

GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA BOUNDARY
ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 2000

SEPTEMBER 7, 2000.—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

R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 3632]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Resources, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 3632) to revise the boundaries of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, and for other purposes, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with an amendment and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Golden Gate National Recreation Area Boundary Adjustment Act of 2000”.

SEC. 2. ADDITIONS TO THE GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.

Section 2(a) of the Act entitled “An Act to establish the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in the State of California, and for other purposes” (16 U.S.C. 460bb-1(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “The recreation area shall also include the lands generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Additions to Golden Gate National Recreation Area’, numbered NPS-80,076, and dated July 2000/PWR-PLRPC.”.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 3632 is to revise the boundaries of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area and for other purposes.

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA), established in 1972, encompasses shoreline areas of San Francisco, Marin, and San Mateo Counties in west central California. The GGNRA con-

sists of ocean beaches, redwood forests, lagoons, marshes, military properties, a cultural center at Fort Mason, and Alcatraz Island.

H.R. 3632 would expand the boundaries of GGNRA to include 19 parcels of private land, two owned by the City of San Francisco, and three parcels owned by the City of Pacifica. The 24 parcels total approximately 1513 acres. The Cities of San Francisco and Pacifica have acknowledged their desire to be included in the GGNRA.

COMMITTEE ACTION

H.R. 3632 was introduced by Congressman Thomas Lantos (D-CA) on February 10, 2000. The bill was referred to the Committee on Resources, and within the Committee to the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands. On May 16, 2000, the Subcommittee held a hearing on the bill.

On June 27, 2000, the Subcommittee met to consider the bill. An amendment in the nature of a substitute was offered by Congressman James V. Hansen (R-UT) which modified the map referenced in the original to include only 12 parcels of land whose owners desired to be within the boundary expansion. The amendment was adopted by voice vote. The bill, as amended, was then ordered favorably reported to the Full Committee by voice vote. On July 26, 2000, the Resources Committee met to consider the bill. No further amendments were offered and the bill, as amended, was then ordered favorably reported to the House of Representatives by unanimous consent.

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 of the Constitution of the United States grants 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 Com-

mittee 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, August 8, 2000.

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. 3632, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area Boundary Adjustment Act of 2000.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contacts are Deborah Reis and Ali Aslam.

Sincerely,

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

Enclosure.

H.R. 3632—Golden Gate National Recreation Area Boundary Adjustment Act of 2000

H.R. 3632 would expand the boundaries of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area to include about 1,200 acres of land in three California counties. Assuming appropriation of the necessary amounts, CBO estimates that the National Park Service (NPS) would spend \$17.5 million over the next five years to implement the bill. Of this amount, \$16 million would be used to purchase about 525 acres of land. (The rest of the acreage is expected to be donated to the government by either nonprofit organizations or local governments.) The remaining \$1.5 million would be used to restore and develop the new lands for recreational purposes. Once all lands have been acquired, the NPS would incur additional operating expenses of about \$1.2 million annually.

The bill would not affect direct spending or receipts; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply. H.R. 3632 contains no private-sector or intergovernmental mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would have no significant impact on the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

On July 21, 2000, CBO prepared a cost estimate for S. 2051, the Golden Gate National Recreational Area Boundary Adjustment Act of 2000, as ordered reported by the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources on July 13, 2000. The two bills are very similar, and the estimated costs are identical.

The CBO staff contacts for this estimate are Deborah Reis and Ali Aslam. The estimate was approved by Robert A. Sunshine, 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 State, local, or tribal law.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

In compliance with clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (new matter is printed in italics and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

SECTION 2 OF THE ACT OF OCTOBER 27, 1972

AN ACT To establish the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in the State of California, and for other purposes

COMPOSITION AND BOUNDARIES

SEC. 2. (a) The recreation area shall comprise the lands, waters, and submerged lands generally depicted on the map entitled: "Revised Boundary Map, Golden Gate National Recreation Area", numbered NRA-GG-80,003-K and dated October 1978, plus those areas depicted on the map entitled "Point Reyes and GGNRA Amendments and dated October 25, 1979. The authority of the Secretary to acquire lands in the tract known as San Francisco Assessor's Block number 1592 shall be limited to an area of not more than one and nine-tenths acres. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary shall not acquire the Marin County Assessor's parcels numbered 199-181-01, 199-181-06, 199-181-08, 199-181-13, and 199-181-14, located in the Muir Beach portion of the recreation area. For the purposes of this Act, the southern end of the town of Marshall shall be considered to be the Marshall Boat Works. The following additional lands are also hereby included within the boundaries of the recreation area: Marin County Assessor's parcel numbered 119-040-04, 119-040-05, 119-040-18, 166-202-03, 166-010-06, 166-010-07, 166-010-24, 166-010-25, 119-240-19, 166-010-10, 166-010-22, 119-240-03, 119-240-51, 119-240-52, 119-240-54, 166-010-12, 166-010-13, and 119-235-10. The recreation area shall also include the lands and waters in San Mateo County generally depicted on the map entitled "Sweeney Ridge Addition, Golden Gate National Recreation Area", numbered NRA GG-80,000-A, and dated May 1980. The recreation area shall also include those lands acquired pursuant to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area Addition Act of 1992. *The recreation area shall also include the lands generally depicted on the map entitled "Additions to Golden Gate National Recreation Area", numbered NPS-80,076, and dated July 2000/PWR-PLRPC.*

* * * * *