

“(f) HIGH SCHELLS WILDERNESS ADJUSTMENT.—The boundary of the High Schells Wilderness established under subsection (a)(11) is adjusted—

“(1) to include the land identified as ‘Include as Wilderness’ on the map titled ‘McCoy Creek Adjustment’ and dated November 3, 2014; and

“(2) to exclude the land identified as ‘NFS Lands’ on the map titled ‘Proposed Wilderness Boundary Adjustment High Schells Wilderness Area’ and dated January 19, 2017.’”

(b) AMENDMENTS TO THE NEVADA WILDERNESS PROTECTION ACT OF 1989.—The Nevada Wilderness Protection Act of 1989 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“SEC. 12. ARC DOME BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.**

“The boundary of the Arc Dome Wilderness established under section 2(2) is adjusted to exclude the land identified as ‘Exclude from Wilderness’ on the map titled ‘Arc Dome Adjustment’ and dated November 3, 2014.’”

**SEC. 5. IMPLEMENTATION OF WHITE PINE COUNTY CONSERVATION, RECREATION, AND DEVELOPMENT ACT.**

(a) DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS.—Section 312 of the White Pine County Conservation, Recreation, and Development Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-432; 120 Stat. 3030) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “and planning” and inserting “municipal water and sewer infrastructure, public electric transmission facilities, public broadband infrastructure, and planning”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (G), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (H), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(I) processing by a government entity of public land-use authorizations and rights-of-way relating to the development of land conveyed to the County under this Act, with an emphasis on authorizations and rights-of-way relating to any infrastructure needed for the expansion of the White Pine County Industrial Park under section 352(c)(2).”

(b) CONVEYANCE TO WHITE PINE COUNTY, NEVADA.—Section 352 of the White Pine County Conservation, Recreation, and Development Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-432; 120 Stat. 3039) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of the Nevada Lands Bill Technical Corrections Act of 2018” before “the Secretary”; and

(2) in subsection (c)(3)(B)(i), by striking “through a competitive bidding process” and inserting “consistent with section 244 of the Nevada Revised Statutes (as in effect on the date of enactment of the Eastern Nevada Economic Development and Land Management Improvement Act)”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(e) DEADLINE.—If the Secretary has not conveyed to the County the parcels of land described in subsection (b) by the date that is 120 days after the date of the enactment of the Nevada Lands Bill Technical Corrections Act of 2018, the Secretary shall convey to the County, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the parcels of land.’”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) each will control 20 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Mem-

bers may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials 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. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6299, introduced by Congressman AMODEI of Nevada, provides commonsense improvements and technical corrections to existing laws that will spur economic development and ensure better land management in several Nevada counties, including Storey, Clark, Lincoln, and White Pine. The provisions included in this bill represent strong collaboration with State and local elected officials and have been supported by the entire Nevada congressional delegation.

I want to thank Chairman GOWDY for his cooperation in getting this bill scheduled for consideration and simply conclude by saying this is a good bill. It is going to enhance sound land management and provide significant public benefit to the people of these Nevada communities. I want to thank and commend Congressman AMODEI for his fine work.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I am prepared to close when the gentleman is finished.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,  
Washington, DC, September 20, 2018.

Hon. TREY GOWDY,  
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On September 5, 2018, the Committee on Natural Resources ordered favorably reported H.R. 6299, the Nevada Lands Bill Technical Corrections Act of 2018. This bill was additionally referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

I ask that you allow the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform to be discharged from further consideration of the bill so that it may be scheduled by the Majority Leader. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and your response in the bill report and in the Congressional Record.

Thank you for your consideration, and I look forward to further opportunities to work with you this Congress.

Sincerely,

ROB BISHOP,  
Chairman,  
Committee on Natural Resources.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COM-  
MITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOV-  
ERNMENT REFORM,  
Washington, DC, September 20, 2018.

Hon. ROB BISHOP,  
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 6299, the Nevada Lands Bill Technical Corrections Act of 2018. As

you know, certain provisions of the bill fall within the jurisdiction of Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

As a result of your having consulted with me concerning the provisions of H.R. 6299 that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction, I agree to forgo consideration of the bill, so the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor. I agree that forgoing formal consideration of the bill will not prejudice the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform with respect to any future jurisdictional claim, and I appreciate your agreement to support appointment of members of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform as conferees in any House-Senate conference on this or related legislation. In addition, I request the Committee be consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so we may address any remaining issues within our jurisdiction.

