

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

H.R. 1129, introduced by Representative MARK UDALL, would authorize a small land exchange in Pitkin County, Colorado, between the Bureau of Land Management, the U.S. Forest Service, and Pitkin County. This bill was passed by the House of Representatives on December 6, 2005, but was recently amended by the Senate. The amendment simply removed a provision of the bill encumbering the land known as the Crystal River parcel with a conservation easement.

The remaining portion of the bill would transfer 35 acres, once part of the Ryan Ranch in the White River National Forest to the Forest Service. This property is nearly surrounded by public land and valued by the community as open space. In exchange, Pitkin County would acquire 5.5 acres known as the Wildwood parcel from the Forest Service and a total of 45.92 acres from the Bureau of Land Management consisting of mining claims and land along the Crystal River.

The exchange is strongly supported by local officials and would help to consolidate public and private ownership in Pitkin County.

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

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

H.R. 1129 authorizes the exchange of certain lands between the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, and Pitkin County in Colorado.

One of the properties the Forest Service will acquire is a 35-acre parcel referred to as the Ryan property, which is one of the scenic gems of the Roaring Fork Valley. At the urging of the Forest Service, in 2000 Pitkin County and the Aspen Valley Land Trust acquired the Ryan property to protect it from development until a land exchange transferring it to Forest Service ownership could be arranged. Five years later, H.R. 1129 accomplishes that goal.

We would like to recognize Representative MARK UDALL for his leadership on H.R. 1129, as well as cosponsor Representative JOHN SALAZAR.

Mr. Speaker, we support H.R. 1129.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 1129, the Pitkin County Land Exchange Act and to express my thanks to Chairman POMBO and Ranking Member RAHALL for making it possible for the House to consider it today.

The bill provides for completion of a land exchange that involves Pitkin County, Colo-

rado, on the one hand and two federal agencies—the Forest Service and BLM—on the other.

Under the exchange, the county will transfer two parcels to the Forest Service—a 35-acre tract known as the “Ryan property” near the ghost town of Ashcroft; and addition about 18.2 acres of patented mining claims on Smuggler Mountain near Aspen, Colorado.

In return, the Federal Government would transfer to the county—

A 5.5 acre tract south of Aspen known as the “Wildwood” parcel, which the county will transfer to private ownership after reserving a permanent public easement for a trail;

About 5.92 acres in 12 scattered locations on Smuggler Mountain that abut or are near lands now owned by the county;

And, finally, a 40-acre tract of BLM land along the Crystal River, which will be subject to a permanent conservation easement limiting future use to recreational, fish and wildlife, and open space purposes.

The bill requires standard appraisals of all properties involved. It provides that if the lands going to the county are worth less than what the county is giving to the Federal Government, the county will waive additional payment, while if the lands provide by the county are worth less than those the county is to receive, the county will either pay cash to equalize or will convey an additional tract of about 160 acres, in the Sellers’ Meadow area near Hagerman Pass, to make up the difference.

The Resources Committee made some technical changes suggested by the administration and the county and the House passed the bill as so amended last year.

On September 29th, the Senate by unanimous consent passed an amended version of the House-passed bill, adding some provisions regarding public access to and future use of the lands to be acquired by the county and making a number of other, technical changes.

The Senate’s changes are consistent with the original intent of the legislation and are acceptable to the county. Accordingly, I urge the House to concur in the Senate amendment and so to send the bill to the President for signing into law.

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

Mr. RADANOVICH. 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 California (Mr. RADANOVICH) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 1129.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LOWER FARMINGTON RIVER AND SALMON BROOK WILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY ACT OF 2005

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 435) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of the Farmington River and Salmon Brook in the State of Con-

necticut for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 435

*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 “Lower Farmington River and Salmon Brook Wild and Scenic River Study Act of 2005”.

#### SEC. 2. DESIGNATION OF ADDITIONAL SEGMENT OF FARMINGTON RIVER AND SALMON BROOK IN CONNECTICUT FOR STUDY FOR POTENTIAL ADDITION TO NATIONAL WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS SYSTEM.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Section 5(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1276(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(139) LOWER FARMINGTON RIVER AND SALMON BROOK, CONNECTICUT.—The segment of the Farmington River downstream from the segment designated as a recreational river by section 3(a)(156) to its confluence with the Connecticut River, and the segment of the Salmon Brook including its mainstream and east and west branches.”.

(b) TIME FOR SUBMISSION.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall submit to Congress a report containing the results of the study required by the amendment made by subsection (a).

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) and the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Speaker, Senate 435, introduced by Senator LIEBERMAN of Connecticut and a companion to H.R. 1344 sponsored by our colleague NANCY JOHNSON, would study a segment of Farmington River and Salmon Brook in Connecticut for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic River System.

I urge adoption of the bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the majority has already explained the purpose of S. 435, which passed the Senate in December 2005. The legislation is nearly identical to a bill which has already passed the House. Since S. 435 simply authorizes a study of a proposed river designation, we have no objection to the adoption of the legislation by the House today.

