

DOROTHY BUELL MEMORIAL VISITOR CENTER PARTNERSHIP ACT

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1287) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a partnership with the Porter County Convention, Recreation and Visitor Commission regarding the use of the Dorothy Buell Memorial Visitor Center as a visitor center for the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1287

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

SECTION 1. DOROTHY BUELL MEMORIAL VISITOR CENTER.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Dorothy Buell Memorial Visitor Center Partnership Act”.

(b) **MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.**—The Secretary of the Interior may enter into a memorandum of understanding to establish a joint partnership with the Porter County Convention, Recreation and Visitor Commission. The memorandum of understanding shall—

- (1) identify the overall goals and purpose of the Dorothy Buell Memorial Visitor Center;
- (2) establish how management and operational duties will be shared;
- (3) determine how exhibits, signs, and other information are developed;
- (4) indicate how various activities will be funded;
- (5) identify who is responsible for providing site amenities;
- (6) establish procedures for changing or dissolving the joint partnership; and
- (7) address any other issues deemed necessary by the Secretary or the Porter County Convention, Recreation and Visitor Commission.

(c) **DEVELOPMENT OF EXHIBITS.**—The Secretary may plan, design, construct, and install exhibits in the Dorothy Buell Memorial Visitor Center related to the use and management of the resources at Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, at a cost not to exceed \$1,500,000.

(d) **NATIONAL LAKESHORE PRESENCE.**—The Secretary may use park staff from Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore in the Dorothy Buell Memorial Visitor Center to provide visitor information and education.

SEC. 2. INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE.

Section 19 of the Act entitled “An Act to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes” (16 U.S.C. 460u–19) is amended—

- (1) by striking “After notifying” and inserting “(a) After notifying”; and
- (2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) **CONTIGUOUS CLARIFIED.**—For purposes of subsection (a), lands may be considered contiguous to other lands if the lands touch the other lands, or are separated from the other lands by only a public or private right-of-way, such as a road, railroad, or utility corridor.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1287 will allow the National Park Service to share visitor center facilities for the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore with the local county’s Convention, Recreation and Visitor Commission. The bill also allows the National Park Service to construct exhibits at the visitor center, and authorizes NPS employees to work there since the visitor center lies outside the established boundaries of the park.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1287 would clarify the definition of “contiguous lands” in the park’s original legislation so that NPS could accept donations of contiguous land even if that land is separated by a right-of-way, such as a road, a railway line or a utility corridor.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman VISCLOSKY has been working hard on this bill for a long time and is to be commended for his diligence and persistence. The legislation passed the House last Congress by an overwhelming vote. I ask my colleagues, once again, to support this measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1287 has been well explained by the majority, and we support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I would yield as much time as he may consume to the sponsor of H.R. 1287, Mr. VISCLOSKY.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman’s yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1287, the Dorothy Buell Memorial Visitor Center Lease Act. I am the proud sponsor of this legislation, and as I have in the previous Congress, I thank Mr. DONNELLY for joining me as a cosponsor.

I also do want to thank Chairman RAHALL, Ranking Member HASTINGS, Subcommittee Ranking Member BISHOP, and especially Subcommittee Chairman GRIJALVA for all of their hard work in ensuring that this legislation is brought to the floor.

It has been explained and I will simply say that it is my sincere hope that this legislation will enable the continuance of our efforts to protect and to enhance the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore and to ensure that all Americans can benefit from the park. The Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, which was established in 1966, is relatively new, but as it continues to mature, the Dorothy Buell Memorial Visitor Center will be vital in helping to provide each lakeshore visitor a complete and rewarding experience.

Mr. Speaker, we should not delay the lakeshore’s ability to mature, thus allowing more people to appreciate the natural beauty of northwest Indiana.

Again, I urge my colleagues, as they did in the last Congress, to support this measure.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, if there are no further speakers, then I would yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1287.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1430

SANTA CRUZ VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA ACT

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 324) to establish the Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 324

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area Act”.

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

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Purposes.
- Sec. 3. Definitions.
- Sec. 4. Designation of Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area.
- Sec. 5. Management plan.
- Sec. 6. Evaluation; report.
- Sec. 7. Local coordinating entity.
- Sec. 8. Relationship to other Federal agencies.
- Sec. 9. Private property and regulatory protections.
- Sec. 10. Authorization of appropriations.
- Sec. 11. Use of Federal funds from other sources.
- Sec. 12. Sunset for grants and other assistance.

