The Invest in U.S. Act also takes full aim at rising income inequality. It increases the minimum wage. It provides tax relief for small businesses who hire new employees and those that buy new equipment.

The American people want one thing: an improved economy and more jobs. Join me in supporting this legislation that will finance critical infrastructure investment, fight income inequality, and grow our economy. The argument is about jobs.

REFOCUSING ON THE ENVIRONMENT

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, climate change, offshore drilling, wildfires, scarcity—these concerns are expressed over and over again from my constituents in my district.

People are anxious that the world that they are handing down to their children is not as pristine as the one they inherited. They plead with us to protect the environment. Yet time and time again, the House majority votes to undercut clean air and water laws, while blocking efforts to protect public lands. What a travesty when an allegiance to industry takes precedence over maintaining a healthy environment.

This week, we wasted precious floor time with needless bills, like the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley Emergency Water Delivery Act, which made a mockery of the serious drought in California. The House needs to stop bringing irresponsible bills to the floor, giving away our cherished lands, stripping away environmental protections, and doing nothing to solve real problems like the drought in California.

We have heard their excuses. They say environmental regulations slow the economy, but let's be honest: putting the interest of appropriations above our environment is a dangerously expensive notion.

Let's stop being reactionary and get ahead of these real problems facing our planet.

JOBS BILL

(Ms. HANABUSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, long-term unemployment has not been this high in this great country since World War II.

It is time to look back in our history and see what the leaders did then. We can always learn from the past. In 1944, the President was Franklin Delano Roosevelt. His vision was to expand economic opportunity, jobs. To build the middle class, we must rebuild, and help them thrive, and fight inequality.

Mr. Speaker, how about beginning with women? Today, we have more than 50 million people—13 million of them are children—living below poverty in this country. We have the greatest economy in the world. This is absolutely shameful.

We must adopt and be committed to the concept of full employment. Take up the President's American Jobs Act of 2013. Rebuild this country's infrastructure, invest in education, in our first responders, and in medical researchers. It is time to put America first and Make It In America.

PUBLIC ACCESS AND LANDS IMPROVEMENT ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2954.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 472 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2954.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 0913

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2954) to authorize Escambia County, Florida, to convey certain property that was formerly part of Santa Rosa Island National Monument and that was conveyed to Escambia County subject to restrictions on use and reconveyance, with Mr. DENHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Public Access and Lands Improvement Act, H.R. 2954, is a bipartisan package of 10 bills to protect and promote public access to lands; to improve opportunities by removing red tape that stands in the way of responsible, local economic development and jobs; and to encourage transparent community center land management.

This small grouping of bills will advance important local projects that will have a direct impact on jobs and on economic growth in communities throughout the country.

□ 0915

The package includes several commonsense land conveyance bills to remove unnecessary bureaucratic strings attached to how land is used and how it is managed. It recognizes that locally elected leaders, not Federal bureaucrats, know how to best manage certain lands.

There are measures to prevent unreasonable Federal regulations or actions from destroying a historic lookout tower in my home State of Washington, blocking unreasonable public recreation access to the Cape Hatteras seashore in North Carolina, and preventing the use of hand-powered boats, such as kayaks, in several national parks in the West.

This bill will help family businesses and ranchers by implementing commonsense reforms to the process of renewing livestock grazing permits. Livestock grazing on Federal lands is an important part of the American ranching tradition. This bill will help our Nation's ranchers operate more efficiently and with greater certainty.

The package, Mr. Chairman, also includes legislation sponsored by the Public Lands Subcommittee chairman, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, requiring the BLM to establish an Internet database for all BLM lands that are available for sale to the public.

In the year 2014, if I may be parochial, when a Seahawks fan can purchase a championship hat on the Internet just moments after the Superbowl ends, the Federal Government can certainly get its act together and post its lands that are available for sale online.

This bill will expedite the planning and implementation of emergency salvage timber sales for Federal lands in California that were ravaged by the Rim Fire last summer. Without prompt emergency action, the impacts of this devastating wildfire could become even worse. Fire-damaged trees invite disease. They invite insect infestations. They increase the risk of future wildfires, and they are a threat to visitor safety. Emergency salvage and forest restoration efforts should not be delayed due to bureaucratic hurdles and lawsuits.

Finally, the bill provides for transparency and accountability in how Federal funds are spent in protecting the Chesapeake Bay.

This small package of bills is reasonable, responsible, and it reflects the will of local communities and their elected leaders. It deserves support, I believe, from my Democrat and Republican colleagues.

Before concluding my remarks on this piece of legislation and listening to the statement of the gentleman from Arizona, I would like to briefly address the legislative work of this committee as a whole. The committee, of course, I speak of is the Natural Resources Committee.

Just this week, the House will have considered three measures from the House Natural Resources Committee.

Two of these packages were individual bills, which means a total of 18 different bills from this committee will have effectively been considered and debated and voted upon by the House this week.

Prior to this week, over the first 13 months of this Congress, the Natural Resources Committee has advanced nearly 60 individual bills through the House. Nearly 50 of those bills have passed on a broad bipartisan basis under the expedited suspension process. Ten bills under the jurisdiction of the committee, both Republican and Democrat, have been signed by the President, which represents a noticeable percentage of the public laws that have been enacted by this Congress. These totals do not include individual bills included in other measures, such as bills that were included in the Defense Authorization Act.

Mr. Chairman, this statement is not made as a pat on the back, but to make clear that the intent of this committee is to dutifully work and act on priorities for our Nation. They may be narrow bills to resolve a parochial problem or broad measures affecting the country as a whole. Of course, the nature of our committee is to deal with, in many cases, bills that deal on very parochial issues. That is one of the reasons why there are so many bills that come out of our committee.

In matters of broad policy, some are of great urgency, such as the importance of restoring responsible, active forest management to both support economically struggling rural communities and to improve the health of Federal forests. We passed that bill earlier this year. Just yesterday, the House moved swiftly to provide a solution to the devastating drought in California.

We have also acted on multiple bipartisan measures to streamline red tape and boost America's ability to safely harness our vast energy resources to create jobs—because we know that energy jobs are good-paying jobs—to lower prices, and to strengthen our national security by reducing dependence on foreign energy from hostile nations.

On each of these measures, it is time for the Senate to act and to pass their own proposals so that we can then work to reach an agreement. Obviously, there will be differences between both Houses, but they need to pass their legislation so we can work on the differences so that these measures can become law. We have differences, but we have a responsibility to represent those we are elected to serve and put forward real solutions for the challenges facing the American people.

There are dozens of bills solving local problems, implementing locally supported solutions, and establishing protections for historic and special places that can be acted on by both the House and the Senate. I believe that this is possible on matters under the jurisdiction of the Natural Resources Committee, that we can find common ground with the Senate. Why do I say that? Because we have successfully done so repeatedly over this last year. That is why there are a noticeable number of public laws from our committees that have been acted on by the House and have gone to the President.

But, as always, this will require a willingness to recognize and respect differences in philosophy and procedure in both the House and in the Senate. It must be a two-way street where each Chamber acts on the other's priorities, but, again, has successfully been done in the past, and I know it can be done in the future. The Republican majority in the House has demonstrated our willingness to do so while maintaining our fundamental views on Federal land management, the importance of multiple use of public lands, and the ability of local communities to make better decisions for themselves than Federal bureaucracies.

So as we conclude this week's full slate of action on House Natural Resources Committee bills, I pledge to continue working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and on both sides of the Capitol to make progress in the days, weeks, and months ahead.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me congratulate the chairman on the Seahawks, and also remind him that there was a long 16-game season. They won their division. They played San Francisco three times, two out of three, and then after that they went into the playoffs. Then after the playoffs, they went to the championship game and, finally, to the Superbowl, which they won. Congratulations. So it is great that you got that cap 1 minute after the game was over. I am pointing out that there was a long, deliberate process with rules, games to be won, that encompassed the whole season. Sometimes us rushing legislation is cutting corners that great championship teams like the Seahawks never do.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT), my colleague.

I will have more to say on the specifics of this legislation later.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

I rise today to express my opposition to H.R. 2954, the mistitled Public Access and Lands Improvement Act. Rather than improving our Nation's lands, this bill negatively affects our land management decisions. It conveys or disposes of Federal lands improperly. It rewrites grazing policy, and it waives numerous environmental laws like the Natural Environmental Policy Act, the Wilderness Act, and the Endangered Species Act.

Overall, H.R. 2954 contains a number of provisions that would undermine the responsible balance of interests and considerations in the stewardship of our Nation's lands and our Nation's resources.

Included in the myriad of poor land management provisions that this bill cobbles together is language that gives away thousands of acres of Federal land in Florida, Alaska, and Nevada, valued at millions of dollars, without a transparent public planning process. When the Federal Government gives away land, we do so with certain understandings of how it will be used. It is just wrong to change the rules without due consideration and without any compensation for the Federal Government—the taxpayers of this Nation—if others will now profit from this land.

Yet another ill-advised land management provision, H.R. 2954 also prevents the Bureau of Land Management from carrying out its mission to manage public lands for multiple use. Specifically, this bill requires that until the agency creates a public database of all lands identified for disposal, BLM would be barred from all land acquisitions. This is couched as a transparency measure when, in reality, it is nothing more than an attempt to prevent and delay BLM from doing its all-important work.

Further, provisions of the bill would disregard or reduce public engagement on a range of community interests, including natural resource protections. In fact, H.R. 2954 would overturn a multiyear National Park Service process that has resulted in balanced provisions that protect threatened shorebirds and endangered nesting sea turtles while preserving the economic health of the community at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The National Park Service should be allowed to continue their balanced and successful management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore in order to ensure these critical protections remain in place.

Along with these poor land management decisions and irresponsible consideration of our Nation's lands and natural resources, H.R. 2954 would eliminate or delay timely reviews of grazing leases necessary to ensure sound conservation principles.

In addition, H.R. 2954 includes a bill to expedite salvaged logging on the Rim Fire area of northern California, overriding NEPA and administrative and judicial review.

The end result after piecing together all these provisions is a piece of legislation that waives Federal law, including laws that require consultation with Federal, State, local, or tribal governments or with local residents in order, among other things, to expedite timber harvest on certain Federal lands in California; reverse course on the science-based National Park Service plan that provides an appropriate balance of off-road vehicle access and protection of sensitive seashore areas in North Carolina; and waive NEPA in multiple scenarios, weakening important public involvement and planning provisions.

Mr. Chairman, our public lands and natural resources would simply be mismanaged, unprotected, and undervalued as a result of this bill. I believe we have to put partisan politics aside and work together to protect and responsibly manage America's natural resources and to support and ensure that the Nation's spectacular landscapes, unique natural life, and cultural resources and icons endure for future generations. This bill is just a giant step in the wrong direction.

Mr. Chairman, for all these reasons, I urge my colleagues here in the House to vote ''no'' on H.R. 2954.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), who is the author of one of the titles of the bill.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and particularly want to thank him for his work on the Natural Resources Committee and for his invaluable assistance on this bill.

This summer, the biggest fire in the history of the Sierra Nevada mountains burned 400 square miles of forestland. The fire left behind an unprecedented swath of environmental devastation that threatens the loss not only of the affected forestland for generations to come, but sets events in motion that could destroy the surrounding forest for many years to come.

The fire also left behind hundreds of millions of board feet of dead timber that is on Federal land that could be sold to raise millions of dollars, money that could then be used to replant and reforest our devastated lands. In addition, processing that timber would help to revive the economy of a stricken region.

