants to public and private organizations for constitution and development of non-federal property within the park.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates? No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?: No House Report for H.R. 4191 was available at press time.

Constitutional Authority: No House Report for H.R. 4191 was available at press time.

RSC Staff Contact: Sarah Makin; 202-226-0718; sarah.makin@mail.house.gov