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act include—

- (1) to establish the Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area in the State of Arizona;
- (2) to implement the recommendations of the “Alternative Concepts for Commemorating Spanish Colonization” study completed by the National Park Service in 1991, and the “Feasibility Study for the Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area” prepared by the Center for Desert Archaeology in July 2005;

(3) to provide a management framework to foster a close working relationship with all levels of government, the private sector, and the local communities in the region and to conserve the region’s heritage while continuing to pursue compatible economic opportunities;

(4) to assist communities, organizations, and citizens in the State of Arizona in identifying, preserving, interpreting, and developing the historical, cultural, scenic, and natural resources of the region for the educational and inspirational benefit of current and future generations; and

(5) to provide appropriate linkages between units of the National Park System and communities, governments, and organizations within the National Heritage Area.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA.—The term “National Heritage Area” means the Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area established in this Act.

(2) LOCAL COORDINATING ENTITY.—The term “local coordinating entity” means the Santa Cruz Valley Heritage Alliance, Inc., which is hereby designated by Congress—

(A) to develop, in partnership with others, the management plan for the National Heritage Area; and

(B) to act as a catalyst for the implementation of projects and programs among diverse partners in the National Heritage Area.

(3) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The term “management plan” means the plan prepared by the local coordinating entity for the National Heritage Area that specifies actions, policies, strategies, performance goals, and recommendations to meet the goals of the National Heritage Area, in accordance with this Act.

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

SEC. 4. DESIGNATION OF SANTA CRUZ VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established the Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area.

(b) BOUNDARIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The National Heritage Area shall consist of portions of the counties of Santa Cruz and Pima.

(2) MAP.—The boundaries of the National Heritage Area shall be as generally depicted on the map titled “Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area”, and numbered T09/80,000, and dated November 13, 2007. The map shall be on file and available to the public in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service and the local coordinating entity.

SEC. 5. MANAGEMENT PLAN.

(a) REQUIREMENTS.—The management plan for the National Heritage Area shall—

(1) describe comprehensive policies, goals, strategies, and recommendations for telling the story of the heritage of the area covered by the National Heritage Area and encouraging long-term resource protection, enhancement, interpretation, funding, management, and development of the National Heritage Area;

(2) include a description of actions and commitments that Federal, State, Tribal, and local governments, private organizations, and citizens will take to protect, enhance, interpret, fund, manage, and develop the natural, historical, cultural, educational, scenic, and recreational resources of the National Heritage Area;

(3) specify existing and potential sources of funding or economic development strategies to protect, enhance, interpret, fund, manage, and develop the National Heritage Area;

(4) include an inventory of the natural, historical, cultural, educational, scenic, and recreational resources of the National Heritage Area related to the national importance and themes of the National Heritage Area that should be protected, enhanced, interpreted, managed, funded, and developed;

(5) recommend policies and strategies for resource management, including the devel-

opment of intergovernmental and inter-agency agreements to protect, enhance, interpret, fund, manage, and develop the natural, historical, cultural, educational, scenic, and recreational resources of the National Heritage Area;

(6) describe a program for implementation for the management plan, including—

(A) performance goals;

(B) plans for resource protection, enhancement, interpretation, funding, management, and development; and

(C) specific commitments for implementation that have been made by the local coordinating entity or any Federal, State, Tribal, or local government agency, organization, business, or individual;

(7) include an analysis of, and recommendations for, means by which Federal, State, Tribal, and local programs may best be coordinated (including the role of the National Park Service and other Federal agencies associated with the National Heritage Area) to further the purposes of this Act; and

(8) include a business plan that—

(A) describes the role, operation, financing, and functions of the local coordinating entity and of each of the major activities contained in the management plan; and

(B) provides adequate assurances that the local coordinating entity has the partnerships and financial and other resources necessary to implement the management plan for the National Heritage Area.

(b) DEADLINE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are first made available to develop the management plan after designation as a National Heritage Area, the local coordinating entity shall submit the management plan to the Secretary for approval.

(2) TERMINATION OF FUNDING.—If the management plan is not submitted to the Secretary in accordance with paragraph (1), the local coordinating entity shall not qualify for any additional financial assistance under this Act until such time as the management plan is submitted to and approved by the Secretary.

