SHASTA-TRINITY NATIONAL FOREST ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION TRANSFER ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 689) to interchange the administrative jurisdiction of certain Federal lands between the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Shasta-Trinity National Forest Administrative Jurisdiction Transfer Act''.

SEC. 2. TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION TO THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Administrative jurisdiction over the Federal land described in subsection (b) is transferred from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The Federal land referred to in subsection (a) is the land within the Shasta-Trinity National Forest in California, Mount Diablo Meridian, as generally depicted on the map entitled ''Shasta-Trinity Administrative Jurisdiction Transfer: Transfer from Forest Service to BLM, Map 1'' and dated November 23, 2009.

(c) MANAGEMENT AND STATUS OF TRANSFERRED LAND.—The Federal land described in subsection (b) shall be administered in accordance with—

(1) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and

(2) any other applicable law (including regulations).

SEC. 3. TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION TO THE FOREST SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Administrative jurisdiction over the Federal land described in subsection (b) is transferred from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Agriculture.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The Federal land referred to in subsection (a) is the land administered by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management in the Mount Diablo Meridian, California, as generally depicted on the map entitled ''Shasta-Trinity Administrative Jurisdiction Transfer: Transfer from BLM to Forest Service, Map 2'' and dated November 23, 2009.

(c) MANAGEMENT AND STATUS OF TRANSFERRED LAND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Federal land described in subsection (b) shall be—

(A) withdrawn from the public domain;

(B) reserved for administration as part of the Shasta-Trinity National Forest; and

(C) managed in accordance with the laws (including the regulations) generally applicable to the National Forest System.

(2) WILDERNESS ADMINISTRATION.—The land transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture under subsection (a) that is within the Trinity Alps Wilderness shall—

(A) not affect the wilderness status of the transferred land; and

(B) be administered in accordance with—

(i) this section;

(ii) the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.); and

(iii) the California Wilderness Act of 1984 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 98–425).

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

(a) CORRECTIONS.—

(1) MINOR ADJUSTMENTS.—The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior may, by mutual agreement, make minor corrections and adjustments to the transfers under this Act to facilitate land management, including corrections and adjustments to any applicable surveys.

(2) PUBLICATIONS.—Any corrections or adjustments made under subsection (a) shall be effective on the date of publication of a notice of the corrections or adjustments in the Federal Register.

(b) HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES.—

(1) NOTICE.—The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior shall, with respect to the land described in sections 2(b) and 3(b), respectively—

(A) identify any known sites containing hazardous substances; and

(B) provide to the head of the Federal agency to which the land is being transferred notice of any sites identified under subparagraph (A).

(2) CLEANUP OBLIGATIONS.—To the same extent as on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, with respect to any Federal liability—

(A) the Secretary of Agriculture shall remain responsible for any cleanup of hazardous substances on the Federal land described in section 2(b); and

(B) the Secretary of the Interior shall remain responsible for any cleanup of hazardous substances on the Federal land described in section 3(b).

(c) EFFECT ON EXISTING RIGHTS AND AUTHORIZATIONS.—Nothing in this Act affects—

(1) any valid existing rights; or

(2) the validity or term and conditions of any existing withdrawal, right-of-way, easement, lease, license, or permit on the land to which administrative jurisdiction is transferred under this Act, except that beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the head of the agency to which administrative jurisdiction over the land is transferred shall be responsible for administering the interests or authorizations (including reissuing the interests or authorizations in accordance with applicable law).

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (H.R. 689), as amended, was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

BLUE RIDGE PARKWAY AND TOWN OF BLOWING ROCK LAND EXCHANGE ACT OF 2009

The bill (H.R. 1121) to authorize a land exchange to acquire lands for the Blue Ridge Parkway from the Town of Blowing Rock, North Carolina, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

UTAH LAND SALE ACT

The bill (H.R. 1442) to provide for the sale of the Federal Government's reversionary interest in approximately 60 acres of land in Salt Lake City, Utah, originally conveyed to the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association under the Act of January 23, 1909, was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

JOHN ADAMS COMMEMORATIVE WORK EXTENSION ACT

The bill (H.R. 2802) to provide for an extension of the legislative authority of the Adams Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in honor of former President John Adams and his legacy, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2010

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 195, H.R. 3619.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3619) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2010, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CONRAD. This is the Statement of Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation for H.R. 3619, as amended by S.A. 3912. This statement has been prepared pursuant to Section 4 of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–139), and is being submitted for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to passage of H.R. 3619, as amended, by the Senate.

Total Budgetary Effects of H.R. 3619, as amended for the 5-year Statutory PAYGO Scorecard: $2 million increase in the deficit.
Total Budgetary Effects of H.R. 3619, as amended for the 10-year Statutory PAYGO Scorecard: $6 million increase in the deficit.

Also submitted for the RECORD as part of this statement is a table prepared by the Congressional Budget Office, which provides additional information on the budgetary effects of this Act.

CBO ESTIMATE OF THE STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR AN AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE TO H.R. 3619, THE COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010 AND 2011, AS PROVIDED TO CBO BY THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, COMMERCE, AND TRANSPORTATION ON MAY 3, 2010

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—												
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2010–2015	2010–2020
	Net Increase or Decrease (−) in the Deficit												
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact [a]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6

[a] H.R. 3619 would increase by $4 million over the 2010–2020 period certain annual payments made by the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund (an increase in direct spending). Provisions of the bill also would reduce offsetting receipts (a credit against direct spending) by about $2 million over the 2010–2020 period because the bill directs the Coast Guard to donate—rather than sell—certain properties to local governments in Michigan.