But time is already running out. Within a year, the value of the timber declines rapidly as the wood is devoured by insects and rot. That is the problem. Cumbersome environmental reviews and litigation that inevitably follow will run up the clock of this valuable asset until it becomes absolutely worthless.

□ 0930

Indeed, it becomes worse than worthless—it becomes hazardous. Bark and wood-boring beetles are already moving in to feast on the dead and dying timber, and a population explosion of pestilence can be expected if those dead trees remain. The beetles won't confine themselves to the fire areas, posing a mortal threat to the adjacent forests.

By the time the normal bureaucratic reviews and lawsuits have run their course, what was once forestland will have already begun converting to brushland, and by the following year, reforestation will have become infinitely more difficult and expensive. Within just a few years, several feet of dry brush will have built up, and the smaller trees will have begun toppling on this tinder. It is not possible to build a more perfect fire stack than that. That means that intense second-generation fires will take advantage of this fuel, sterilizing the soil, eroding the landscape, fouling the watersheds, and jeopardizing surrounding forests.

Without timely salvage and reforestation, we know the fate of the Sierras because we have seen the result of neglect after previous fires. The trees don't come back for many, many generations. Instead, thick brush takes over the land that was once shaded by towering forests. It quickly overwhelms any seedlings struggling to make a start. It replaces the diverse ecosystems supported by the forests with scrub brush.

For this reason, I introduced H.R. 3188, which waives the time-consuming environmental review process and prevents the endless litigation that always follows. It authorizes Federal forest managers, following well-established environmental protocols for salvage, to sell the dead timber and to supervise its careful removal while there is still time. The millions of dollars raised can then be directed toward replanting the region before layers of brush choke off any chance of forest regrowth in the foreseeable future.

It was modeled on legislation authored by Democratic Senator Tom Daschle for salvaging dead and dying trees in the Black Hills National Forest, a measure credited with speeding the preservation and recovery of that forest. Unfortunately, the bill spawned lurid tales from the activist left of uncontrolled logging in the Sierras. Nothing could be further from the truth. The legislation vests full control of the salvage plans with Federal forest managers, not the logging companies. It leaves Federal foresters in charge of enforcing salvage plans that fully protect the environment.

Because of the opposition—and we heard a little bit of it just a moment ago—in a few minutes, I will offer an amendment that was worked out in consultation with the U.S. Forest Service and with several Democratic offices, and I hope it will receive bipartisan support. It preserves the EIS process and the environmental and judicial reviews, but it expedites them and assures that salvage under the direction of the Forest Service can begin this spring.

There is plenty of room for compromise, but there is absolutely no excuse for inaction. The left wants a policy of benign neglect—to let a quarter of a million acres of destroyed timber rot in place, to surrender the ravaged land to beetles and to watch contentedly as the forest ecosystem is replaced by scrub brush. It is true that without human intervention the forests will eventually return in about a century from now but certainly not in the lifetimes of ourselves, of our children or of our children's children. If we want to stop the loss of this forestland and if we want to control the beetle infestation before it explodes out of control, the dead timber has to come out soon.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. If we take it up now, we can generate the funds necessary to suppress brush buildup, to plant new seedlings and to restore these forests for the use and enjoyment of our children. If we wait for the normal bureaucratic reviews and litigation and delays, we will have lost these forests for the next several generations.

The irony is that 16,000 acres of that same forest were destroyed but were on private land. The owner, Sierra Pacific Industries, is in the process of salvaging the timber on their lands. They will be done by this summer, and then they will begin reforesting from a portion of those proceeds. Meanwhile, the public lands lay unattended. Let me tell you something. Within a couple of years, the difference is going to be dramatic. We will have fully salvaged and reforested private lands next to neglected, overgrown public lands that are dry with scrub brush and just waiting for the next fire.

The public management of our lands will be judged in comparison with the management of the private lands, and if we maintain current law, we will have been held in the balance and found wonting.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlelady from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today with great frustration, and must oppose the Public Access and Lands Improvement Act in its current form.

This bill is a merger of 10 public lands and natural resource bills, all of which are unrelated to each other and many of which would ignore the best available science, would compromise the stewardship of our public lands and would completely disregard the bedrock environmental laws that have served to protect our environment and cherished open space for decades.

That being said, there is one part of this bill that I do support. Buried in title VI of this bill is the Green Mountain Lookout Heritage Protection Act, which I introduced with Congressman LARSEN and Senators MURRAY and CANTWELL.

Green Mountain Lookout, located in the Glacier Peak Wilderness, was built in 1933 as a Civilian Conservation Corps project to detect fires and spot enemy aircraft during World War II. The lookout is an important, historic and unique part of the Pacific Northwest. It is a popular destination for hikers, and it is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Unfortunately, severe weather caused the Green Mountain Lookout to fall into disrepair in 2001, and the U.S. Forest Service began taking steps to preserve the historic

structure for future generations. However, an out-of-State group filed a lawsuit against the Forest Service for using machinery to conduct these repairs, and a U.S. District Court ordered the Forest Service to remove the lookout.

My bill would allow critical and routine maintenance while keeping this iconic structure where it is meant to be—in its original home. Local governments in the area, my constituents, as well as a number of environmental and historic preservation groups support my bill to keep the Green Mountain Lookout where it is. The Natural Resources Committee agrees. They passed this bill unanimously last year, and why wouldn't they? This bill is common sense. It saves us money because it would actually cost more to remove the lookout than to keep it where it is.

There is absolutely no doubt in my mind that, if this bill had been brought up on its own, by its own merits, it would have passed with overwhelming bipartisan support. Unfortunately, that is not what is happening here today. Instead, this bill has gotten wrapped up in a series of very controversial and divisive bills. The Green Mountain Lookout represents a significant piece of the Pacific Northwest's history, and it deserves to be protected for outdoor enthusiasts to enjoy for years to come. It does not deserve to be wrapped up in a package of bills that we all know will be dead on arrival in the Senate. The administration has also voiced its support for keeping the Green Mountain Lookout where it is while strongly opposing the rest of this bill.

Green Mountain deserves a vote on its own, and I am extremely disappointed that my amendment to separate my bill from the rest of this package was denied a chance to be considered today. The way this piece of legislation was handled is emblematic of the dysfunction that is so prevalent and so unnecessary in Congress today. The people of Washington State expect Congress to make progress, and they expect compromise, not partisan exercises that won't make it to the President's desk or achieve a meaningful result. I am deeply disappointed that that is where this bill is today, and I know that many of my constituents are as well.

It is my hope that I will be able to work with my colleagues from across the aisle to consider the Green Mountain Lookout Heritage Protection Act before it is too late. The need for immediate action is great because, if the lookout is moved once, there is no moving it back.

It is simple. Taking care of our environment is critical to protecting the quality of life we cherish. I cannot in good conscience support this overall bill due to the many other harmful measures that are included in this package.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR), who is an author of one of the titles of the bill.

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of title VIII of H.R. 2954, which I originally introduced as H.R. 657, the Grazing Improvement Act. I thank Chairman HASTINGS for recognizing the importance of this issue and for including it in H.R. 2954 for consideration today.

Livestock grazing is an important part of the rich ranching tradition in Idaho and the United States. My home State of Idaho produces some of the world's finest lamb and beef. Food production is a major part of Idaho's history, and it is an integral part of our cultural fabric and our economic security. These traditions are under attack, and we must preserve them for future generations.

The financial security of ranchers depends upon their responsible stewardship of the land. Unfortunately, the Federal process to review the permits which allows them to produce food has become severely backlogged due to lawsuits aimed at eliminating livestock from public lands. The local Federal land-managing offices cannot keep up with the pace of litigation and the endless environmental analysis. This diverts the already limited resources from these offices and leaves ranchers at risk of losing their grazing permits and jeopardizing their livelihoods.

Agriculture is a challenging way to make a living, but producers choose this path because it is their passion, and it is their way of life. Several ranchers in my State of Idaho have said, if they were to lose their grazing permits, they would have to subdivide their land and further reduce their grazing areas. My bill, the Grazing Improvement Act, would provide relief to these ranchers and to ranchers throughout the country.

It would, number one, extend livestock grazing permits from 10 to 20 years in order to give producers adequate longevity and production stability. It would codify existing appropriation language to put into statute annual riders. It would also encourage the respective Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to utilize categorical exclusions to expedite permit processing.

I believe that protecting our environment can be done in a manner that does not impede our economic growth. It is time that we improve our regulatory structure so that we continue to prosper as a Nation. We can no longer allow the Federal Government to maintain an enormous backlog in processing grazing permits.

I thank the cosponsors of this legislation, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on this issue.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2954 is another attempt to weaken landmark environmental protections, to dictate land management decisions, to convey and dispose of Federal land, and to rewrite grazing policy.

This Chamber, once again, will spend a day debating bad policy put forth by the majority, which seems to work tirelessly to undermine the progress of the last century Americans have made in land conservation and environmental protection, undeterred by reality or a desire by the American people for bipartisan legislation and compromise. Furthermore, Republicans have long criticized omnibus bills as an affront to regular order, but they now attempt to force this bill of bad policy proposals through the House, which has no chance of passing in the Senate.

Let me quote a statement from the White House, which strongly opposes the bill. It reads:

> Overall, H.R. 2954 contains a number of provisions that would undermine the responsible balance of interests and considerations and stewardship of the Nation's lands and natural resources . . . Provisions of the bill would disregard or reduce public engagement on a range of community interests, including natural resource protections, and would preclude agencies from considering less detrimental environmental alternatives . . . Provisions of the bill would waive all Federal laws and consultation requirements that would now initiate a timber sale without those, that would eliminate the balanced limitation on off-road vehicle use within the Cape Hatteras recreation area and that would waive environmental review requirements for grazing activities on Federal lands.

The White House said it could support provisions that would restore the Green Mountain Lookout in Washington State and that would modify conservation programs at the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

Overall, this legislation is going nowhere. It has no chance of ever becoming law, but here we are. Furthermore, even though we could be working together on a variety of public land issues that need to be addressed, like the reauthorization of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, we are, instead, debating a package of bills that fails to address significant issues that have bipartisan solutions. In fact, we can work together on some of the individual titles in this bill as standalones. We are not legislating. We are wasting valuable time. It is clear why the American people have such a negative view of Congress. Let me review quickly the substance of the package.

□ 0945

Title I would extinguish the reversionary clause covering property on Santa Rosa Island in Florida. The reversionary clause requires that the property in question is used for public purposes, since Federal land is for the American public in its entirety.

What is the reason for rescinding the clause? So that the county of Escambia can dredge and build a harbor that would cut off access to the rest of the island, most of which is managed as part of the Gulf islands National Seashore, a unit of the National Park Service.

Titles II and III are much of the same, Federal land grabs to be used for

windfall profits at the expense of the American people. Title III goes further by waiving a number of laws, including the Endangered Species Act; the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act; the National Historic Preservation Act; and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act.

Title IV would prevent the BLM from carrying out its mission to manage public lands for multiple use until the agency creates a public database of all lands identified for disposal. BLM would be barred from all land acquisitions until such database is created.

BLM currently uses a public process developed and implemented locally through Resource Management Plans, and approved by Congress, to identify parcels for acquisition or disposal. This measure would just add another extreme layer of bureaucracy.

Title V would threaten endangered nesting shorebirds and sea turtles in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore recreational area. In 2007, the National Park Service placed modest limits on the use of off-highway vehicles on the beaches in order to limit the impacts on these species. The National Park Service was sued, and a judge determined the limits were inadequate protection for the endangered species.