Finally, I request you include your letter and this response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Natural Resources, as well as in the Congressional Record during consideration of the bill on the floor.

Sincerely,

TREY GOWDY.

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

Mr. Speaker, I agree with my colleague. This is a good bill. We are pleased that it facilitates the implementation of the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation plan for the Lower Virgin River. It authorizes funds for fuels reduction and restoration projects in pinyon-juniper-dominated landscapes, makes technical corrections to the boundaries of several wilderness areas and validates a patent associated with a previously authorized land exchange.

A previous version of this bill is co-sponsored by the entire Nevada delegation, and I recognize that its passage is important to the people of eastern Nevada. I do want to thank the majority and the sponsor for working with the BLM to address many of their concerns throughout the bill's history. Resolving those concerns and working with the BLM turned this bill into a proposal we can support.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for adoption of the bill, 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. McCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6299, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIRECTING SECRETARY OF THE  
INTERIOR TO MANAGE AGRICULTURAL  
PROPERTY IN POINT  
REYES NATIONAL SEASHORE

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6687) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to manage the Point

Reyes National Seashore in the State of California consistent with Congress' long-standing intent to maintain working dairies and ranches on agricultural property as part of the seashore's unique historic, cultural, scenic and natural values, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6687

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

**SECTION 1. MANAGEMENT OF AGRICULTURAL PROPERTY IN POINT REYES NATIONAL SEASHORE.**

*Public Law 87-657 (16 U.S.C. 459c, et seq.) is amended as follows:*

(1) In section 5(b) (16 U.S.C. 459c-5(b))—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “As used in” and inserting the following:

“(1) As used in”;

(B) by striking “The term ‘agricultural property’ as used” and inserting the following:

“(2) The term ‘agricultural property’ as used”;

(C) by striking “means lands which were in regular use” and inserting “means—

“(A) lands under agricultural lease or permit as of September 1, 2018, or lands that were in regular use”; and

(D) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and

“(B) on the northern district of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, lands under agricultural lease or permit as of September 1, 2018, or lands that were in regular use for, or were being converted to, agricultural, ranching, or dairying purposes as of May 1, 1978, together with residential and other structures related to the above uses of the property that were in existence or under construction as of May 1, 1978.”.

(2) In section 5 (16 U.S.C. 459c-5)—

(A) by inserting before subsection (a) the following:

“(a) The Secretary shall manage agricultural property consistent with Congress' long-standing intent that working dairies and ranches continue to be authorized to operate on agricultural property as part of the seashore's unique historic, cultural, scenic and natural values.”; and

(B) by redesignating subsequent subsections accordingly.

(3) In section 6 (16 U.S.C. 459c-6), by adding at the end the following:

“(c)(1) In areas of agricultural property where Tule Elk present conflicts with working ranches or dairies, the Secretary shall manage the Tule Elk for separation from the working ranches or dairies. To minimize the conflicts and prevent establishment of new Tule Elk herds on agricultural property, the Secretary may work with Indian Tribes interested in the following:

“(A) Partnering with the Secretary in the relocation and reestablishment of Tule Elk on Tribal lands.

“(B) Participating in hunting Tule Elk on a subsistence or ceremonial basis.

“(C) Other partnerships and activities that the Secretary determines are suitable and feasible for this purpose.

“(2) Nothing in this subsection reduces or diminishes the authority of the Secretary to use other existing authorities or management tools to separate Tule Elk from agricultural property.”.

(4) By adding at the end, the following:

“SEC. 10. Consistent with the purposes of this Act, including section 5(a), the Secretary is directed to complete, without delay, the General Management Plan Amendment for Point Reyes National Seashore and the northern district of Golden Gate National Recreation Area, its Envi-

ronmental Impact Statement, and, upon completion of the Record of Decision, issue leases and special use permits of 20 years for working dairies and ranches on agricultural property. Nothing in this Act requires the Secretary to issue leases and special use permits of 20 years in circumstances where there is no willing lessee, or to a previous lessee who has abandoned or discontinued ranching.”.

