

my constituents, but the U.S. Forest Service. Most importantly, this bill will authorize a land exchange that will allow the Town of Payson to purchase a portion of the conveyed property to create private sector business development and job opportunities. Payson is totally surrounded by national forest lands, virtually land-locking the community. Local officials feel that the lack of land for industry and affordable housing is the major obstacle to economic development in the region.

The legislation also authorizes the Forest Service to acquire a 495-acre parcel known as the Q Ranch, which is currently owned by The Conservation Fund. In exchange, the Diamond Point Summer Homes Association will acquire 108 acres of federal land that has been occupied by the group's 45 residential cabins since the 1950's.

The Tonto National Forest Plan has specifically recommended conveyance of the federal land. The exchange will transfer land of limited public use to the association in exchange for private lands that will increase management efficiency and enhance public access, use and enjoyment of the surrounding national forest lands.

In summary, the bill contains common-sense legislation that accomplishes goals that the Forest Service has stated are a priority. These land exchanges are endorsed by the Gila County Board of Supervisors, the Rim County Regional Chamber of Commerce, the Town of Payson, the Payson Regional Economic Development Corporation, and the National Park Service, among others.

I have been honored to serve the community of Payson in the House of Representatives for eight years. Due to redistricting, I will no longer have the opportunity to directly represent this beautiful part of Arizona. Nevertheless, even as congressional lines change, the issues remain the same, and I hope to convey to my friends in Payson that I will remain a strong advocate of their interests.

With that, I urge an "aye" vote on H.R. 4919.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4919, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIAMI CIRCLE PARK FEASIBILITY STUDY

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1894) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the national significance of the Miami Circle site in the State of Florida as well as the suitability and feasibility of its inclusion in the National Park System as part of the Biscayne National Park, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1894

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

TITLE I—MIAMI CIRCLE SITE SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDY

SEC. 101. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

- (a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—
- (1) the Tequesta Indians were one of the earliest groups to establish permanent villages in southeast Florida;
 - (2) the Tequestas had one of only two North American civilizations that thrived and developed into a complex social chiefdom without an agricultural base;
 - (3) the Tequesta sites that remain preserved today are rare;
 - (4) the discovery of the Miami Circle, occupied by the Tequesta approximately 2,000 years ago, presents a valuable new opportunity to learn more about the Tequesta culture; and
 - (5) Biscayne National Park also contains and protects several prehistoric Tequesta sites.
- (b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this title is to direct the Secretary to conduct a special resource study to determine the national significance of the Miami Circle site as well as the suitability and feasibility of its inclusion in the National Park System as part of Biscayne National Park.

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

- In this title:
- (1) MIAMI CIRCLE.—The term "Miami Circle" means the Miami Circle archaeological site in Miami-Dade County, Florida.
 - (2) PARK.—The term "Park" means Biscayne National Park in the State of Florida.
 - (3) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the National Park Service.

SEC. 103. SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDY.

- (a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date funds are made available, the Secretary shall conduct a special resource study as described in subsection (b). In conducting the study, the Secretary shall consult with the appropriate American Indian tribes and other interested groups and organizations.
- (b) COMPONENTS.—In addition to a determination of national significance, feasibility, and suitability, the special resource study shall include the analysis and recommendations of the Secretary with respect to—
- (1) which, if any, particular areas of or surrounding the Miami Circle should be included in the Park;
 - (2) whether any additional staff, facilities, or other resources would be necessary to administer the Miami Circle as a unit of the Park; and
 - (3) any impact on the local area that would result from the inclusion of Miami Circle in the Park.
- (c) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after completion of the study, the Secretary shall submit a report describing the findings and recommendations of the study to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Resources of the United States House of Representatives.
- (d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this title.

TITLE II—GATEWAY COMMUNITIES COOPERATION

SEC. 201. IMPROVED RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FEDERAL LAND MANAGERS AND GATEWAY COMMUNITIES TO SUPPORT COMPATIBLE LAND MANAGEMENT OF BOTH FEDERAL AND ADJACENT LANDS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) Communities that are adjacent to or near Federal lands, including units of the National Park System, units of the National Wildlife Refuge System, units of the National Forest System, and lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management, are vitally impacted by the management and public use of these Federal lands.