In arbitration, the parties, including all stakeholders, agreed on a new plan that provided adequate protection for endangered species while allowing managed off-highway vehicle access. This measure would require the seashore be managed under the first rule rather than the agreed upon settlement.

Title VIII would change grazing tenure from 10 to 20 years and provide environmental waivers for grazing permit renewals, reissuance, or transfers. If we are going to reform grazing permit tenure, we should also talk about those ranchers who would like to get out of the business and retire their permits.

Also, we should address the low cost of grazing on Federal lands. Grazing fees have not changed since 1996 and are significantly lower than in the past, while State and private landowners generally seek market value for grazing. This measure is completely unbalanced and fails to address significant grazing issues.

Title IX, like many other natural resource measures proposed by the Republicans, waives NEPA, judicial review, and administrative review, completely disregarding the input of critical stakeholders such as the general public.

In conclusion, this so-called lands package should be called the ''Federal Lands Giveaway, Destruction of Protected Species, and Lack of Accountability Act.'' This package undermines the management of our public lands, and I urge my colleagues to oppose the legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, the bill we are considering this morning includes a provision that would repeal excessive restrictions on public access to Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Even though the seashore is paid for by tax dollars, current regulations have restricted access to the recreational area that is owned by the taxpayer. The elected officials of Dare County have verified that the regulations have damaged the economy in the area, which relies heavily on tourism. The last thing that we need in eastern North Carolina—and across the country—is governmental regulations stifling job creation and economic growth.

This bill would overturn the current rule, while restricting access to the seashore, and reinstitute the National Park Service's 2007 Interim Management Strategy to govern visitor access and species protection at Cape Hatteras. The Interim Management Strategy was backed by a 113-page Biological Opinion issued by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, which found that it would not jeopardize piping plover, sea turtles, or other species of concerns.

Please support this legislation. Let's protect the species that need to be protected, but let's also protect the rights of the taxpayer. This bill finds the balance between the two.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), an author of one of the titles of the bill.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I thank the chairman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chair, I do want to say that this is a simple solution to a very important property rights issue in northwest Florida.

Pursuant to a 1947 Federal deed, Escambia County, Florida, was given authority to transfer property on Santa Rosa Island but could not issue title to that land. Instead, the county began leasing the property to individuals who would pay a lease fee instead of being charged a property tax.

In the years since 1947, Pensacola Beach and Navarre Beach have grown into bustling communities and fine tourist destinations.

Additionally, numerous pending cases in the judicial system seek to allow local authorities to levy taxes now on those properties that currently are being leased. As a result of these developments, local stakeholders, including the boards of commissioners of both Escambia and Santa Rosa Counties, asked me to introduce this piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this is a fairness issue. It will allow leaseholders the option of attaining fee simple title to their property while also protecting current agreements governing conservation, public access, and recreation. Additionally, the bill would help ease management of the island by allowing conveyance of certain land currently owned by Escambia County to Santa Rosa County.

It is important to note that the bill does not address the issue of property taxes on those properties. It simply seeks to permit leaseholders the option to attain title to their property so that leaseholders and local governments can jointly address any local tax issues that may arise in the future.

Contrary to a statement released by the White House yesterday, this bill does not remove any protections from Santa Rosa Island. Rather, it restates those protections that are currently in place with Santa Rosa County and Escambia County that are critical to this barrier island.

I also want to take note that this bill in no way affects the right to public beach access, nor does it change the boundaries of the Gulf Islands National Seashore, nor does it impact the mission of the National Park Service. And contrary to what the ranking member said, Escambia County has absolutely no intention of dredging a bay. This is not going to happen.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Escambia County is protected on both sides of the land that they have currently now under lease by the National Park Service, the Gulf Islands National Seashore, so I urge all of my colleagues to support this commonsense bill.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It should be noted for the record that the National Park Service provided a series of recommendations to make this portion of the legislation workable, and those were not considered during the process.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. If the National Park Service said Escambia County was doing this because they had an intent of doing some type of dredging project, they are absolutely incorrect.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Reclaiming my time, this land was to be used for public purposes. This is public land, not land to give away and, as stated before, over and over again, be dredged and used for a harbor for potential windfall profit. Not only that, this action completely disregards the conservation goals of the adjacent national seashore by hindering access. On one hand, we talk about limited access to public lands; on the other, we hinder access to those places we see fit.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), subcommittee chairman and also an author of one of the titles of the bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, let me begin by talking about some things that have been overstated on parts, especially the one that is my title.

My title does not stop the BLM or anybody in the Interior Department from doing multiple use on land. It has nothing to do with management. It simply says they can buy no new land until they first become transparent and provide a database that anyone can easily accomplish.

As with some of the other statements that have been made on the floor, some of them are somewhat exaggerated from what this bill intends to do.

Mr. Chairman, let me talk about this bill as an entity. There is a common thread that runs through this bill that deals with public lands and people from Florida to Alaska and all stations in between. What we simply have found is the Federal Government has large, centralized bureaucracies that do our land management process that no longer meet the needs of people, but, rather, they hide behind rules and policies and regulations which make them safe for them. But they don't actually help people, which requires sometimes people to be flexible and think outside the proverbial box.

The island in Florida that Mr. MILLER was just referring to was given by Florida to the government, and the government gave it back to Florida before I was born—and that has been a while. But the concept here is that the government does not own this land. They don't need it, they don't use it, but they still wish to control it—it doesn't matter why; they still do—and there is no purpose for that.

It is ludicrous that the Congressman from Alaska must come down here and write a law to transfer 3 acres of land in Anchorage back to the city of Anchorage so it can be used to benefit the people of Anchorage. Again, land the Federal Government does not own, they don't need, they don't use, but they still wish in some way to control it.

The grazers in Idaho who produce the stuff from which Big Macs and Whoppers are made—and I know that from personal experience, obviously—only wanted to be treated fairly and consistently and with consideration for the needs so they can be successful in their trade.

Kayakers in Wyoming simply want the ability to recreate on an area that was designed for recreation without being specifically prohibited by rules and regulations that were to insist and support a policy that we have found no longer is necessary and does not work.

If these 10 bills were to pass, unfortunately it doesn't solve all our problems. Because all these 10 bills do is show a tip of the proverbial iceberg of the problems that we face in dealing with land management when it comes from a large, centralized bureaucracy and we no longer put our primary interest in helping people meet their needs.

Mr. Chairman, when the Berlin Wall fell down, the entire world realized that large, centralized bureaucracies of the communist world failed.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Eastern Europe learned that, entrepreneurs learned that. They found that lean, aggressive companies simply take market share from the lumbering corporate products of the past.

Everyone realized that a large, centralized bureaucratic program is ineffective, except here in Washington, D.C., where we still address every problem with an effort to try and build something that is going to be controlled here in the center of all wisdom that is large, that is centralized, and that is bureaucratic. It is mind-boggling that the Nation who defeated the Soviet Union with creativity and freedom still decides to solve all problems and all management issues by going back to a Soviet-styled agency program and concept.

This bill is needed because it affects people throughout the length and breadth of this country, and it is only the beginning of what we need to do to set it right and make sure that our highest priority is people, not rules and regulations.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have heard our colleagues on the other side of the aisle make fun of the fact that the United States Congress has to be involved in such unimportant matters as the conveyance of Federal land, this great Nation defeated that the Soviet Union, and we allude to the fact that we have a Soviet-style centralized government with regard to land management in this country. I think that my colleagues need to take that up with the Framers of the Constitution.

Article IV of that document states:

> The Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

So I am sorry if the majority finds this burdensome, but the Framers apparently felt that Federal property was valuable and that Congress should play a role in determining what to do with it.

□ 1000

Let's be clear: we are talking here about Federal property, that is, property owned by all Americans. The land in question in Escambia County, Florida; Anchorage, Alaska; Fernley, Nevada; Cape Hatteras, North Carolina; Yellowstone and Grand Teton and the land on which Federal grazing occurs, the land impacted by this package is Federal land, owned by each and every American taxpayer.

In the case of these land transfers, the Federal Government gave the land, gave it to a local community as a means of Federal support, and the only requirement, in most cases, was that the land always be used for public purposes. As long as it is a park or a school or a fire station, it is yours, for free.

What these bills do is end those public purpose requirements. The communities want to use these lands for private profit. They want to close them to the public, in many cases.

This is not a land grab by Uncle Sam. This is not some silly scheme by the Feds to harm local communities and to use their power to hold down the taxpayers and keep the public out. This is a community asking to make money off land that was owned by all Americans, and it is the job of Congress to decide if that is a good idea or not.

Let's put one other misleading claim to rest. While Republicans claim the Federal Government owns too much land, the historic trend has been one of divestiture and fragmentation.

As recently as the late 1860s, the Federal Government owned 1.8 billion of the 2.3 billion acres in the contiguous United States. Grants to States, homesteaders, land-grant colleges, railroads and others settling in the Alaska and the West have reduced Federal land ownership by roughly 640 million acres to date.

We have been giving land away for centuries, not buying it up. Today we have a whole series of bills seeking more Federal land, and we owe it to the American people—the American people require that we consider this carefully, and the Constitution requires that Congress be empowered to consider these carefully.

These mischaracterizations are not helpful in the discussions. These bills are not in the best interest of the American people, on the merits alone, and using misinformation to claim otherwise is wrong.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire how much time is on both sides?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 9½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I will advise my friend that, at this point, I have no more requests for time, and I am prepared to close if the gentleman is prepared to close.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

I want to respect the chairman. The chairman is correct. The Natural Resources Committee, of which I am a proud member, appears to be very busy passing bills.

But let's be clear: the Republican majority, time and time again, acts unilaterally, alone, without meaningful cooperation with the minority in this legislation, in the House, and with the Senate and with the administration.

On suspensions, the majority insists on ridiculous limitations that prevent consideration of many measures designed to conserve lands, and, of course, they insist on a more than 3:1 ratio of their legislation to the minority's legislation, to ours. No wonder the number of suspensions is lagging behind what we have done in the past.

As to the bills we have considered under a rule, most of them are almost identical repeats of the bills that were passed in the House last Congress, but because they were opposed by the Senate and the administration, they went nowhere.

To keep passing the same, dead-on-arrival bills over and over again to make the committee look busy should not be mistaken for legislating. The idea is to work on legislation that can bring bills of a bipartisan nature, that the Senate will deal with and, more importantly, that the administration will sign.

That is the legislation my side of the aisle looks forward to working on and, in a very serious manner, improving the operation of Interior, improving the operation of our public lands, and creating transparency at all levels.

We want to do that, and we look forward to working with the majority and with our esteemed chairman in that direction.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, I was very pleased when I heard my good friend from Arizona congratulate the work of the committee until I heard his explanation of what the committee did, and then I had to have a bit of a caution there.

I just want to point out that when the gentleman complains about the ratio of majority and minority, we are following precisely the same example when roles were reversed. In other words, when the Democrats were in the majority, when we were in the minority, we had the same ratio. So we are following that pretty much to the same, and that has been the tradition in this House for a long period of time.

The difference, however, I would say, Mr. Chairman, is that the committee has been much more productive when we have been in control, meaning that there has been more legislation moving that the Democrats would like.

I want to make this point also. There are Democrat and Republican suspension bills that are both sitting in the Senate that haven't been acted on, and I think that the Senate needs to act on those pieces of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this is an important piece of legislation. All of these titles have passed out of the committee and were amalgamated here, but they had all been acted on. They all had input in subcommittee in some way or the other within the committee.