Amend the title so as to read: “A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to manage the Point Reyes National Seashore in the State of California consistently with Congress' long-standing intent to continue to authorize working dairies and ranches on agricultural property as part of the seashore's unique historic, cultural, scenic and natural values, and for other purposes.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials 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. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present this bill on behalf of its author, Mr. HUFFMAN, and its cosponsor, Chairman BISHOP. Chairman BISHOP has also asked that I commend my colleague from California for his work and collaboration on this measure.

Representative HUFFMAN worked to forge consensus with diverse local stakeholders on a complicated issue. When we found local solutions that the local people agree is the answer, as has been done here, we should do everything we can on both sides of the aisle to advance the solution forward.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that is strongly bipartisan. It reaffirms congressional intent to continue to authorize sustainable, working dairies and ranches within a portion of the Point Reyes National Seashore. This is consistent with the seashore's historic, cultural, scenic, and natural values.

It also honors repeated Federal promises that the ranches and dairies in the Point Reyes National Seashore would be offered long-term permits so that they can have the certainty and the clarity they need to obtain financing, make family succession plans, and other decisions necessary to continue operations.

For over 150 years, agriculture has been a vital part of the fabric of West Marin, part of my district in northern California. This includes the historic

ranches and dairies in the Point Reyes National Seashore and also some northern portions of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. These ranches and dairies contribute to the unique history, character, and cultural heritage of these magnificent national park units.

The statutory history of Point Reyes reflects Congress' intent to continue ranching in the pastoral areas of the seashore to ensure that future generations could experience these working landscapes. We are reaffirming that intent with this bill.

I think the agricultural heritage of West Marin is worth protecting. The National Park Service agrees. Across Presidential administrations and since the creation of the seashore and the GGNRA, the Park Service has consistently supported continuation of the ranching heritage in these areas. Today, Congress is reaffirming long-standing policy and decades of diligent efforts by the Park Service.

We are also making good on a commitment Interior Secretary Salazar made in November of 2012 to provide long-term assurances for these ranchers and dairies. He specifically directed the Park Service to proceed with extending 20-year permits consistent with applicable laws and planning processes.

□ 2100

Toward that same end, this bill directs the issuance of 20-year leases and permits after completion by the Park Service of a robust general management plan update process, including public engagement and environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act, which must include compliance with the Endangered Species Act and any other environmental reviews.

Through this planning and environmental review process, the Park Service will receive public comment, evaluate possible measures that could improve the environmental sustainability of the ranches and dairies, and ensure the good stewardship of the seashore's national resources.

The general management plan and the NEPA process will inform how the Park Service exercises its broad discretionary authority to set terms and conditions in the leases and the permits, and can develop critical strategies, actions, and policies on a wide range of issues involving land and natural resource management within the seashore.

As any visitor to Point Reyes knows, one of the unique features of the seashore is the successful return of the majestic tule elk. This legislation envisions a healthy coexistence of thriving elk herds and the historic ranches and dairies within the seashore through effective management.

It provides direction to the Park Service to manage for effective separation between tule elk and livestock in areas where growing elk herds have

presented conflicts with working ranches and dairies, such as taking up permanent residence on dairies' critical organic pastureland, interfering with ranch operations, or damaging infrastructure, hardly the outcomes envisioned by the Park Service's 1998 elk management plan.

While providing this general policy guidance, the bill leaves broad discretion to the Park Service to determine how best to manage the elk. It leaves in place all existing tools, while adding a new opportunity to explore relocation and cultural ceremonial activities with interested Native American Tribes.

I am grateful for the broad public support that this bill has received, ranging from the Marin Conservation League to the Marin County Farm Bureau and the Marin County Board of Supervisors.

I also want to address, briefly, some misconceptions that a few of the bill's critics have raised.

First, nothing in this bill elevates ranching above other uses of the seashore. It specifically does not amend the purpose section of the enabling act, which means that operations of the ranches and dairies will remain consistent with the policies and legal requirements that govern the Interior Department's stewardship of the land.