(2) These communities, commonly known as gateway communities, fulfill an integral part in the mission of the Federal lands by providing necessary services, such as schools, roads, search and rescue, emergency, medical, provisioning, logistical support, living quarters, and drinking water and sanitary systems, for both visitors to the Federal lands and employees of Federal land management agencies.

(3) Provision of these vital services by gateway communities is an essential ingredient for a meaningful and enjoyable experience by visitors to the Federal lands because Federal land management agencies are unable to provide, or are prevented from providing, these services.

(4) Gateway communities serve as an entry point for persons who visit the Federal lands and are ideal for establishment of visitor services, including lodging, food service, fuel and auto repairs, emergency services, and visitor information.

(5) Development in these gateway communities affect the management and protection of these Federal lands, depending on the extent to which advance planning for the local development is coordinated between the communities and Federal land managers.

(6) The planning and management decisions of Federal land managers can have unintended consequences for gateway communities and the Federal lands, when the decisions are not adequately communicated to, or coordinated with, the elected officials and residents of gateway communities.

(7) Experts in land management planning are available to Federal land managers, but persons with technical planning skills are often not readily available to gateway communities, particularly small gateway communities.

(8) Gateway communities are often affected by the policies and actions of several Federal land agencies and both the communities and the agencies would benefit from greater interagency coordination of those policies and actions.

(9) Persuading gateway communities to make decisions and undertake actions in their communities that would also be in the best interest of the Federal lands is most likely to occur when such decisionmaking and actions are built upon a foundation of cooperation and coordination.

(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this title to require Federal land managers to communicate, coordinate, and cooperate with gateway communities in order to—

(1) improve the relationships among Federal land managers, elected officials, and residents of gateway communities;

(2) enhance the facilities and services in gateway communities available to visitors to Federal lands, when compatible with the management of these lands; and

(3) result in better local land use planning and decisions by Federal land managers.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) GATEWAY COMMUNITY.—The term "gateway community" means a county, city,

town, village, or other subdivision of a State, or a federally recognized American Indian tribe or Alaska Native village, that—

(A) is incorporated or recognized in a county or regional land use plan; and

(B) a Federal land manager (or the head of the tourism office for the State) determines is significantly affected economically, socially, or environmentally by planning and management decisions regarding Federal lands administered by that Federal land manager.

(2) FEDERAL LAND AGENCIES.—The term “Federal land agencies” means the National Park Service, United States Forest Service, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Bureau of Land Management.

(3) FEDERAL LAND MANAGER.—The term “Federal land manager” means—

(A) the superintendent of a unit of the National Park System;

(B) the manager of a national wildlife refuge;

(C) the field office manager of a Bureau of Land Management area; or

(D) the supervisor of a unit of the National Forest System.

(d) PARTICIPATION IN FEDERAL PLANNING AND LAND USE.—

(1) PARTICIPATION IN PLANNING.—The Federal land agencies shall provide for meaningful public involvement at the earliest possible time by elected and appointed officials of governments of local gateway communities in the development of land use plans, programs, land use regulations, land use decisions, transportation plans, general management plans, and any other plans, decisions, projects, or policies for Federal public lands under the jurisdiction of these agencies that will have a significant impact on these gateway communities. To facilitate such involvement, the Federal land agencies shall provide these officials, at the earliest possible time, with a summary in nontechnical language of the assumptions, purposes, goals, and objectives of such a plan, decision, project, or policy and a description of any anticipated significant impact of the plan, decision, or policy on gateway communities.

(2) EARLY NOTICE OF PROPOSED DECISIONS.—To the extent practicable, the Federal land agencies shall provide local gateway communities with early public notice of proposed decisions of these agencies that may have a significant impact on gateway communities.

(3) TRAINING SESSIONS.—The Federal land agencies shall offer training sessions for elected and appointed officials of gateway communities at which such officials can obtain a better understanding of—

(A) agency planning processes; and

(B) the methods by which they can participate most meaningfully in the development of the agency plans, decisions, and policies referred to in paragraph (1).

(4) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—At the request of the government of a gateway community, a Federal land agency shall assign, to the extent practicable, an agency employee or contractor to work with the community to develop data and analysis relevant to the preparation of agency plans, decisions, and policies referred to in paragraph (1).