LIQUEFIED NATURAL GAS FACILITIES

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to engage in a colloquy with my colleague from Rhode Island, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and my colleague from West Virginia, Mr. ROCKEFELLER.

Mr. President, I want to thank the chairman of the Commerce Committee for his leadership in advancing this bill. As he, Senator WHITEHOUSE, and I have discussed, there is significant concern with respect to the safety and security of proposed liquefied natural gas, LNG, facilities throughout the country. Given the Deepwater Horizon disaster in the Gulf of Mexico, we know that no system for handling volatile substances is fool-proof.

Over the last several years, the people of Rhode Island have been greatly concerned about proposals to develop LNG facilities on or in close proximity to Rhode Island's shores, as well as proposals to transit LNG traffic through our waterways. I have come to the floor on many occasions to express my deep concerns about the wisdom of these projects; not as a matter of reflexive opposition to LNG but as a matter of the appropriateness of siting these facilities with little State control.

This includes a proposal in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts that will have significant impact on the State of Rhode Island, as it calls for vessels to transit through Narragansett Bay and off-load at an offshore berth in Mount Hope Bay just outside of Rhode Island waters. Over the years, members of the Rhode Island and Massachusetts delegations have raised concerns about this project, but the most severe impacts of the vessel traffic and related safety and security measures will be on Rhode Island, which has very little authority to influence the process. The Coast Guard has the responsibility of issuing so-called Letters of Recommendation to establish the suitability of a waterway to accommodate this type of vessel traffic and operation. Its determination is critical in the siting LNG facilities. Unfortunately, Rhode Island, like other states, has little recourse to object to the findings or conditions laid out by the Coast Guard, even though the bulk of the vessel activity will take place in its state waters. I believe the state should have a say about the appropriateness of activities in its waterways and should be consulted, especially about the broader impacts of LNG facilities and vessel traffic on other waterway users and on communities.

Although the underlying House bill includes a port security title, the substitute does not. While I recognize that and that the Committee will be dealing with port security legislation later this year, I think that it is critical that we act on this issue as soon as possible. I would like to work with the Chairman in crafting that bill, but I would also ask for his commitment to work to address the issues related to LNG facilities during conference with the House on the Coast Guard Reauthorization bill.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I share the sentiments of the senior Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. REED.

Rhode Islanders are strongly opposed to this project. Furthermore, the process for siting the LNG facility has afforded us too few opportunities to address the impacts it will have on our state's economy, safety, and environment.

The Coast Guard is charged with the narrow task of determining whether LNG tankers can safely transit Rhode Island waters on their way to an offshore berthing station just on the other side of the state line in Massachusetts. However, the safe transit of these tankers is only one of the many important considerations that can, and should, be taken into account in determining the suitability of such a project. Narragansett Bay is the backbone of the Rhode Island economy, as it sustains our fishing, recreation, and tourism sectors. The proposed LNG facility in Fall River threatens to undermine these pillars of our economy.

I am not opposed to LNG as a fuel source. However, I have serious concerns with the proposal under consideration. The LNG tankers transiting Rhode Island waters must pass through heavily populated communities, under the presence of heavy security. The Coast Guard admits that this will likely displace other users of the bay and disrupt traffic on the bridges the tankers must travel beneath. This is too high a burden for Rhode Island to carry for a facility that is located in a neighboring state—and I am not convinced this burden is worth the marginal benefits of the proposed LNG facility.

I thank the Chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, Senator ROCKEFELLER, for his willingness to work with us on an issue critical to the State of Rhode Island.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I am aware of both Senators' concerns and I will work with each of you related to LNG facilities during conference with the House on the Coast Guard Reauthorization bill.

Mr. REED. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I look forward to this issue being addressed in the final Coast Guard Reauthorization bill.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that the Cantwell substitute amendment, which is at the desk, be considered and agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements be printed in the RECORD without further intervening action or debate.

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

The amendment (No. 3912) was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 3619) was read the third time and passed.

CONDEMNING THE CONTINUED DETENTION OF DAW AUNG SAN SUU KYI

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 480.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 480) condemning the continued detention of Burmese democracy leader Daw Aung San Suu Kyi and calling on the military regime in Burma to permit a credible and fair election process and the transition to civilian, democratic rule.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment at the desk be agreed to; the resolution, as amended, be agreed to; the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The amendment (No. 3913) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the resolving clause)

On page 2, beginning on line 7, strike ''the National League for Democracy and other opposition groups,'' and insert ''all political groups and individuals dedicated to democratic ideals,''.

On page 3, beginning on line 9, strike ''(including the People's Republic of China, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, and the United Nations Security Council)'' and insert '', as appropriate, in order''.

On page 3, line 17, strike ''the National League for Democracy and''.

The resolution (S. Res. 480), as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, with its preamble reads as follows:

S. RES. 480

Whereas the military regime in Burma, headed by General Than Shwe and the State Peace and Development Council, continues to persecute Burmese democracy leader Daw Aung San Suu Kyi and her supporters in the National League for Democracy, and ordinary citizens of Burma, including ethnic minorities, who publically and courageously speak out against the regime's many injustices;

Whereas Daw Aung San Suu Kyi has been imprisoned in Burma for 14 of the last 19 years and many members of the National League for Democracy have been similarly jailed, tortured, or killed;

Whereas the Constitution adopted in 2008 and the election laws recently promulgated effectively prohibit the National League for Democracy, Buddhist monks, ethnic minority leaders, and Daw Aung San Suu Kyi from participating in upcoming elections, and do not leave much opportunity for domestic dialogue among key stakeholders; and

Whereas the persecution of the people of Burma has continued even though the Department of State has pursued a policy of engagement with the military regime designed to secure the release of political prisoners,