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

□ 1430

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 435,

the Lower Farmington River and Salmon Brook Wild and Scenic River Study Act of 2005. Once passed, the bill will designate a segment of the Farmington River and Salmon Brook in the State of Connecticut for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. I would like to thank the chairman of the Resources Committee, Mr. POMBO, for bringing this legislation to the floor and for working with me to ensure that this important study can commence promptly.

The bill commissions a feasibility study to evaluate whether the Lower Farmington River and the Salmon Brook qualify as a Wild and Scenic Partnership River within the National Park Service's Wild and Scenic Rivers System. The Lower Farmington River is defined as the 40-mile stretch between the end of the west branch of the Farmington River in Canton, Connecticut, and the Rainbow Dam in Windsor, and the Salmon Brook, an additional 32-mile stretch in the top 12 in the State of Connecticut for diversity of aquatic insects it hosts. The study area crosses both the Fifth and First Congressional Districts. The Farmington River and Salmon Brook's recreational and environmental contributions to our State are well-known and a valuable resource for future generations.

The 14 miles of the Farmington River's west branch, designated as a Wild and Scenic Partnership River in 1994, is a resounding environmental and economic success story. Partnership designation for the west branch has fostered public-private partnerships to preserve the area's environment and heritage while yielding economic benefits to river towns. Its designation has preserved it as a home to trout, river otter, and bald eagle populations; and historic structures still grace its banks. Fishermen, hikers, canoeists, and kayakers enjoy the river year-round.

I hope to see the rest of the Farmington River, as well as Salmon Brook, enjoy similar success. This new initiative is an ideal way to showcase the whole river's unique cultural and recreational resources. The direct economic impact of the final designation is estimated at \$3 million and an additional \$9 million in total economic impact from recreational users.

This legislation has broad bipartisan support at the local, State, and Federal level, and I urge my colleagues' support for the bill.

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentlewoman from Connecticut for her hard work and bipartisanship in advancing this legislation.

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

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 435.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PACTOLA RESERVOIR REALLOCATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2005

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 819) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reallocate costs of the Pactola Dam and Reservoir, South Dakota, to reflect increased demands for municipal, industrial, and fish and wildlife purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 819

*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 "Pactola Reservoir Reallocation Authorization Act of 2005".

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) it is appropriate to reallocate the costs of the Pactola Dam and Reservoir, South Dakota, to reflect increased demands for municipal, industrial, and fish and wildlife purposes; and

(2) section 302 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7152) prohibits such a reallocation of costs without congressional approval.

#### SEC. 3. REALLOCATION OF COSTS OF PACTOLA DAM AND RESERVOIR, SOUTH DAKOTA.

The Secretary of the Interior may, as provided in the contract of August 2001 entered into between Rapid City, South Dakota, and the Rapid Valley Conservancy District, reallocate, in a manner consistent with Federal reclamation law (the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388, chapter 1093), and Acts supplemental to and amendatory of that Act (43 U.S.C. 371 et seq.)), the construction costs of Pactola Dam and Reservoir, Rapid Valley Unit, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, South Dakota, from irrigation purposes to municipal, industrial, and fish and wildlife purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) and the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, Senate 819, introduced by Senator TIM JOHNSON of South Dakota, reallocates the costs of the Pactola Dam and Reservoir to reflect growing municipal needs for water. As Rapid City's municipal water needs are growing at a rapid rate and demand for local irrigation water decreases, this legislation appropriately reallocates the costs associated with the changing water needs. This bill is a win for the citizens of Rapid City and a win for the American taxpayer, and I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation.

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

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

(Ms. HERSETH asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support S. 819, sponsored by Senator TIM JOHNSON, which is the counterpart to legislation I sponsored which passed this body earlier this year. This bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to reallocate the construction costs of Pactola Dam and Reservoir. This important water supply project is located just 15 miles west of Rapid City in my home State of South Dakota.

The water supply needs of the Rapid City area have changed dramatically since the Bureau of Reclamation built Pactola Dam 50 years ago. Rapid City is the second largest city in South Dakota, and there is no doubt this metropolitan area will continue to enjoy strong economic and population growth. The cost reallocation authorized in this legislation will simply allow the Secretary of the Interior to modernize the financial structure of the project to reflect the changing water supply needs of this area of my State.

I want to thank Chairman RADANOVICH, Ranking Member NAPOLITANO, and committee staff for working with me to advance the House counterpart of this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support S. 819.

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

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, the Pactola Dam, located near Rapid City, South Dakota, stores water from Rapid Creek and is part of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program. This bill authorizes reallocation of a portion of the construction costs of the Pactola Dam and Reservoir from irrigation purposes to municipal and industrial and fish and wildlife purposes.

The effort to reallocate Pactola Dam costs stems from the population growth around Rapid City, with corresponding increases in demand for M&I water and decreases in demand for irrigation water. Pactola Dam originally provided water storage for flood control, irrigation, and M&I uses. A 40-year water service contract between the Bureau of Reclamation and Rapid City for M&I water expired in 1991.