

House today is the best long-term approach to this problem.

During subcommittee and committee consideration in the 107th Congress, I made a number of changes to the bill that addressed issues raised by the administration, members of the Committee on Resources and the Committee on Education and the Workforce. For example, the bill makes it clear that funds made available by the Secretary under H.R. 620 will not go towards new construction, construction contracts, or major capital improvements and thus would be limited to general upkeep, maintenance, and classroom teaching.

Madam Speaker, I do not think that we should stand by and permit children of the Park Service and concessionaire employees from being deprived of their education simply because their parents have chosen to work in Yosemite National Park.

□ 1430

Lastly, the bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to locate facilities including transportation systems outside the boundaries of the Yosemite National Park. H.R. 620 is supported by the minority and majority of the Committee on Resources and the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 620, as amended.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

(Mr. KIND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, we have no objections to this legislation in its current form and would encourage our colleagues to support its passage. H.R. 620 provides a unique arrangement for funding certain local public schools. The legislation authorizes the National Park Service to provide funds and services to supplement the educational services and facilities provided to children of Yosemite National Park employees and the park concessionaire at three small local schools located within the park system.

Similar legislation was considered in the 107th Congress. Initially, a significant number of issues and problems were associated with that bill; however, the sponsor, the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH), agreed to a number of changes requested by the minority and the administration; and it appears as if we have worked out some of those concerns.

There were also changes made to the bill as a result of negotiations with the Committee on Education and the Workforce that holds joint jurisdiction with the Committee on Resources over this matter. As a result of those changes, the bill passed the House in April of 2002.

H.R. 620 is essentially the same bill that was passed through the House last

year with limitations on the amount, use, source, and duration of the funds for these local schools. Of particular note, while the bill authorizes the use of appropriated funds, it is our expectation that these will be newly appropriated funds and not come from the existing operating budget within the park system. Yosemite National Park, like many other national parks, has significant operating challenges. The park can ill afford to divert operating funds to a nonoperations function.

Madam Speaker, as I noted earlier, this legislation does provide a unique arrangement for funding what should be a local responsibility. However, we have no objection to the bill's consideration, and again we encourage its passage here today.

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

Mr. RADANOVICH. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 620, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GLEN CANYON NATIONAL RECREATION AREA BOUNDARY REVISION ACT

Mr. RADANOVICH. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 788) to revise the boundary of the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area in the States of Utah and Arizona.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 788

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 "Glen Canyon National Recreation Area Boundary Revision Act".

SEC. 2. GLEN CANYON NATIONAL RECREATION AREA BOUNDARY REVISION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The first section of Public Law 92-593 (16 U.S.C. 460dd; 86 Stat. 1311) is amended—

(1) by striking "That in" and inserting "SECTION 1. (a) In"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) In addition to the boundary change authority under subsection (a), the Secretary may acquire approximately 152 acres of private land in exchange for approximately 370 acres of land within the boundary of Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, as generally depicted on the map entitled 'Page One Land Exchange Proposal', number 608/60573a-2002, and dated May 16, 2002. The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service. Upon conclusion of the exchange, the boundary of the recreation area shall be revised to reflect the exchange."

(b) CHANGE IN ACREAGE CEILING.—Such section is further amended by striking "one million two hundred and thirty-six thousand eight hundred and eighty acres" and inserting "1,256,000 acres".

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

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

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 788, as introduced by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON), would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to complete a land exchange that would help protect an important viewshed located in southern Utah at the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area and revise the boundaries of the park to reflect the change. The exchange would facilitate the acquisition of 152 acres, including an important scenic viewshed by the National Park Service, while the private developer would acquire 370 acres of land on the other side of Highway 89 that is more appropriate for development. The parcel acquired by the Park Service will also help facilitate a more manageable boundary at the park's most visited entrance. While the Park Service will be acquiring land of considerably greater value than the developer, the private developer has expressed his willingness to donate the approximately \$350,000 difference in value to the National Park Service. Both parties consider the exchange to be mutually beneficial.

The House passed legislation containing this same exchange during the 107th Congress. The bill is supported, as it was during the last Congress, by both the majority and the minority as well as the administration, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

(Mr. KIND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, we also support the passage of H.R. 788, a bill which is similar to legislation which passed the House in June of last year. It must be said, however, that there continues to be great concern regarding most cases where public land owned by the American taxpayer is exchanged for private land. In many instances it is not at all clear that the taxpayers are receiving full value for the lands being traded away in their names. In fact, in many cases it is clear that they are not.

We have been working with our friends on the other side of the aisle and the Federal Land Management agencies to develop a more comprehensive approach to exchanges that might address the failures in the current process, and we look forward to continuing those efforts. In the meantime,

it is our hope that we would only approve specific exchanges that truly serve the best interests of the American taxpayer.

Fortunately, it appears we have such an exchange in this instance. The basic concept of the exchange contained in H.R. 788 appears to serve both the interests of the private landowner as well as the park. In addition, once authorized, this exchange will go through a full NEPA process, including appraisals, which should identify and address any remaining issues.

We commend the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) on his legislation and support passage of H.R. 788 and encourage our colleagues to do the same.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON).

Mr. CANNON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 788. This bill has two purposes: first, it will revise the boundary of the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area in Utah by exchanging 152 acres of land owned by Page One LLC for approximately 370 acres of land within the National Recreation Area. This exchange will enable both entities to consolidate the properties and make it possible for the Park Service to better protect the area around Lake Powell and Highway 89.