(c) APPROVAL OF MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(1) REVIEW.—Not later than 180 days after receiving the plan, the Secretary shall review and approve or disapprove the management plan for a National Heritage Area on the basis of the criteria established under paragraph (3).

(2) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall consult with the Governor of each State in which the National Heritage Area is located before approving a management plan for the National Heritage Area.

(3) CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL.—In determining whether to approve a management plan for a National Heritage Area, the Secretary shall consider whether—

(A) the local coordinating entity represents the diverse interests of the National Heritage Area, including Federal, State, Tribal, and local governments, natural and historic resource protection organizations, educational institutions, businesses, recreational organizations, community residents, and private property owners;

(B) the local coordinating entity—

(i) has afforded adequate opportunity for public and Federal, State, Tribal, and local governmental involvement (including through workshops and hearings) in the preparation of the management plan; and

(ii) provides for at least semiannual public meetings to ensure adequate implementation of the management plan;

(C) the resource protection, enhancement, interpretation, funding, management, and development strategies described in the management plan, if implemented, would adequately protect, enhance, interpret, fund,

manage, and develop the natural, historic, cultural, educational, scenic, and recreational resources of the National Heritage Area;

(D) the management plan would not adversely affect any activities authorized on Federal land under public land laws or land use plans;

(E) the local coordinating entity has demonstrated the financial capability, in partnership with others, to carry out the plan;

(F) the Secretary has received adequate assurances from the appropriate State, Tribal, and local officials whose support is needed to ensure the effective implementation of the State, Tribal, and local elements of the management plan; and

(G) the management plan demonstrates partnerships among the local coordinating entity, Federal, State, Tribal, and local governments, regional planning organizations, nonprofit organizations, or private sector parties for implementation of the management plan.

(4) DISAPPROVAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary disapproves the management plan, the Secretary—

(i) shall advise the local coordinating entity in writing of the reasons for the disapproval; and

(ii) may make recommendations to the local coordinating entity for revisions to the management plan.

(B) DEADLINE.—Not later than 180 days after receiving a revised management plan, the Secretary shall approve or disapprove the revised management plan.

(5) AMENDMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An amendment to the management plan that substantially alters the purposes of the National Heritage Area shall be reviewed by the Secretary and approved or disapproved in the same manner as the original management plan.

(B) IMPLEMENTATION.—The local coordinating entity shall not use Federal funds authorized by this Act to implement an amendment to the management plan until the Secretary approves the amendment.

(6) AUTHORITIES.—The Secretary may—

(A) provide technical assistance under the authority of this Act for the development and implementation of the management plan; and

(B) enter into cooperative agreements with interested parties to carry out this Act.

SEC. 6. EVALUATION; REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years before the date on which authority for Federal funding terminates for the National Heritage Area under this Act, 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, Tribal, and local, 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 a report to the Committee on Natural Resources of the United States House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate. The report shall include recommendations for the future role of the National Park Service, if any, with respect to the National Heritage Area.

SEC. 7. LOCAL COORDINATING ENTITY.

(a) DUTIES.—To further the purposes of the National Heritage Area, the Santa Cruz Valley Heritage Alliance, Inc., as the local coordinating entity, shall—

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

(2) submit an annual report to the Secretary for each fiscal year for which the local coordinating entity receives Federal funds under this Act, specifying—

(A) the specific performance goals and accomplishments of the local coordinating entity;

(B) the expenses and income of the local coordinating entity;

(C) the amounts and sources of matching funds;

(D) the amounts leveraged with Federal funds and sources of the leveraging; and

(E) grants made to any other entities during the fiscal year;

(3) make available for audit for each fiscal year for which the local coordinating entity receives Federal funds under this Act, all information pertaining to the expenditure of the funds and any matching funds; and

(4) encourage economic viability and sustainability that is consistent with the purposes of the National Heritage Area.