So I wanted to make that point. This is not legislation that was pulled out of the air. It was legislation that was deliberated upon within the committee.

I also want to mention, even though the Statement of Administration Policy was negative in some parts of the bill, there is no veto threat by the administration on this piece of legislation. They expressed concerns, as is understandable, on certain parts of it. I understand that, but there is no veto threat at all whatsoever in what the administration has said.

Finally, let me make this observation, and we hear this over and over and over, especially as it relates to the NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act.

Now, I am going to acknowledge that NEPA certainly has its place within our statutes and how we conduct policy, particularly on public land, but here is where we part company, Mr. Chairman.

We part company because my friends on the other side of the aisle always advocate that, even before Congress acts, NEPA should be the judge of whatever that action is.

Now, I have to tell you, Mr. Chairman, I think that is contrary to what our role is here. Congress created NEPA, meaning that Congress is the one who decides what the law of the land is. Within these bills, we are deciding what the law of the land is, and NEPA should not get in front of our actions.

To hear my friends on the other side of the aisle argue, they are saying over and over and over again that NEPA should be between Congress acting on a law.

Wait a minute. We are putting regulations before Congress should be doing their constitutional duty and enacting statutes?

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman; I part company with that philosophy, yet that is exactly what we hear over and over and over from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

We are the ones that are given authority by the Constitution to make statutes. We believe that that should be the law, and then regulations follow, not the other way around. But that is what we hear over and over and over again.

So, Mr. Chairman, this is a good piece of legislation. As I mentioned, it addresses areas that are certain parochial and certain parts of the country, as my colleague from Utah said, all the way from Florida to Alaska.

I think it is responsible legislation, and I think it deserves our support.

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

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–35. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 2954

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 ''Public Access and Lands Improvement Act''.

TITLE I—SANTA ROSA ISLAND TITLE FAIRNESS AND LAND PRESERVATION ACT

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Santa Rosa Island Title Fairness and Land Preservation Act''.

SEC. 102. CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY.

(a) CONVEYANCE FREE OF RESTRICTIONS.—Notwithstanding the restrictions on conveyance of property located on Santa Rosa Island, Florida, contained in the Act of July 30, 1946 (chapter 699; 70 Stat. 712), and the deed to the property from the United States to Escambia County, Florida, dated January 15, 1947, Escambia County may, at its discretion, convey or otherwise dispose of all of its right, title, and interest (in whole or in part), in and to any portion of the property that was conveyed to it pursuant to that Act and deed, to any person or entity, free from any restriction on conveyance or reconveyance imposed by the United States in that Act or deed. Any conveyance under this subsection shall be subject to the conditions set forth in subsection (c).

(b) LEASEHOLD INTERESTS.—No person or entity holding a leasehold interest in the property as of the date of the enactment of this Act shall be required to involuntarily accept a fee interest in lieu of their leasehold interest in the property.

(c) CONDITIONS.—Any conveyance under subsection (a) shall be subject to the following conditions:

(1) Not later than two calendar years after the date of the enactment of this Act, Escambia County shall convey to Santa Rosa County all right, title, and interest held in and to any portion of the property that was conveyed to Escambia County under the Act and deed that fall in the jurisdictional boundaries of Santa Rosa County, Florida. The conveyance by Escambia County to Santa Rosa County shall be absolute and shall terminate any subjugation of Santa Rosa County to Escambia County or any regulation of Santa Rosa County by Escambia County. Santa Rosa County shall not be required to pay any sum for the subject property other than actual costs associated with the conveyance.

(2) Santa Rosa County or any other person to which property is conveyed under this title may reconvey property, or any portion of property, conveyed to it under this section.

(3) For all properties defined under subsection (a) the leaseholders, or owners are free to pursue incorporation, annexation, or any other governmental status so long as all other legal conditions required for doing so are followed.

(4) Each property defined under subsection (a) is under the jurisdiction of the county and any other local government entity in which the property is located.

(5) Any proceeds from the conveyance of any property defined under subsection (a) by Escambia County or Santa Rosa County, other than direct and incidental costs associated with such conveyance, shall be considered windfall profits and shall revert to the United States.

(6) Escambia County and Santa Rosa County shall in perpetuity preserve those areas on Santa Rosa Island currently dedicated to conservation, preservation, public, recreation, access and public parking in accordance with resolutions heretofore adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of each respective county.

(d) DETERMINATION OF COMPLIANCE.—Escambia County and Santa Rosa County shall have no deadline or requirement to make any conveyance or reconveyance of any property defined under subsection (a) other than the conveyance required under subsection (c)(1). Each county may establish terms for conveyance or reconveyance, subject to the conditions set forth in this title and applicable State law.

TITLE II—ANCHORAGE LAND CONVEYANCE ACT

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Anchorage Land Conveyance Act of 2014''.

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) CITY.—The term ''City'' means the city of Anchorage, Alaska.

(2) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''non-Federal land'' means certain parcels of land located in the City and owned by the City, which are more particularly described as follows:

(A) Block 42, Original Townsite of Anchorage, Anchorage Recording District, Third Judicial District, State of Alaska, consisting of approximately 1.93 acres, commonly known as the Egan Center, Petrovich Park, and Old City Hall.

(B) Lots 9, 10, and 11, Block 66, Original Townsite of Anchorage, Anchorage Recording District, Third Judicial District, State of Alaska, consisting of approximately 0.48 acres, commonly known as the parking lot at 7th Avenue and I Street.

(C) Lot 13, Block 15, Original Townsite of Anchorage, Anchorage Recording District, Third Judicial District, State of Alaska, consisting of approximately 0.24 acres, an unimproved vacant lot located at H Street and Christensen Drive.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 203. CONVEYANCE OF REVERSIONARY INTERESTS, ANCHORAGE, ALASKA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall convey to the City, without consideration, the reversionary interests of the United States in and to the non-Federal land for the purpose of unencumbering the title to the non-Federal land to enable economic development of the non-Federal land.

(b) LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the exact legal descriptions of the non-Federal land shall be determined in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary.

(c) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions to the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(d) COSTS.—The City shall pay all costs associated with the conveyance under subsection (a), including the costs of any surveys, recording costs, and other reasonable costs.

TITLE III—FERNLEY ECONOMIC SELF-DETERMINATION ACT

SEC. 301. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) CITY.—The term ''City'' means the City of Fernley, Nevada.

(2) FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''Federal land'' means the approximately 9,407 acres of land located in the City of Fernley, Nevada, that is identified by the Secretary and the City for conveyance under this title.

(3) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Proposed Fernley, Nevada, Land Sales'' and dated January 25, 2013.

SEC. 302. CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND TO CITY OF FERNLEY, NEVADA.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—Subject to valid existing rights and not later than 180 days after the date on which the Secretary of the Interior receives an offer from the City to purchase the Federal land depicted on the map, the Secretary, acting through the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Reclamation, shall convey, notwithstanding the land use planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), to the City in exchange for consideration in an amount equal to the fair market value of the Federal land, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to such Federal land.

(b) APPRAISAL TO DETERMINE FAIR MARKET VALUE.—The Secretary shall determine the fair market value of the Federal land to be conveyed—

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

(2) based on an appraisal that is conducted in accordance with nationally recognized appraisal standards, including—

(A) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisition; and

(B) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(d) RESERVATION OF EASEMENTS AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY.—The City and the Bureau of Reclamation may retain easements or rights-of-way on the Federal land to be conveyed, including easements or rights-of-way the Bureau of Reclamation determines are necessary to carry out—

(1) the operation and maintenance of the Truckee Canal; or

(2) the Newlands Project.

(e) COSTS.—The City shall, at closing for the conveyance authorized under subsection (a), pay or reimburse the Secretary, as appropriate, for the reasonable transaction and administrative personnel costs associated with the conveyance authorized under such subsection, including the costs of appraisal, title searches, maps, and boundary and cadastral surveys.

(f) CONVEYANCE NOT A MAJOR FEDERAL ACTION.—A conveyance or a combination of conveyances made under this section shall not be considered a major Federal action for purposes of section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)).

SEC. 303. RELEASE OF UNITED STATES.

Upon making the conveyance under section 302, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States is released from any and all liabilities or claims of any kind or nature arising from the presence, release, or threat of release of any hazardous substance, pollutant, contaminant, petroleum product (or derivative of a petroleum product of any kind), solid waste, mine materials or mining related features (including tailings, overburden, waste rock, mill remnants, pits, or other hazards resulting from the presence of mining related features) on the Federal land in existence on or before the date of the conveyance.

SEC. 304. WITHDRAWAL.

Subject to valid existing rights, the Federal land to be conveyed under section 302 of this title shall be withdrawn from all forms of—

(1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) disposition under the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

TITLE IV—LAND DISPOSAL TRANSPARENCY AND EFFICIENCY ACT

SEC. 401. PROHIBITION ON ACQUISITION OF LAND.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This title may be cited as the ''Land Disposal Transparency and Efficiency Act''.

(b) PROHIBITION ON ACQUISITION OF LAND.—No land or interests in land may be added by acquisition, donation, transfer of administrative jurisdiction, or otherwise to the inventory of land and interests in land administered by the Bureau of Land Management until a centralized database of all lands identified as suitable for disposal by Resource Management Plans for lands under the administrative jurisdiction of the Bureau is easily accessible to the public on a website of the Bureau. The database required under this subsection shall be updated and maintained to reflect changes in the status of lands identified for disposal under the administrative jurisdiction of the Bureau.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall provide to the Committee on Natural Resources in the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources in the Senate a report detailing the status and timing for completion of the database required by subsection (b).

TITLE V—PRESERVING ACCESS TO CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE RECREATIONAL AREA ACT

SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Preserving Access to Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area Act''.

SEC. 502. REINSTATEMENT OF INTERIM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY.

(a) MANAGEMENT.—After the date of the enactment of this Act, Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area shall be managed in accordance with the Interim Protected Species Management Strategy/Environmental Assessment issued by the National Park Service on June 13, 2007, for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, North Carolina, unless the Secretary of the Interior (hereafter in this title referred to as the ''Secretary'') issues a new final rule that meets the requirements set forth in section 503.

(b) RESTRICTIONS.—The Secretary shall not impose any additional restrictions on pedestrian or motorized vehicular access to any portion of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area for species protection beyond those in the Interim Management Strategy, other than as specifically authorized pursuant to section 503 of this title.

SEC. 503. ADDITIONAL RESTRICTIONS ON ACCESS TO CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE RECREATIONAL AREA FOR SPECIES PROTECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If, based on peer-reviewed science and after public comment, the Secretary determines that additional restrictions on access to a portion of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area are necessary to protect species listed as endangered under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), the Secretary may only restrict, by limitation, closure, buffer, or otherwise, pedestrian and motorized vehicular access for recreational activities for the shortest possible time and on the smallest possible portions of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.

(b) LIMITATION ON RESTRICTIONS.—Restrictions imposed under this section for protection of species listed as endangered under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) shall not be greater than the restrictions in effect for that species at any other National Seashore.

(c) CORRIDORS AROUND CLOSURES.—To the maximum extent possible, the Secretary shall designate pedestrian and vehicular corridors of minimal distance on the beach or interdunal

area around closures implemented under this section to allow access to areas not closed.

SEC. 504. INAPPLICABILITY OF FINAL RULE AND CONSENT DEGREE.