The second purpose of the bill is to increase the acreage ceiling for the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area. The park's enabling legislation incorrectly identified the total acreage within the park boundary. H.R. 788 will correct that error.

The bill is the result of years of discussion and negotiation between Page One and the National Park Service. The Park Service has been involved from day one. The local communities have also voiced their support for this bill. In addition, the Kane County Planning and Zoning Commission, the Southern Utah Planning Advisory Council, and the National Parks Conservation Association all endorse this land exchange.

H.R. 788 is a noncontroversial piece of legislation that is beneficial to the park, to the private developer, and to the public at large. I urge its support.

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Madam Speaker, I have no further 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 bill, H.R. 788.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Madam 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.

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN PROTECTION ACT

Mr. RADANOVICH. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 961) to promote Department of the Interior efforts to provide a scientific basis for the management of sediment and nutrient loss in the Upper Mississippi River Basin, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 961

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 "Upper Mississippi River Basin Protection Act".

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

Sec. 3. Reliance on sound science.

TITLE I—SEDIMENT AND NUTRIENT MONITORING NETWORK

Sec. 101. Establishment of monitoring network.

Sec. 102. Data collection and storage responsibilities.

Sec. 103. Relationship to existing sediment and nutrient monitoring.

Sec. 104. Collaboration with other public and private monitoring efforts.

Sec. 105. Reporting requirements.

Sec. 106. National Research Council assessment.

TITLE II—COMPUTER MODELING AND RESEARCH

Sec. 201. Computer modeling and research of sediment and nutrient sources.

Sec. 202. Use of electronic means to distribute information.

Sec. 203. Reporting requirements.

TITLE III—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS AND RELATED MATTERS

Sec. 301. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 302. Cost-sharing requirements.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) The terms "Upper Mississippi River Basin" and "Basin" mean the watershed portion of the Upper Mississippi River and Illinois River basins, from Cairo, Illinois, to the headwaters of the Mississippi River, in the States of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Iowa, and Missouri. The designation includes the Kaskaskia watershed along the Illinois River and the Meramec watershed along the Missouri River.

(2) The terms "Upper Mississippi River Stewardship Initiative" and "Initiative" mean the activities authorized or required by this Act to monitor nutrient and sediment loss in the Upper Mississippi River Basin.

(3) The term "sound science" refers to the use of accepted and documented scientific methods to identify and quantify the sources, transport, and fate of nutrients and sediment and to quantify the effect of various treatment methods or conservation

measures on nutrient and sediment loss. Sound science requires the use of documented protocols for data collection and data analysis, and peer review of the data, results, and findings.

SEC. 3. RELIANCE ON SOUND SCIENCE.

It is the policy of Congress that Federal investments in the Upper Mississippi River Basin must be guided by sound science.

TITLE I—SEDIMENT AND NUTRIENT MONITORING NETWORK

SEC. 101. ESTABLISHMENT OF MONITORING NETWORK.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—As part of the Upper Mississippi River Stewardship Initiative, the Secretary of the Interior shall establish a sediment and nutrient monitoring network for the Upper Mississippi River Basin for the purposes of—

(1) identifying and evaluating significant sources of sediment and nutrients in the Upper Mississippi River Basin;

(2) quantifying the processes affecting mobilization, transport, and fate of those sediments and nutrients on land and in water;

(3) quantifying the transport of those sediments and nutrients to and through the Upper Mississippi River Basin;

(4) recording changes to sediment and nutrient loss over time;

(5) providing coordinated data to be used in computer modeling of the Basin, pursuant to section 201; and

(6) identifying major sources of sediment and nutrients within the Basin for the purpose of targeting resources to reduce sediment and nutrient loss.

(b) ROLE OF UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.—The Secretary of the Interior shall carry out this title acting through the office of the Director of the United States Geological Survey.

SEC. 102. DATA COLLECTION AND STORAGE RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) GUIDELINES FOR DATA COLLECTION AND STORAGE.—The Secretary of the Interior shall establish guidelines for the effective design of data collection activities regarding sediment and nutrient monitoring, for the use of suitable and consistent methods for data collection, and for consistent reporting, data storage, and archiving practices.

(b) RELEASE OF DATA.—Data resulting from sediment and nutrient monitoring in the Upper Mississippi River Basin shall be released to the public using generic station identifiers and hydrologic unit codes. In the case of a monitoring station located on private lands, information regarding the location of the station shall not be disseminated without the landowner's permission.

(c) PROTECTION OF PRIVACY.—Data resulting from sediment and nutrient monitoring in the Upper Mississippi River Basin is not subject to the mandatory disclosure provisions of section 552 of title 5, United States Code, but may be released only as provided in subsection (b).

SEC. 103. RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING SEDIMENT AND NUTRIENT MONITORING.

(a) INVENTORY.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary of the Interior shall inventory the sediment and nutrient monitoring efforts, in existence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, of Federal, State, local, and nongovernmental entities for the purpose of creating a baseline understanding of overlap, data gaps and redundancies.

(b) INTEGRATION.—On the basis of the inventory, the Secretary of the Interior shall integrate the existing sediment and nutrient monitoring efforts, to the maximum extent practicable, into the sediment and nutrient monitoring network required by section 101.

(c) CONSULTATION AND USE OF EXISTING DATA.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall make maximum