(b) AUTHORITIES.—For the purposes of preparing and implementing the approved management plan for the National Heritage Area, the local coordinating entity may use Federal funds made available under this Act to—

(1) make grants to political jurisdictions, nonprofit organizations, and other parties within the National Heritage Area;

(2) enter into cooperative agreements with or provide technical assistance to political jurisdictions, nonprofit organizations, Federal agencies, and other interested parties;

(3) hire and compensate staff, including individuals with expertise in—

(A) natural, historical, cultural, educational, scenic, and recreational resource conservation;

(B) economic and community development; and

(C) heritage planning;

(4) obtain funds or services from any source, including other Federal 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) PROHIBITION ON ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY.—The local coordinating entity may not use Federal funds authorized under this Act to acquire any interest in real property.

SEC. 8. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act 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 a 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 Act—

(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 a National Heritage Area; or

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

SEC. 9. PRIVATE PROPERTY AND REGULATORY PROTECTIONS.

Nothing in this Act—

(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 to permit public access (including access by Federal, State, Tribal, or local agencies) to the property of the property owner, or to modify public access or use of property of the property owner under any other Federal, State, Tribal, or local law;

(3) alters any duly adopted land use regulation, approved land use plan, or other regulatory authority of any Federal, State, Tribal, or local agency, or conveys any land use or other regulatory authority to any local coordinating entity, including but not necessarily limited to development and management of energy, water, or water-related infrastructure;

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

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

(6) 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. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Subject to subsection (b), there are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act not more than \$1,000,000 for any fiscal year. Funds so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL AMOUNTS APPROPRIATED.—Not more than \$15,000,000 may be appropriated to carry out this Act.

(c) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.—The Federal share of the total cost of any activity under this Act shall be not more than 50 percent; the non-Federal contribution may be in the form of in-kind contributions of goods or services fairly valued.

SEC. 11. USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS FROM OTHER SOURCES.

Nothing in this Act shall preclude the local coordinating entity from using Federal funds available under other laws for the purposes for which those funds were authorized.

SEC. 12. SUNSET FOR GRANTS AND OTHER ASSISTANCE.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and in-

clude extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 324 would create the Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area. I introduced this legislation on January 8 and am proud that my neighbor in the valley, the gentlelady from Arizona (Ms. GIFFORDS), is an original cosponsor.

My own history began in the Santa Cruz Valley, at Canoa Ranch where my father worked. My earliest memories are of a life in that extraordinary scenic valley and they comprise an important part of who I am today.

Sharing a border with Mexico, the Santa Cruz Valley encompasses a multitude of cultures, a rich and diverse history, as well as a host of nationally recognized national treasures that are situated within its borders.

The amount of support for this proposal, both in my district and in Ms. GIFFORDS', is astounding. Every county, municipality, tribe, Federal and State park and land management agency within the proposed heritage area, plus a long list of chambers of commerce, tourism organizations, conservation and historic preservation groups, ranchers, farmers and businesses, all support H.R. 324.

The House has already approved this legislation as part of a heritage area package in the last Congress. Mr. Speaker, this bill is important to many of us and to me, to my district, and to Ms. GIFFORDS and to her constituents. I ask my colleagues to support the passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I have to rise in opposition to H.R. 324. As many of us have discovered, the National Heritage Area program, although well intended, is not a new program and has no established framework. Many of our colleagues have sought to ensure that despite a lack of guidance, heritage areas would include basic property rights protections. Unfortunately, this bill does not have sufficient protection for the property owners within the boundaries of this area, and it is likely many of them have no idea that they are to be included.

To remedy this problem, we request, and we have requested in the past, that the bill be amended to allow property owners the opportunity to remove their property from the heritage area.

While the current language allows owners to "refrain from participation," nothing changes the fact that this bill places them within a new Federal designation that provides a basis for ambitious Federal land managers to claim that they now have a mandate and millions of Federal dollars to interfere with local decisions affecting their neighbors' property.

Three years ago, this point was brought to the forefront when my

friend, the sponsor of this legislation, authored legislation to reduce the size of the Yuma Crossing Heritage Area. When that heritage area was established in 2000, it was much larger than local farmers were expecting. Further exacerbating the problem, local zoning bureaucrats began to use the heritage area boundaries in planning.

Because the language designating the heritage area included no recourse for property owners who wanted out, or who never wanted to be included in the heritage area in the first place, their only option was to come to Congress to adjust the boundary and solve the zoning assault that they faced. We must not make that mistake again.

