

MIWALETA PARK EXPANSION ACT

NOVEMBER 4, 1999.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, from the Committee on Resources,
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 1725]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Resources, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 1725) to provide for the conveyance by the Bureau of Land Management to Douglas County, Oregon, of a county park and certain adjacent land, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

H.R. 1725 would provide for the conveyance by the Bureau of Land Management to Douglas County, Oregon, of a county park and certain adjacent lands.

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The Miwaleta Park is currently managed under an agreement between Douglas County, Oregon, and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). The Miwaleta Park is presently a county day-use facility and also a boat ramp facility at Galesville Reservoir. Title to the Park is currently held by the BLM. H.R. 1725 would direct the BLM to transfer title of the Park to Douglas County. The parcel of land involved, covering approximately 28.5 acres, would be used by the County to construct a campground.

While this type of transfer could be made administratively under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act, the County has become frustrated with the length of time the necessary assessments, consultations, and other bureaucratic redtape is taking. One of the main problems for the delay is there is a bald eagle nest within one mile of the proposed campground and several juvenile spotted owls

have been seen in the vicinity. H.R. 1725 was introduced to expedite the process.

COMMITTEE ACTION

H.R. 1725 was introduced on May 6, 1999, by Congressman Peter DeFazio (D-OR). The bill was referred to the Committee on Resources, and within the Committee to the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands. On July 13, 1999, the Subcommittee held a hearing on the bill. On September 23, 1999, the Subcommittee met to mark up the bill. No amendments were offered and the bill was then ordered favorably reported to the Full Committee on a voice vote. On October 20, 1999, the Full Resources Committee met to consider the bill. No amendments were offered and the bill was then ordered favorably reported to the House of Representatives by a voice vote.

COMMITTEE OVERSIGHT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Regarding clause 2(b)(1) of rule X and clause 3(c)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Resources' oversight findings and recommendations are reflected in the body of this report.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Article I, section 8, and Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution of the United States grant Congress the authority to enact this bill.

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XIII

1. Cost of Legislation. Clause 3(d)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives requires an estimate and a comparison by the Committee of the costs which would be incurred in carrying out this bill. However, clause 3(d)(3)(B) of that rule provides that this requirement does not apply when the Committee has included in its report a timely submitted cost estimate of the bill prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

2. Congressional Budget Act. As required by clause 3(c)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this bill does not contain any new budget authority, spending authority, credit authority, or an increase or decrease in revenues or tax expenditures.

3. Government Reform Oversight Findings. Under clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee has received no report of oversight findings and recommendations from the Committee on Government Reform on this bill.

4. Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate. Under clause 3(c)(3) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and section 403 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Committee has received the following cost estimate for this bill from the Director of the Congressional Budget Office:

U.S. CONGRESS,
 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
 Washington, DC, October 29, 1999.

Hon. DON YOUNG,
 Chairman, Committee on Resources,
 House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 1725, the Miwaleta Park Expansion Act.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contacts are Mark Grabowicz (for federal costs) and Marjorie Miller (for the impact on state and local governments).

Sincerely,

BARRY B. ANDERSON
 (For Dan L. Crippen, Director).

Enclosure.

H.R. 1725—Miwaleta Park Expansion Act

H.R. 1725 would direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey, without compensation, Miwaleta Park and certain adjacent land to Douglas County, Oregon. The bill stipulates that the county must use this land for recreational purposes. Currently, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) allows the county to use the land for a park at no cost to the county. Because BLM does not plan to sell the land or otherwise generate receipts from it, CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 1725 would result in no significant costs to the federal government. The bill would not affect direct spending or receipts, so pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply.

H.R. 1725 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act. Douglas County might incur some costs as a result of the bill's enactment, but any such costs would be voluntary. The county also would benefit, however, because it would receive land at a negligible cost. The bill would have no significant impact on the budgets of other state, local, or tribal governments.

The CBO staff contacts are Mark Grabowicz (for federal costs) and Marjorie Miller (for the impact on state and local governments). This estimate was approved by Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

COMPLIANCE WITH PUBLIC LAW 104-4

This bill contains no unfunded mandates.

PREEMPTION OF STATE, LOCAL OR TRIBAL LAW

This bill is not intended to preempt any State, local or tribal law.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

If enacted, this bill would make no changes in existing law.