(a) FINAL RULE.—The final rule titled ''Special Regulations, Areas of the National Park System, Cape Hatteras National Seashore—Off-Road Vehicle Management'' (77 Fed. Reg. 3123–3144) shall have no force or effect after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) CONSENT DECREE.—The April 30, 2008, consent decree filed in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina regarding off-road vehicle use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore in North Carolina shall not apply after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE VI—GREEN MOUNTAIN LOOKOUT HERITAGE PROTECTION ACT

SEC. 601. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Green Mountain Lookout Heritage Protection Act''.

SEC. 602. CLARIFICATION OF LEGAL AUTHORITY OF GREEN MOUNTAIN LOOKOUT.

(a) LEGAL AUTHORITY OF LOOKOUT.—Section 4(b) of the Washington State Wilderness Act of 1984 (Public Law 98–339; 98 Stat. 300; 16 U.S.C. 1131 note) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: '', and except that with respect to the lands described in section 3(5), the designation of such lands as a wilderness area shall not preclude the operation and maintenance of Green Mountain Lookout.''

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Washington State Wilderness Act of 1984.

SEC. 603. PRESERVATION OF GREEN MOUNTAIN LOOKOUT LOCATION.

The Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service, may not move Green Mountain Lookout from its current location on Green Mountain in the Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest unless the Secretary determines that moving Green Mountain Lookout is necessary to preserve the Lookout or to ensure the safety of individuals on or around Green Mountain. If the Secretary makes such a determination, the Secretary shall move the Green Mountain Lookout to a location outside of the lands described in section 3(5) of the Washington State Wilderness Act of 1984 and designated as a wilderness area in section 4(b) of such Act.

TITLE VII—RIVER PADDLING PROTECTION ACT

SEC. 701. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''River Paddling Protection Act''.

SEC. 702. REGULATIONS SUPERSEDED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The rivers and streams of Yellowstone National Park and Grand Teton National Park shall be open to hand-propelled vessels as determined by the director of the National Park Service within 3 years of the date of enactment of this Act. Beginning on the date that is 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the following regulations shall have no the force or effect regarding closing rivers and streams of Yellowstone National Park and Grand Teton National Park to hand-propelled vessels:

(1) Section 7.13(d)(4)(ii) of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, regarding vessels on streams and rivers in Yellowstone National Park.

(2) Section 7.22(e)(3) of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, regarding vessels on lakes and rivers in Grand Teton National Park.

(b) COORDINATION OF RECREATIONAL USE.—The Fish and Wildlife Service shall coordinate any recreational use of hand-propelled vessels on the Gros Ventre River within the National Elk Refuge with Grand Teton National Park to ensure such use is consistent with the requirements of the National Wildlife Refuge Administration Act.

TITLE VIII—GRAZING IMPROVEMENT ACT

SEC. 801. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Grazing Improvement Act''.

SEC. 802. TERMS OF GRAZING PERMITS AND LEASES.

Section 402 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1752) is amended—

(1) by striking ''ten years'' each place it appears and inserting ''20 years'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''or'' at the end of each of paragraphs (1) and (2);

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) the initial environmental analysis under National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) regarding a grazing allotment, permit, or lease has not been completed.''; and

(3) after subsection (h), insert the following new subsection:

''(i) Only applicants, permittees and lessees whose interest in grazing livestock is directly affected by a final grazing decision may appeal the decision to an administrative law judge.''.

SEC. 803. RENEWAL, TRANSFER, AND REISSUANCE OF GRAZING PERMITS AND LEASES.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Title IV of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 405. RENEWAL, TRANSFER, AND REISSUANCE OF GRAZING PERMITS AND LEASES.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) CURRENT GRAZING MANAGEMENT.—The term 'current grazing management' means grazing in accordance with the terms and conditions of an existing permit or lease and includes any modifications that are consistent with an applicable Department of Interior resource management plan or Department of Agriculture land use plan.

''(2) SECRETARY CONCERNED.—The term 'Secretary concerned' means—

''(A) the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to National Forest System land; and

''(B) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to land under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

''(b) RENEWAL, TRANSFER, REISSUANCE, AND PENDING PROCESSING.—A grazing permit or lease issued by the Secretary of the Interior, or a grazing permit issued by the Secretary of Agriculture regarding National Forest System land, that expires, is transferred, or is waived shall be renewed or reissued under, as appropriate—

''(1) section 402;

''(2) section 19 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (commonly known as the 'Granger-Thye Act'; 16 U.S.C. 580l);

''(3) title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U.S.C. 1010 et seq.); or

''(4) section 510 the California Desert Protection Act of 1994 (16 U.S.C. 410aaa–50).

''(c) TERMS; CONDITIONS.—The terms and conditions (except the termination date) contained in an expired, transferred, or waived permit or lease described in subsection (b) shall continue in effect under a renewed or reissued permit or lease until the date on which the Secretary concerned completes the processing of the renewed or reissued permit or lease that is the subject of the expired, transferred, or waived permit or lease, in compliance with each applicable law.

''(d) CANCELLATION; SUSPENSION; MODIFICATION.—Notwithstanding subsection (c), a permit or lease described in subsection (b) may be cancelled, suspended, or modified in accordance with applicable law.

''(e) RENEWAL TRANSFER REISSUANCE AFTER PROCESSING.—When the Secretary concerned has completed the processing of the renewed or reissued permit or lease that is the subject of the expired, transferred, or waived permit or lease, the Secretary concerned shall renew or reissue the permit or lease for a term of 20 years after completion of processing.

''(f) COMPLIANCE WITH NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT OF 1969.—The renewal, reissuance, or transfer of a grazing permit or lease by the Secretary concerned shall be categorically excluded from the requirement to prepare an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement if—

''(1) the decision continues to renew, reissue, or transfer the current grazing management of the allotment;

''(2) monitoring of the allotment has indicated that the current grazing management has met, or has satisfactorily progressed towards meeting, objectives contained in the land use and resource management plan of the allotment, as determined by the Secretary concerned; or

''(3) the decision is consistent with the policy of the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture, as appropriate, regarding extraordinary circumstances.

''(g) PRIORITY AND TIMING FOR COMPLETING ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSES.—The Secretary concerned, in the sole discretion of the Secretary concerned, shall determine the priority and timing for completing each required environmental analysis regarding any grazing allotment, permit, or lease based on the environmental significance of the allotment, permit, or lease and available funding for that purpose.

''(h) NEPA EXEMPTIONS.—The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) shall not apply to the following:

''(1) Crossing and trailing authorizations of domestic livestock.

''(2) Transfer of grazing preference.

''(3) Range improvements as defined under 43 U.S.C. 315c and 16 U.S.C. 580h.''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 is amended by adding after the item for section 404, the following:

''Sec. 405. Renewal, transfer, and reissuance of grazing permits and leases.''.

TITLE IX—RIM FIRE EMERGENCY SALVAGE ACT

SEC. 901. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Rim Fire Emergency Salvage Act''.

SEC. 902. EXPEDITED SALVAGE TIMBER SALES IN RESPONSE TO THE CALIFORNIA RIM FIRE.

(a) SALVAGE TIMBER SALES REQUIRED.—As part of the restoration and rehabilitation activities undertaken on the lands within the Stanislaus National Forest and the Bureau of Land Management lands adversely impacted by the 2013 Rim Fire in California, the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to affected Stanislaus National Forest lands, and the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to affected Bureau of Land Management lands, shall promptly plan and implement salvage timber sales of dead, damaged, or downed timber resulting from that wildfire.

(b) EXPEDITED IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) LEGAL SUFFICIENCY.—Due to the extraordinary severity of the Rim Fire occurring on the Federal lands described in subsection (a), salvage timber sales conducted under such subsection shall proceed immediately and to completion notwithstanding any other provision of law, including the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), section 14 of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a), the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.), and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

(2) ADMINISTRATIVE AND JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Salvage timber sales conducted under subsection (a) shall not be subject to—

(A) administrative review, including, in the case of the Forest Service, the notice, comment,

and appeal requirements of section 322 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993 (Public Law 102–381; 16 U.S.C. 1612 note); or

(B) judicial review in any court of the United States.

TITLE X—CHESAPEAKE BAY ACCOUNTABILITY AND RECOVERY ACT

SEC. 1001. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Chesapeake Bay Accountability and Recovery Act of 2014''.

SEC. 1002. CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSCUT BUDGET.

(a) CROSSCUT BUDGET.—The Director, in consultation with the Chesapeake Executive Council, the chief executive of each Chesapeake Bay State, and the Chesapeake Bay Commission, shall submit to Congress a financial report containing—

(1) an interagency crosscut budget that displays—

(A) the proposed funding for any Federal restoration activity to be carried out in the succeeding fiscal year, including any planned interagency or intra-agency transfer, for each of the Federal agencies that carry out restoration activities;

(B) to the extent that information is available, the estimated funding for any State restoration activity to be carried out in the succeeding fiscal year;

(C) all expenditures for Federal restoration activities from the preceding 2 fiscal years, the current fiscal year, and the succeeding fiscal year; and

(D) all expenditures, to the extent that information is available, for State restoration activities during the equivalent time period described in subparagraph (C);

(2) a detailed accounting of all funds received and obligated by all Federal agencies for restoration activities during the current and preceding fiscal years, including the identification of funds which were transferred to a Chesapeake Bay State for restoration activities;

(3) to the extent that information is available, a detailed accounting from each State of all funds received and obligated from a Federal agency for restoration activities during the current and preceding fiscal years; and

(4) a description of each of the proposed Federal and State restoration activities to be carried out in the succeeding fiscal year (corresponding to those activities listed in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1)), including the—

(A) project description;

(B) current status of the project;

(C) Federal or State statutory or regulatory authority, programs, or responsible agencies;

(D) authorization level for appropriations;

(E) project timeline, including benchmarks;

(F) references to project documents;

(G) descriptions of risks and uncertainties of project implementation;

(H) adaptive management actions or framework;

(I) coordinating entities;

(J) funding history;

(K) cost sharing; and

(L) alignment with existing Chesapeake Bay Agreement and Chesapeake Executive Council goals and priorities.

(b) MINIMUM FUNDING LEVELS.—The Director shall only describe restoration activities in the report required under subsection (a) that—

(1) for Federal restoration activities, have funding amounts greater than or equal to $100,000; and

(2) for State restoration activities, have funding amounts greater than or equal to $50,000.

(c) DEADLINE.—The Director shall submit to Congress the report required by subsection (a) not later than 30 days after the submission by the President of the President's annual budget to Congress.

(d) REPORT.—Copies of the financial report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations, Natural Resources, Energy and Commerce, and Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Appropriations, Environment and Public Works, and Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply beginning with the first fiscal year after the date of enactment of this Act for which the President submits a budget to Congress.

SEC. 1003. RESTORATION THROUGH ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with other Federal and State agencies, and with the participation of stakeholders, shall develop a plan to provide technical and financial assistance to Chesapeake Bay States to employ adaptive management in carrying out restoration activities in the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

(b) PLAN DEVELOPMENT.—The plan referred to in subsection (a) shall include—

(1) specific and measurable objectives to improve water quality, habitat, and fisheries identified by Chesapeake Bay States;

(2) a process for stakeholder participation;

(3) monitoring, modeling, experimentation, and other research and evaluation technical assistance requested by Chesapeake Bay States;

(4) identification of State restoration activities planned by Chesapeake Bay States to attain the State's objectives under paragraph (1);

(5) identification of Federal restoration activities that could help a Chesapeake Bay State to attain the State's objectives under paragraph (1);

(6) recommendations for a process for modification of State and Federal restoration activities that have not attained or will not attain the specific and measurable objectives set forth under paragraph (1); and

(7) recommendations for a process for integrating and prioritizing State and Federal restoration activities and programs to which adaptive management can be applied.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—In addition to carrying out Federal restoration activities under existing authorities and funding, the Administrator shall implement the plan developed under subsection (a) by providing technical and financial assistance to Chesapeake Bay States using resources available for such purposes that are identified by the Director under section 1002.