Complicating this particular proposed heritage area is the inclusion of some of the most heavily traveled human and narcotics trafficking routes in our country. We have already seen what happens when we lock up Federal border lands within Federal wilderness areas. The cartels run rampant knowing that Border Patrol is hamstrung by draconian rules making them subservient to land managers and the accompanying bureaucratic red tape. Now is not the time to place yet another layer of Federal interference over this region. The border lands are far from secure.

I urge my colleagues to support private property rights and the effort to secure the border by opposing H.R. 324.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, every time we bring up a national heritage proposal, we hear concerns expressed about private property protections. We should be clear that during the 20-plus years of this program's existence, opponents have not been able to identify a single instance in which someone has been deprived of the use of their property as a result of this designation.

Tens of millions of Americans in States across the country have lived, worked and recreated and made their living within a heritage area. Despite the best efforts of opponents of these designations, they have never found a case where property rights were violated.

The Government Accountability Office even investigated potential property rights violations and found none. Nevertheless, this bill contains extensive private property provisions. These private property protections are the same language approved by Congress in earlier bills and signed into law by both the Obama and Bush administrations. If the problem existed, the bill has the language necessary to take care of it.

The other issue, in terms of law enforcement, this designation in no way restricts local, county, State or national law enforcement from carrying out its enforcement mission and its responsibility to uphold the law. There is no restriction, no impediment, and no redesignation of their mission. The mission continues. The heritage area in no way hinders or prohibits that mission from going on.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. I would like to inquire if there are any additional speakers at this point from the majority, and if not, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 324.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ROOSEVELT NATIONAL FOREST BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT AND LAND CONVEYANCES

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1858) to provide for a boundary adjustment and land conveyances involving Roosevelt National Forest, Colorado, to correct the effects of an erroneous land survey that resulted in approximately 7 acres of the Crystal Lakes Subdivision, Ninth Filing, encroaching on National Forest System land, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1858

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

SECTION 1. BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT AND LAND CONVEYANCES, ROOSEVELT NATIONAL FOREST, COLORADO.

(a) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—The boundaries of Roosevelt National Forest, Colorado, are hereby modified to exclude from the national forest a parcel of real property consisting of approximately 7 acres within the Crystal Lakes Subdivision as depicted on the map entitled "Crystal Lakes Encroachment, HR 3299" and dated July 15, 2008.

(b) CONVEYANCE OF LAND REMOVED FROM NATIONAL FOREST.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall use the authority provided by Public Law 97-465 (commonly known as the Small Tracts Act; 16 U.S.C. 521c-521i) to convey all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property excluded from the boundaries of Roosevelt National Forest under subsection (a) to the landowners whose real property adjoins the excluded land and who, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, occupy the excluded land.

(c) CONSIDERATION.—The conveyances required by subsection (b) shall be made without consideration.

(d) DESCRIPTION OF REAL PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the land excluded from the boundaries of Roosevelt National Forest under subsection (a) and conveyed under subsection (b) shall be

determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary.

(e) CANCELLATION OF PORTION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCE IN FLREA SPECIAL ACCOUNT.—The amount available for obligation as of the date of the enactment of this Act from the unobligated balance in the special account established for the Forest Service under section 807 of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6806) is reduced by a total of \$200,000, and the amount so reduced is hereby cancelled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1858, introduced by Representative BETSY MARKEY of Colorado, would provide for a boundary adjustment and land conveyances involving the Roosevelt National Forest in Colorado to correct the effects of erroneous land survey. The bill responds to an ongoing boundary dispute between the Forest Service and private land owners with property adjacent to the forest.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend our colleague, Representative MARKEY, for her work on this bill. As a freshman, she has demonstrated remarkable ability to get things done on behalf of her constituents. I ask my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 1858.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

This bill provides a legislative solution for a number of homeowners in Larimer County, Colorado, who own real property adjacent to the Roosevelt National Forest. These homeowners have occupied or improved their property in good faith and in reliance on 1975 land surveys.

It was introduced in the last Congress by Congresswoman Marilyn Musgrave. It is needed to resolve the issue fairly because a recent Forest Service resurvey now claims that a small portion of Roosevelt National Forest is occupied by these adjacent landowners.

This bill conveys approximately 7 acres occupied by the affected landowners to those landowners, and I support its passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, at this point let me yield as much time as she may consume to the sponsor of the legislation, Representative MARKEY.

Ms. MARKEY of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 1858 and for private property rights.