

EXTENSION OF ILLINOIS AND MICHIGAN CANAL HERITAGE
CORRIDOR COMMISSION

—————
AUGUST 5, 1998.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State
of the Union and ordered to be printed
—————

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, from the Committee on Resources,
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 1042]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Resources, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 1042) to amend the Illinois and Michigan Canal Heritage Corridor Act of 1984 to extend the Illinois and Michigan Canal Heritage Corridor Commission, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF COMMISSION.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 111(a) of the Illinois and Michigan Canal National Heritage Corridor Act of 1984 (98 Stat. 1456; 16 U.S.C. 461 note) is amended by striking “ten” and inserting “20”.

(b) REPEAL OF EXTENSION AUTHORITY.—Section 111 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 461 note) is further amended—

- (1) by striking “(a) TERMINATION.—”; and
- (2) by repealing subsection (b).

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 1042 is to amend the Illinois and Michigan Canal Heritage Corridor Act of 1984 to extend the Illinois and Michigan Canal Heritage Corridor Commission.

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The Illinois and Michigan Canal National Heritage Corridor was established by Congress in 1984 (Public Law 98-398). The Corridor

was established to protect the historical significance and promote the recreational possibilities of the Illinois and Michigan Canal. This legislation was the first “partnership park” of its kind and is now a model for such parks across the Nation. The Corridor stretches 100 miles across Illinois, from Chicago to LaSalle/Peru, and encompasses 450 square miles. Its rich heritage and recreational opportunities attract many visitors to the area, and it is of great historical significance to the State of Illinois and the United States.

The Illinois and Michigan Canal, built from 1836 to 1848, transformed the City of Chicago from a backwater trading settlement into a bustling commercial hub and the gateway to the American West. The canal, which linked Lake Michigan with the Illinois River in downstate Illinois, made it possible to ship cargo from the Atlantic Ocean through the Great Lakes to the Mississippi River and down to the Gulf of Mexico.

Public Law 98–398 also created a Commission, which coordinates the efforts and resources of federal, state, and local entities. It has a permanent authorization for \$250,000 per fiscal year. Since its creation, the Commission has made significant progress along the Corridor in terms of economic development, environmental restoration, and recreational projects. H.R. 1042 would extend the Commission until the year 2004. H.R. 1042 was amended at to retire the Commission established by Public Law 98–398 after the five-year extension granted by this bill.

COMMITTEE ACTION

H.R. 1042 was introduced on March 12, 1997, by Congressman William Lipinski (D–IL). The bill was referred to the Committee on Resources, and within the Committee to the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands. On May 21, 1998, the Subcommittee met to consider H.R. 1042. An amendment, which retires the Commission after the extension provided by the bill, was offered by Congressman James V. Hansen (R–UT) and adopted by voice vote. The bill, as amended, was ordered favorably reported to the Full Committee by voice vote. On July 22, 1998, the Full Resources Committee met to consider H.R. 1042. No further amendments were offered and the bill, as amended, was ordered favorably reported to the House of Representatives by voice vote.

COMMITTEE OVERSIGHT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

With respect to the requirements of clause 2(1)(3) of rule XI of the rules of the House of Representatives, and clause 2(b)(1) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Resources’ oversight findings and recommendations are reflected in the body of this report.

FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE STATEMENT

The advisory commission reauthorized in H.R. 1042 is an existing advisory committee and its duties could not be performed by one or more agencies or by enlarging the mandate of an existing advisory committee.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Article I, section 8 and Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution of the United States grant Congress the authority to enact H.R. 1042.

COST OF THE LEGISLATION

Clause 7(a) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives requires an estimate and a comparison by the Committee of the costs which would be incurred in carrying out H.R. 1042. However, clause 7(d) of that rule provides that this requirement does not apply when the Committee has included in its report a timely submitted cost estimate of the bill prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 403 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XI

1. With respect to the requirement of clause 2(1)(3)(B) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, H.R. 1042 does not contain any new budget authority, spending authority, credit authority, or an increase or decrease in revenues or tax expenditures.

2. With respect to the requirement of clause 2(1)(3)(D) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee has received no report of oversight findings and recommendations from the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight on the subject of H.R. 1042.

3. With respect to the requirement of clause 2(1)(3)(C) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and section 403 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Committee has received the following cost estimate for H.R. 1042 from the Director of the Congressional Budget Office.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, July 30, 1998.

Hon. DON YOUNG,
*Chairman, Committee on Resources,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 1042, a bill to amend the Illinois and Michigan Canal Heritage Corridor Act of 1984 to extend the Illinois and Michigan Canal Heritage Corridor Commission.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Deborah Reis.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL, *Director.*

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

H.R. 1042.—A bill to amend the Illinois and Michigan Canal Heritage Corridor Act of 1984 to extend the Illinois and Michigan Canal Heritage Corridor Commission

Assuming appropriation of the authorized amounts, CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 1042 would cost the federal government a total of \$1 million over the 2000–2003 period. The bill would not affect direct spending or receipts; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply. H.R. 1042 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would have no significant impact on the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

H.R. 1042 would extend the Illinois and Michigan Canal National Heritage Corridor Commission through August 2004. The commission, which is scheduled to expire in August 1999, is authorized to receive an appropriation of \$250,000 each year throughout its existence. (In recent years, the annual appropriation to the commission has been \$238,000.)

The CBO staff contact is Deborah Reis. This estimate was approved by Robert A. Sunshine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

COMPLIANCE WITH PUBLIC LAW 104–4

H.R. 1042 contains no unfunded mandates and has no significant effect on state, local, or tribal governments.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

**SECTION 111 OF THE ILLINOIS AND MICHIGAN CANAL
NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR ACT OF 1984**

TERMINATION OF COMMISSION

SEC. 111. [(a) TERMINATION.—]Except as provided in subsection (b), the Commission shall terminate on the day occurring [ten] 20 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

[(b) EXTENSION.—The Commission may extend the life of the Commission for a period of not more than five years beginning on the day referred to in subsection (a) if, not later than one hundred and eighty days before such day—

[(1) the Commission determines such extension is necessary in order for the Commission to carry out the purpose of this title;

【(2) the Commission submits such proposed extension to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

【(3) the Governor and the Secretary each approve such extension.】