(d) UPDATES.—The Administrator shall update the plan developed under subsection (a) every 2 years.

(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the end of a fiscal year, the Administrator shall transmit to Congress an annual report on the implementation of the plan required under this section for such fiscal year.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall contain information about the application of adaptive management to restoration activities and programs, including level changes implemented through the process of adaptive management.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraph (1) shall apply to the first fiscal year that begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

(f) INCLUSION OF PLAN IN ANNUAL ACTION PLAN AND ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT.—The Administrator shall ensure that the Annual Action Plan and Annual Progress Report required by section 205 of Executive Order 13508 includes the adaptive management plan outlined in subsection (a).

SEC. 1004. INDEPENDENT EVALUATOR FOR THE CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There shall be an Independent Evaluator for restoration activities in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, who shall review and report on restoration activities and the use of adaptive management in restoration activities, including on such related topics as are suggested by the Chesapeake Executive Council.

(b) APPOINTMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Independent Evaluator shall be appointed by the Administrator from among nominees submitted by the Chesapeake Executive Council.

(2) NOMINATIONS.—The Chesapeake Executive Council may submit to the Administrator 4 nominees for appointment to any vacancy in the office of the Independent Evaluator.

(c) REPORTS.—The Independent Evaluator shall submit a report to the Congress every 2 years in the findings and recommendations of reviews under this section.

(d) CHESAPEAKE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.—In this section, the term ''Chesapeake Executive Council'' has the meaning given that term by section 307 of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–567; 15 U.S.C. 1511d).

SEC. 1005. DEFINITIONS.

In this title, the following definitions apply:

(1) ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT.—The term ''adaptive management'' means a type of natural resource management in which project and program decisions are made as part of an ongoing science-based process. Adaptive management involves testing, monitoring, and evaluating applied strategies and incorporating new knowledge into programs and restoration activities that are based on scientific findings and the needs of society. Results are used to modify management policy, strategies, practices, programs, and restoration activities.

(2) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(3) CHESAPEAKE BAY STATE.—The term ''Chesapeake Bay State'' or ''State'' means the States of Maryland, West Virginia, Delaware, and New York, the Commonwealths of Virginia and Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia.

(4) CHESAPEAKE BAY WATERSHED.—The term ''Chesapeake Bay watershed'' means the Chesapeake Bay and the geographic area, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, consisting of 36 tributary basins, within the Chesapeake Bay States, through which precipitation drains into the Chesapeake Bay.

(5) CHIEF EXECUTIVE.—The term ''chief executive'' means, in the case of a State or Commonwealth, the Governor of each such State or Commonwealth and, in the case of the District of Columbia, the Mayor of the District of Columbia.

(6) DIRECTOR.—The term ''Director'' means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(7) STATE RESTORATION ACTIVITIES.—The term ''State restoration activities'' means any State programs or projects carried out under State authority that directly or indirectly protect, conserve, or restore living resources, habitat, water resources, or water quality in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, including programs or projects that promote responsible land use, stewardship, and community engagement in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Restoration activities may be categorized as follows:

(A) Physical restoration.

(B) Planning.

(C) Feasibility studies.

(D) Scientific research.

(E) Monitoring.

(F) Education.

(G) Infrastructure development.

(8) FEDERAL RESTORATION ACTIVITIES.—The term ''Federal restoration activities'' means any Federal programs or projects carried out under existing Federal authority that directly or indirectly protect, conserve, or restore living resources, habitat, water resources, or water quality in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, including programs or projects that provide financial and technical assistance to promote responsible land use, stewardship, and community engagement in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Restoration activities may be categorized as follows:

(A) Physical restoration.
(B) Planning.
(C) Feasibility studies.
(D) Scientific research.
(E) Monitoring.
(F) Education.
(G) Infrastructure development.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 113–340. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 113–340.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike title IV.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 472, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is straightforward. It strikes title IV of the bill. Title IV is the text of H.R. 2095, introduced by my friend from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), chairman of the Public Land Subcommittee.

The title would prohibit BLM from acquiring additional land until the agency creates a publicly accessible database that inventories current landholdings and identifies land suitable for disposal.

Much of the bill we are considering today seeks to undermine the public planning process and give away Federal land free of charge. This land belongs to the American people, and if we are going to be in the business of giving it away, we should at least not hinder our ability to acquire more land when it makes sense to do so.

Let me see if I understand this. I do not oppose the idea of creating a database that catalogs Federal landholdings. I do not oppose the idea of transparency at BLM, or any other government agency for that matter, but putting an arbitrary condition on land acquisition authority is just bad policy.

The true intent of the title is not to create a database. The intent is to limit land acquisition.

The majority has been clear about their agenda to limit expansion of the Federal estate, and the bill we are considering today is just another attempt to advance that priority. It is a wolf in sheep's clothing.

Through the public land use planning process, BLM keeps an inventory of its land. Land managers, from the folks down the street in the Department of the Interior building to the field staff all over the country, know how much land the Federal Government owns.

In fact, the Federal Land and Policy Management Act, also known as the BLM's Organic Act, provides clear direction and authority for cataloging and the inventory of Federal lands. FLPMA also provides the agency with authority to dispose of lands deemed worthy for disposal through the public planning process.

Like I mentioned before, I don't see a problem with creating a database of information available in BLM's Resource Management Plans. The problem is with limiting authority for land acquisition.

Land acquisition authority makes the management of Federal lands more efficient. It is not the bogeyman that the sponsors of the bill claim. Federal land managers acquire land in order to clean up the checkerboard pattern of ownership, consolidating Federal holdings and making them easier to manage.

Limiting this authority will have the consequence of making the management of Federal lands more difficult and less efficient.

Land is also acquired when it makes sense for conservation and resource management purposes. The Federal Government is the steward of some of our Nation's most pristine and treasured resources. There are times when it makes sense to add to national parks or national monuments to make sure that they have the resources and the protection that they merit.

Popular programs like the Land and Water Conservation Fund have helped conserve millions of acres that provide all of our constituents with opportunities to hike, hunt, fish, and pursue other recreational activities.

If we want to ensure that efficient management of Federal land, limiting land acquisition authority is a step in the wrong direction. My amendment makes sure that this important tool is not jeopardized, and I urge my colleagues to support its adoption.

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

□ 1015

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate very much the gentleman from Arizona. I do enjoy working with him on the subcommittee. And I have to admit, at this stage of the game, I am a little bit perplexed about the amendment.

The gentleman purports that the idea of transparency and keeping a database is not a bad idea. He just objects to the enforcement mechanism we put in there. If that were the case, I would wonder why he didn't just strike the enforcement mechanism out or come up with a substitute enforcement mechanism. I am not bound to this particular one. Had there been a date certain or some other ideas, I may even have accepted that as a friendly approach to try to help this particular title. But, instead, the amendment strikes everything. It strikes the very essence of forcing them to actually come up with a database that is there.

During the Clinton administration—and that has been a while ago—the Interior Department did come up with a database of lands that were available for disposal, that were needless, that were useless for the government. We have the data. The only problem is it is almost impossible to get to the data. The data is found in books in over 150 different local offices. It would take a huge road trip to try to come up with just the information.

This is now 2014. The idea that the BLM cannot actually put this data on a Web site that is available to everybody is, quite frankly, not acceptable. That they are too busy to do this is simply not acceptable.

All this says is the data is there. Put the data on a Web site so it is transparent and it is viewable for everybody to see.

And then we said, since there has been a whole lot of dragging their feet since the Clinton administration in trying to do this, we will give you some incentive. You can't buy new land until you put on this Web site so people can see what land is available for disposal. It does not stop them from managing the land for multiple use or for nonmultiple use or any other reason. It simply gives them an incentive to go ahead and do it.

Like I said, if your goal was to change the incentive, I would have been amenable to discussions on that. I will still be amenable to discussions on that. But this amendment strikes the entire thing, not just the enforcement provision. For that reason, I would oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, in my amendment, we are also talking about the Federal Government having the authority to buy land from willing sellers. And when you bar the Federal Government from trying to buy land, then what happens? The seller still wants to sell. So who steps up? Developers, other high-intensity uses around areas that should be protected.

When you look at Uncle Sam as a buyer for political purposes, you empower developers and others that want the land for completely different uses; and before you know it, an area that you wanted to conserve and preserve is gone. This is bad policy. And to remove the authority from the Federal Government of being able to purchase land from willing sellers I think is a step too far.

And with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) to show how this amendment would impact the Chesapeake Bay area.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and to speak in support of H.R. 2954, the Public Access and Lands Improvement Act.

I wish to extend my thanks to the gentleman from Washington, Chairman DOC HASTINGS, for his leadership in bringing this important package of bills from the Natural Resources Committee to the House floor.

Today, I want to highlight how this legislation will aid in the cleanup of one of our prized historic resources, the Chesapeake Bay. This body of water provides habitat for plants and animals, resources that drive local economies, recreation, and a way of life for many that live on and around its shores.

I am the proud author of title X of this bill, the Chesapeake Bay Accountability and Recovery Act. These provisions would implement and strengthen management techniques like crosscut budgeting and adaptive management to ensure we get more bang for our buck and continue to make progress in Chesapeake Bay restoration efforts.

These techniques will ensure that we are coordinating how restoration dollars are spent and making sure that everyone understands how individual projects fit into the bigger picture. That way, we are not duplicating efforts, spending money we don't need to, or worse, working at cross-purposes.

During the 112th Congress, the House passed similar legislation as part of H.R. 2578, the Conservation and Economic Growth Act. More recently, identical language was adopted by voice vote and included in the House version of the farm bill. These provisions would implement and strengthen management techniques to ensure, again, we get more bang for our buck and progress in the Chesapeake Bay restoration efforts continue and are measurable. Crosscut budgeting and adaptive management and an independent evaluator should be key components for the complex restoration efforts for our Chesapeake Bay.

I encourage my colleagues to join with me and support H.R. 2954.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. LUMMIS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 113–340.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I have an amendment at the desk, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 17, strike lines 3 through 12.

Page 17, line 13, strike ''(3)'' and insert ''(2)''.

Page 17, line 14, strike ''subsection'' and insert ''subsections''.

Page 17, line 17, after ''decision'' insert ''concerning renewal, transfer or reissuance of a grazing permit or lease''.

Page 17, line 18, before the first period insert ''or appeal officer as applicable''.

Page 18, strike lines 7 through 10 and insert ''existing permit or lease.''.

Page 20, line 15, after ''the'' insert ''applicable''.

Page 20, line 15, strike ''and'' and insert ''or''.

Page 20, strike line 22 through page 21, line 4, and insert the following:

''(g) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS.—

''(1) The Secretary concerned, in the sole discretion of the Secretary concerned, shall determine the priority and timing for completing required environmental reviews regarding any grazing allotment, permit, or lease based on the environmental significance of the allotment, permit, or lease and available funding for that purpose.

''(2) The Secretary concerned shall seek to conduct environmental reviews on an allotment or multiple allotment basis, to the extent practicable, for purposes of compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and other applicable laws.