It is important to remember that less than one-third of the seashore is in agricultural use today. Nearly twice that amount is designated as wilderness. Nothing in this bill expands agriculture. It is limited to the areas where there is currently ranching or dairy operations.

I also want to address and emphasize the fact that nothing in this bill suggests elimination of elk from the seashore. I am not aware of a single stakeholder who has suggested eliminating elk. If they had, I would reject it. There is no reason elk and ranching cannot coexist on the seashore if there is effective management and separation in areas of conflict. This bill leaves broad discretion to the Park Service to determine the strategies and actions that make the most sense to achieve that goal.

For those worried that this bill may somehow reopen the 2012 decision by Interior Secretary Ken Salazar to not renew for Drakes Bay Oyster Company and to designate and manage Drakes Estero as marine wilderness, let me be emphatically clear. There is nothing in the letter or the intent of this bill that possibly could be read to do that. The bill has nothing to do with the oyster issue. It focuses on making sure the unresolved part of Secretary Salazar's 2012 decision, the part providing long-term assurances for the historic ranches and dairies, is actually carried out.

In this regard, I was mindful in drafting the bill of Secretary Salazar's specific direction in his memo of November 29, 2012, that the Park Service work with the ranches and dairies to "reaf-

firm my intention that, consistent with applicable laws and planning processes, recognition of the role of ranching be maintained and to pursue extending permits to 20-year terms. . . ."

Secretary Salazar also directed that "the values of multigenerational ranching and farming at Point Reyes should be fully considered in future planning efforts. These working ranches are a vibrant and compatible part of Point Reyes National Seashore and both now and in the future represent an important contribution to Point Reyes' superlative natural and cultural resources." I couldn't agree more.

Finally, we have been careful in this bill not to micromanage or tie the hands of the Park Service. As we made clear in amendments at markup and in the committee report, the Service retains the ability to exercise common-sense discretion in the supervision of the seashore's agriculture property and in administering its various permits and leases.

For example, the Park Service is not financially responsible for operating ranches and dairies. It is not required to bring back property into agriculture if it has been retired or converted to other purposes. It doesn't have to allow ranching on agricultural property where there is no willing lessee.

Nothing in this bill diminishes any of the Secretary's existing discretionary authority regarding how to manage agricultural property, including setting and enforcing permit terms and conditions and allowing shorter lease or permit terms if a rancher does not want a 20-year lease or permit. All of this is common sense.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6687 is a narrowly tailored bill to help ensure that sustainable ranches and dairies continue as part of the fabric of our spectacular Point Reyes National Seashore for generations to come. The bill does this without compromising any environmental standards. It is consistent with both longstanding congressional intent, with Secretary Salazar's 2012 policy directive, and with the current National Park Service planning process.

I am proud that this bill has been a refreshing bipartisan effort here in Congress, and I do want to thank my colleagues on the Natural Resources Committee for their support and assistance, especially Chairman ROB BISHOP and his staff, as well as Ranking Member RAÚL GRIJALVA and his staff, who have worked diligently to perfect this legislation and to move it forward.

I also want to thank my staff, especially my district director, Jenny Callaway, as well as Logan Ferree and Christine Sur from my legislative team, for their hard work to make this bill possible.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for adoption of the bill, 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. McCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6687, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to manage the Point Reyes National Seashore in the State of California consistently with Congress' long-standing intent to continue to authorize working dairies and ranches on agricultural property as part of the seashore's unique historic, cultural, scenic and natural values, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FDR HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5420) to authorize the acquisition of land for addition to the Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site in the State of New York, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5420

*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 "FDR Historic Preservation Act".*

#### SEC. 2. HOME OF FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE.

(a) *LAND ACQUISITION.*—The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase from a willing seller using donated funds, or exchange, the approximately 89 acres of land identified as the "Morgan Property" and generally depicted on the map titled "Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site, Proposed Park Addition", numbered 384/138,461 and dated May 2017.

(b) *AVAILABILITY OF MAP.*—The map referred to in subsection (a) shall be available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(c) *BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT; ADMINISTRATION.*—Upon acquisition of the land referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior shall—

(1) *adjust the boundary of the Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site to reflect the acquisition; and*

(2) *administer such land as part of the Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site in accordance with applicable laws.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK).

GENERAL LEAVE

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