Page 21, line 12, after the first period, insert the following

''(i) TEMPORARY TRAILING AND CROSSING.—

''(1) Any application for temporary trailing or crossing that has been submitted in a timely manner or not less than 30 days prior to the anticipated trailing or crossing shall be granted, modified or denied not less than fifteen days prior to the date of requested crossing or trailing. The minimum times specified in this subsection shall not preclude the approval of an application in a shorter time where an immediate need exists.

''(2) Temporary trailing or crossing authorizations across lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management or the Forest Service system of lands shall not be subject to protest or appeal except by the applicant or an affected permittee or lessee.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 472, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am offering this amendment with Representative LABRADOR after discussions with our local agriculture producers and the Public Lands Council on some needed adjustments to the underlying bill.

This amendment includes some conforming language to the Senate version of the Grazing Improvement Act that was marked up in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee last November. This includes allowing the Secretary to consolidate environmental reviews of allotments in order to reduce the backlog on permit and lease renewals.

The amendment clarifies the definition of current grazing management to the common sense wording of ''the terms and conditions of an existing permit or lease.'' It also clarifies that only those directly affected by the renewal, transfer, or reissuance of a permit or lease may appeal a final grazing decision.

Lastly, this amendment addresses some concerns with how the Federal land agencies treat temporary crossings and trailing. While the underlying bill exempts all crossing and trailing of domestic livestock from the National Environmental Policy Act, this amendment clarifies that temporary applications and those where an immediate need exists will receive a timely response from the agency. It also states that these authorizations are not subject to protest or appeal, except by affected parties.

Our producers' normal business operations require the ability to cross and trail livestock. It is often necessary to remain in compliance with their grazing permits. Temporary trailing has a de minimis impact on the range, and approval should be an administrative action with a quick turnaround time.

Weather, changes in grazing patterns, and even requests by Federal land agencies can all require trailing unexpectedly. For example, a hailstorm could wipe out a stand of grass in an hour. A devastating grasshopper infestation can change the grazing conditions on the ground. Those kinds of things require quick response to get cattle or sheep to a different pasture to keep that grass stand healthy. We need to provide the flexibility for our Federal land agencies to approve temporary requests.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Lummis-Labrador amendment and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. This amendment attempts to conform with the Senate language related to the Grazing Improvement Act, but two wrongs don't necessarily make a right. The language is still problematic.

I thank the sponsors for this amendment and for this opportunity to talk a little bit more about public land grazing.

As I mentioned in my opening remarks, title VIII attempts to address one issue related to public lands grazing, the backlog of permit renewals, but it fails to take on the larger issue of below-market grazing fees.

The Federal Government charges $1.35 per month per animal unit on Federal lands. If we are going to consider legislation that waives NEPA and extends the tenure of grazing permits, almost doubles the number of years, we also have to review the formula for grazing fees.

The State of Idaho charges $12 to $14 per month to graze on State lands. In

Arizona, we charge $8 to $9 per month. Washington State charges $12 per month; Nevada, $12.50 per month; California, over $16 per month.

We often hear from the majority that the States do a better job of managing their lands. In this case, I would agree. The States do a better job of making sure their taxpayers get a fair return on the use of their State lands, while Federal taxpayers are stuck subsidizing the practice of grazing on public lands.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), the chairman of our Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I support this amendment. I think the brief part of this debate here points out the importance of having flexibility on the local level rather than having a one-size-fits-all; because there are conditions that can come up in grazing in various States, and those managers need that flexibility, which is, I think, a common thread that we talk about all the time when we talk about Federal land management. So I think this amendment adds very much to the Labrador title of the bill, and I intend to support it.

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

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would like to point out something about the difference between State lands and Federal lands. I ran my State's Office of State Lands and Investments for a time, and the rights that are conveyed by States on lands to use their lands are very different than the rights that are conveyed by the Federal Government to users of Federal lands.

In the case of State lands, frequently, they have many more rights, including, in some States, the right to exclude others. They have the right to make improvements on the ground. They have the right to acquire water permits. They have no NEPA requirements that are specific to the State land and other opportunities to, in fact, even sublease their lands. And those vary from State to State. States that grant more rights can acquire more revenue because it gives more flexibility to the person who is grazing.

In the case of the Federal Government, there are burdensome regulations. There are third-party challenges. There are compliance issues. It is more of a command-and-control structure, so it is just not worth as much financially because of the tremendous paperwork and burden involved. Therefore, there are reasons for those differences.

Mr. Chairman, the amendments we are proposing have nothing to do with that but offer commonsense solutions to the very important grazing issues.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. LABRADOR

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 113–340.

Mr. LABRADOR. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 17, line 18, after the first period, insert the following:

''(j) LEGAL FEES.—

''(1) Any person, other than a directly affected party, challenging an action of the Secretary concerned regarding a final grazing decision in Federal court who is not a prevailing party shall pay to the prevailing parties (including a directly affected party who intervenes in such suit) fees and other expenses incurred by that party in connection with the challenge unless the Court finds that the position of the person was substantially justified.

''(2) For purposes of this subsection, the term ''directly affected party'' means any applicant, permittee, or lessee (or any organization representing applicants, permittees or lessees) whose interest in grazing livestock is directly affected by the final grazing decision.''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 472, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment of title VIII of H.R. 2954, which I originally introduced as H.R. 657, the Grazing Improvement Act.

My amendment is a commonsense reform to require groups who are not substantially justified or directly affected by final Federal grazing decisions to pay for the legal expenses of the other party when they lose in court.

□ 1030

In short, this is a ''loser pays'' system to discourage frivolous legal challenges to Federal land management grazing decisions.

Current law gives grazing permittees the right to a hearing in connection with grazing decisions and gives the ''interested public'' the opportunity to participate in the way Federal land is managed. However, it is doubtful that Congress ever intended to elevate the ''interested public'' to a level of equal standing to that of grazing permittees.

In 1995, the Bureau of Land Management established grazing regulations that far surpassed the intent of Congress. Some were given the ability to participate in the administrative appeals process allowing them to sue if the nonpermittees disagreed with a final grazing decision. Since then, environmental groups have been increasingly effective at abusing the current appeals process, not to promote environmental health, but for the sole reason of removing livestock from Federal lands. Each year, hundreds of appeals are filed on grazing decisions by groups. The cost to ranchers can hardly be measured. In a recent case in Wyoming, for example, an appeal cost a small group of ranchers over $125,000 in administrative appeal and attorneys' fees alone.

My amendment simply addresses this growing problem by clarifying the intent of Congress on who may appeal and litigate a final agency decision on a final grazing decision. It is time we ease the burden that environmental groups have placed on our ranchers.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LABRADOR. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think that the gentleman's amendment to this piece of legislation is an important policy step. In fact, I think in many cases a ''loser pay'' ought to apply to a much larger area.

I know that the gentleman's amendment only deals with grazing, but he cited an example in Wyoming where it cost somebody $125,000, and with the volatility of the market, that is a big expense on individuals. I think this will help curb that in the future.

So I congratulate the gentleman for his amendment, and I intend to support it.

Mr. LABRADOR. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, very simply, seeks to limit, if not eliminate, judicial review on those who have an interest in grazing on our public lands. This amendment attempts to, with incentives—negative incentives to the public—limit the public from challenging Federal action on grazing decisions by making them pay the prevailing party's legal fees.

Like I have mentioned before, all Federal taxpayers are on the hook for subsidizing grazing on Federal lands; therefore, all citizens of this country should have the opportunity to challenge the decisions made that have an effect on their public lands.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Chairman, I agree that everyone should have a right to sue, but if you lose, I think you should pay. This amendment will allow Federal land managers to get back to managing lands, create greater certainty in the ranching community, and help strengthen rural economies in the West. This minor reform will save taxpayer dollars and countless hours and dollars spent by ranchers who are forced to defend against these nuisance suits.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, grazing has impacts on public lands like no other use, and it is important that we

consider these impacts through the NEPA process and through judicial review, both that are being struck from that process today. Steamrolling and eliminating judicial review and the public process, as in a reference to East Germany, centralized government and thought control, once we begin to limit the public's and the individual's access to redress through the courts by action of this Congress, it is a dangerous not only precedent and a dangerous step in public transparency, but more importantly, in the public's right to know.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 113–340.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike title IX and insert the following new title:

TITLE IX—RIM FIRE EMERGENCY SALVAGE ACT

SEC. 901. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Rim Fire Emergency Salvage Act''.

SEC. 902. EXPEDITED FOREST SERVICE TIMBER SALVAGE AND RESTORATION PILOT PROJECTS IN RESPONSE TO THE CALIFORNIA RIM FIRE.

(a) PILOT PROJECTS REQUIRED.—As part of the restoration and rehabilitation activities undertaken on the lands within the Stanislaus National Forest adversely impacted by the 2013 Rim Fire in California, the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct a timber salvage and restoration pilot project on burned National Forest System land within the Rim Fire perimeter.

(b) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(1) USE OF EIS PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct the pilot project required by subsection (a) in the manner provided in the proposed alternative contained in the draft environmental impact statement noticed in the Federal Register on December 6, 2013, for Rim Fire recovery.

(2) MODIFICATION.—During the course of the pilot project, the Secretary may adopt such modifications to the management plan as the Secretary considers appropriate in response to public comment and consultation with interested Federal, State, and tribal agencies.

(c) LEGAL SUFFICIENCY.—The pilot project required by subsection (a), and activities conducted under the pilot project, are deemed to be in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), section 14 of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a), the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.), the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), and the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

(d) ADMINISTRATIVE AND JUDICIAL REVIEW AND ACTION.—The pilot project required by subsection (a), and activities conducted under the pilot project, are not subject to—

(1) administrative review;

(2) judicial review by any court of the United States; or

(3) a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction based on environmental impacts in a case for which a final decision has not been issued.

SEC. 903. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING USE OF FUNDS GENERATED FROM SALVAGE SALES CONDUCTED AFTER CATASTROPHIC WILD FIRES ON NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LAND OR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LANDS.

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to National Forest System lands, and the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to Bureau of Land Management land, should use existing authorities available to the Secretary to retain revenues (other than revenues required to be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury) generated by salvage sales conducted in response to catastrophic wild fires on such land to cover the cost of restoration projects on such land.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 472, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, last August, the Rim Fire destroyed 400 square miles of timber in the Sierra Nevada. It left behind hundreds of millions of board feet of dead timber that can still be salvaged, but, as I pointed out earlier, time is of the essence. Within a year, the fire-killed timber loses much of its value. Yet the current environmental review process takes a year to complete, and then litigation starts and runs out the clock on what remains of that perishable resource.

Sixteen thousand acres of the destroyed timber is on private land owned by Sierra Pacific Industries. It does not face the bureaucratic obstacles that we face on the public land. SPI is already halfway through its salvage. It will be completed by summer. They will use a portion of those proceeds to replant their devastated acreage.

Meanwhile, the timber on the public land continues to rot and decay. The earliest the Forest Service can conclude its environmental review is August, and then the litigation process will start, and then it will be too late. The cost will be hundreds of jobs, millions of dollars of lost economic activity, and millions of dollars of lost salvage revenues that could otherwise have been used by the Federal Government for reforestation of the public lands.

Now, title IX of the bill in its current form was based on bipartisan language introduced by Senator Tom Daschle to expedite salvage in the Black Hills National Forest, but these provisions were opposed from the other side of the aisle. So I sat down with the Forest Service and opposition offices to work out a process that will assure that salvage can begin by spring, while maintaining both environmental and judicial review. And I particularly want to thank Chief Tom Tidwell for his technical assistance and that of his office. This amendment is the product of these talks.

It authorizes the Forest Service to select acreage for salvage where there is no wilderness, ESA, historic, or other legal restrictions. It authorizes them to implement the draft EIS that is expected to be completed by April and deems the draft is compliant with all applicable environmental reviews. This will allow salvage to begin under their direction in April.

It authorizes the Forest Service to modify the draft EIS in response to public comment and allows for judicial review of the final EIS based on ecological impacts. It merely bars litigation based on process, and it bars temporary restraining orders. This will allow the timely salvage of a portion of the public lands destroyed by the fire while the final EIS is prepared and while any judicial review proceeds. Finally, it authorizes the Forest Service to use the millions of dollars raised by the salvage for forest restoration in the devastated Sierra.

This compromise language assures compliance with all environmental laws and maintains judicial review while assuring that salvage can begin this spring. It is also important to the economy of the region that has been devastated by the fire and by increasingly stringent Federal restrictions and land acquisitions that have ravaged the timber, livestock, mineral, and tourist industries upon which these mountain communities depend. It means jobs for hundreds of lumberjacks, mill workers, truckers, and all those who support them.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I just want to say that I think this amendment adds to what he is attempting to do because the issue of salvage and the timeliness of that is something that is lost on a lot of people. So I congratulate the gentleman for not only the title in the bill but for the amendment. I intend to support it.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, since the Rim Fire burned over 200,000 acres in California's Sierra Nevada Mountains in August of last year, Mr. MCCLINTOCK has expressed an interest in expediting salvage logging operations in the burned area. The language he has offered to achieve this

goal keeps evolving, and, in my opinion, it keeps getting better. Unfortunately, I still cannot support this amendment, the latest version of H.R. 3188.

Since the fire, the Forest Service has engaged in an extensive planning effort that includes salvage operations where they are deemed appropriate. The planning effort is ongoing, and the amendment seeks to force a decision before it is complete. The amendment references a proposed action that predates the issuance of the draft Environmental Impact Statement. The draft EIS is due out in April. Until then, we should allow the public process to end before backing the Forest Service into a corner with a mandated decision. Otherwise, we take away the opportunity for public input and the ability for the Forest Service to examine the economic feasibility of salvage operations, potential damage to wildlife, and other consequences.

CEQ has already approved an expedited process for the EIS that includes a shortened timeline for the comment period and eliminates notification requirements. The Forest Service is committed to this expedited process and working diligently to advance appropriate restoration.

The amendment still mandates salvage logging in areas where it might not be appropriate while waiving Federal environmental standards. Taking NEPA out of the picture will not end up in more logging or less lawsuits. Supporters of this amendment understand that this is the case. That is why the amendment waives a bevy of other environmental laws, including the Endangered Species Act.

The forests of Sierra Nevada provide Californians with clean water, fish, and wildlife habitat and recreation. Indiscriminate salvage logging threatens these treasured forests.

Additionally, the amendment limits judicial and administrative review. This is still a huge sticking point. Salvage logging is extremely controversial, and we shouldn't take away any tools available for the public to be able to weigh in on these critical decisions. Supporters of this amendment argue that the objection process is overused and abused, but it is there to make sure that everybody has a voice in the process.

I oppose this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to oppose its adoption. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, if the opposition prevails, the Sierra, 400 square miles of it anyway, will be consigned to scrub brush and disease for generations to come. We have bent over backwards with the opposition to work out this compromise, and their continued opposition is quite disappointing.

I repeat that time is of the essence. I beg the Senate and the Democrats to take up these provisions without further delay. These provisions were developed with the full input of the administration and Democratic offices. But if they are still not acceptable, then tell us what is, but please don't just sit there and do nothing.

The Forest Service estimates that 2.2 million board feet can be processed per day. That means every day we dither and delay, $250 million of Federal revenue is lost. That is enough to reforest more than 1,000 every day. But every day we delay, we lose that revenue, we lose those jobs, the salvage value deteriorates with the wood, and that window will start to close even before the litigation begins under current law.

The private lands destroyed by the fire will have been fully salvaged and replanted a few years from now. They are going to host a thriving, young forest. If we don't change current law now, the public lands will remain unsalvaged and the millions of dollars we could have raised for reforestation will have been forfeited. Dry brush and dead trees will be the legacy of the Sierra that we leave our children.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, the Forest Service, as we speak, is preparing to authorize salvage operations on 30,000 of the 154,000 burned acres, and a decision is due as early as August. As I said earlier, salvage logging is not without controversy, and the decisions to authorize these activities need to be fully analyzed and fully transparent. Many ecologists believe that post-fire landscapes are an essential component of forest lifecycles that provide critical habitat for wildlife and other essential ecological services. Rushing to allow indiscriminate salvage operations, as this bill intends, threatens the overall health of the forest. The planning process is ongoing under expedited emergency provisions set out by CEQ.

Our national forests are more than timber factories, and we have a public planning process that ensures all uses and benefits are considered. This bill ignores that process, and that is why I repeat opposition to it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1045

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part A of House Report 113–340.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE XI—ALASKA NATIVE VETERAN ALLOTMENT

SEC. 1101. ALASKA NATIVE VETERAN ALLOTMENT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPLICATION.—The term ''application'' means the Alaska Native Veteran Allotment application numbered AA-084021-B.

(2) FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''Federal land'' means the 80 acres of Federal land that is—

(A) described in the application; and

(B) depicted as Lot 2 in U.S. Survey No. 13957, Alaska, that was officially filed on October 9, 2009.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) ISSUANCE OF PATENT.—Notwithstanding section 41 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1629g) and subject to subsection (c), the Secretary shall—

(1) approve the application; and

(2) issue a patent for the Federal land to the person that submitted the application.

(c) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The patent issued under subsection (b) shall—

(A) only be for the surface rights to the Federal land; and

(B) be subject to the terms and conditions of any certificate issued under section 41 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1629g), including terms and conditions providing that—

(i) the patent is subject to valid existing rights, including any right of the United States to income derived, directly or indirectly, from a lease, license, permit, right-of-way, or easement on the Federal land; and

(ii) the United States shall reserve an interest in deposits of oil, gas, and coal on the Federal land, including the right to explore, mine, and remove the minerals on portions of the Federal land that the Secretary determines to be prospectively valuable for development.

(2) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require any additional terms and conditions for the issuance of the patent under subsection (a) that the Secretary determines to be appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 472, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, the Alaska Native Allotment Act allowed Alaska Natives to acquire up to 160 acres of Federal land. Approximately 2,800 Alaska Natives served in the military during the Vietnam War, and because of their absence, they did not have an opportunity to apply for their Native allotment.

In 1998, Congress passed a law that provided certain Alaska Native Vietnam veterans an opportunity to obtain an allotment.

One of my constituents, Mr. William Alstrom, applied for an allotment in accordance with this law. During the war, he served honorably in the Air Force. Mr. Alstrom is a lifelong resident of St. Mary's, Alaska, a village of roughly 550 mostly Yup'ik Eskimo residents located on the Lower Yukon River in southwestern Alaska. His family has a long history in the region, helping to settle the area and operating the first general store. During World War II, Mr. Alstrom's father, Fred, was a member of the Alaska Territorial Guard, or the Eskimo Scouts, a military reserve component of the U.S. Army organized in 1942.

Following a TB outbreak in 1954, Mr. Alstrom was sent to a boarding school in southeast Alaska with many other children from Alaska villages. As the Vietnam War was escalating, he graduated from one of these boarding schools and promptly enlisted in the U.S. Air Force, serving his country. Soon thereafter, he left his wife and two children stateside and headed to southeast Asia. During the war, the newly minted Sergeant Alstrom served in Thailand, preparing aircraft on their way to strike North Vietnam.

On completion of his service, William and his family returned home to St. Mary's, where he invested himself in his village and continued to grow and raise his family. Today, William continues to serve—this time as mayor of his community and president of his village corporation.

In 2002, William applied for the Alaska Native veteran's allotment he was entitled to by law. Following an extensive application and vetting process, in 2009, the Bureau of Land Management, BLM, deeded him two 80-acre parcels located in the Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge.

With his deed in hand, William transported lumber and other supplies to one of his parcels on his skiff, spent countless hours clearing trees and brush, and finally built a small cabin and fish camp for him and his family to enjoy.

Out of the blue a few years later, the Fish and Wildlife Service realized that errors had been made by the Fish and Wildlife Service and BLM personnel, both in the surveying and application approval process. Instead of being located on general refuge lands, the two allotment parcels were located within the congressionally designated Andreafsky Wilderness Area. Conveying allotments in wilderness areas is prohibited by law. Similarly, making improvements to the land, such as constructing a cabin, cutting trees, or clearing bush, is also prohibited. As a result, the BLM canceled the deed to the two parcels, plunging this Alaska Native veteran and the status of his allotment and cabin into a state of limbo.

After this decision, William contacted me for assistance. To their credit, the BLM quickly admitted that both they and the Fish and Wildlife Service screwed up. Though, after looking into their options, they also admitted that they couldn't fix their mistakes administratively. In an attempt to resolve the issue, the BLM offered William two parcels of equal size elsewhere in the region. While he agreed to accept one of the replacement parcels, the second proposed parcel excluded his cabin.

My amendment today would approve his application for the second original parcel, subsequently saving his cabin and fish camp from demolition.

Though two Federal agencies are at fault, my Alaska Native constituent is the one being forced to bear the full cost of their errors. The purpose of my amendment is simply to allow a veteran to retain the 80-acre parcel with the cabin on it, at no cost to the taxpayer.

An identical version of this amendment was adopted by voice vote when the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee held their markup of the Green Mountain Lookout Heritage Protection Act, of which the House version is included in today's package.

As you well know, I am no proponent of the fact that the Federal Government is the landlord of well over 60 percent of my State. Think about this: 60 percent. I generally oppose wilderness areas. I have often had an adversarial relationship with Federal land management agencies. All of that aside, this amendment is not meant to make a statement for or against wilderness designations, but rather to fix a unique issue for a truly deserving Vietnam veteran. At its core, fixing issues like this is what we do well when we are sent to Washington. Mr. Alstrom, like his father before him, served this country with honor and dignity, and he deserves similar treatment from this government in return.

I hope you will join me today in fixing this unfortunate mistake and allow this gentleman and his family to move on with their lives by supporting this simple amendment to H.R. 2954.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. If no Member is seeking recognition in opposition, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Alaska) having assumed the chair, Mr. DENHAM, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2954) to authorize Escambia County, Florida, to convey certain property that was formerly part of Santa Rosa Island National Monument and that was conveyed to Escambia County subject to restrictions on use and reconveyance, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 11:15 a.m. today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 51 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1115

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE) at 11 o'clock and 15 minutes a.m.

PUBLIC ACCESS AND LANDS IMPROVEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 472 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2954.

Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) kindly take the chair.

□ 1116

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2954) to authorize Escambia County, Florida, to convey certain property that was formerly part of Santa Rosa Island National Monument and that was conveyed to Escambia County subject to restrictions on use and reconveyance, with Mr. HOLDING (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 5 printed in part A of House Report 113–340, offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House Report 113–340 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. LABRADOR of Idaho.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 224, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 51]

AYES—190

Andrews	Becerra	Bonamici
Barber	Bera (CA)	Brady (PA)
Barrow (GA)	Bishop (GA)	Braley (IA)
Bass	Bishop (NY)	Brown (FL)
Beatty	Blumenauer	Brownley (CA)