(5) REVIEW OF FEDERAL LAND MANAGEMENT PLANNING.—At the request of a gateway community, and to the extent practicable, a Federal land manager shall assist the gateway community to conduct a review of land use, management, or transportation plans of the Federal land manager likely to affect the gateway community.

(6) COORDINATION OF LAND USE.—To the extent consistent with the laws governing the administration of the Federal public lands, a Federal land manager may enter into a cooperative agreement with a gateway community to provide for coordination between—

(A) the land use inventory, planning, and management activities for the Federal lands administered by the Federal land manager; and

(B) the land use planning and management activities of other Federal agencies, agencies of the State in which the Federal lands are located, and local and tribal governments in the vicinity of the Federal lands.

(7) INTERAGENCY COOPERATION AND COORDINATION.—To the extent practicable, when the plans and activities of two or more Federal land agencies are anticipated to have a significant impact on a gateway community, the Federal land agencies involved shall consolidate and coordinate their plans and planning processes to facilitate the participation of the gateway community in the planning processes.

(8) TREATMENT AS COOPERATING AGENCIES.—When a proposed action is determined to require the preparation of an environmental impact statement, the Federal land agencies shall, as soon as practicable, but not later than the scoping process, actively solicit the participation of gateway communities as cooperating agencies under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(e) GRANTS TO ASSIST GATEWAY COMMUNITIES.—

(1) GRANTS AUTHORIZED; PURPOSES.—A Federal land manager may make grants to an eligible gateway community to enable the gateway community—

(A) to participate in Federal land planning or management processes;

(B) to obtain professional land use or transportation planning assistance necessary as a result of Federal action;

(C) to address and resolve public infrastructure impacts that are identified through these processes as a likely result of the Federal land management decisions and for which sufficient funds are not otherwise available; and

(D) to provide public information and interpretive services about the Federal lands administered by the Federal land manager and the gateway community.

(2) ELIGIBLE GATEWAY COMMUNITIES.—To be eligible for a grant under this subsection, a gateway community may not have a population in excess of 10,000 persons.

(f) FUNDING SOURCES.—

(1) GENERAL AGENCY FUNDS.—A Federal land agency may use amounts available for the general operation of the agency to provide funds to Federal land managers of that agency to make grants under subsection (e).

(2) OTHER PLANNING OR PROJECT DEVELOPMENT FUNDS.—Funds available to a Federal land manager for planning, construction, or project development may also be used to fund programs under subsection (d) and make grants under subsection (e).

(3) COMBINATION OF FUNDS.—Federal land managers from different Federal land agencies may combine financial resources to make grants under subsection (e).

TITLE III—MOUNT NEBO WILDERNESS BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS

SEC. 301. BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS, MOUNT NEBO WILDERNESS, UTAH.

(a) LANDS REMOVED.—The boundary of the Mount Nebo Wilderness is adjusted to exclude the following:

(1) MONUMENT SPRINGS.—The approximately 8.4 acres of land depicted on the Map as “Monument Springs”.

(2) GARDNER CANYON.—The approximately 177.8 acres of land depicted on the Map as “Gardner Canyon”.

(3) BIRCH CREEK.—The approximately 5.0 acres of land depicted on the Map as “Birch Creek”.

(4) INGRAM CANYON.—The approximately 15.4 acres of land depicted on the Map as “Ingram Canyon”.

(5) WILLOW NORTH A.—The approximately 3.4 acres of land depicted on the Map as “Willow North A”.

(6) WILLOW NORTH B.—The approximately 6.6 acres of land depicted on the Map as “Willow North B”.

(7) WILLOW SOUTH.—The approximately 21.5 acres of land depicted on the Map as “Willow South”.

(8) MENDENHALL CANYON.—The approximately 9.8 acres of land depicted on the Map as “Mendenhall Canyon”.

(9) WASH CANYON.—The approximately 31.4 acres of land depicted on the Map as “Wash Canyon”.

(b) LANDS ADDED.—Subject to valid existing rights, the boundary of the Mount Nebo Wilderness is adjusted to include the approximately 293.2 acres of land depicted on the Map for addition to the Mount Nebo Wilderness. The Utah Wilderness Act of 1984 (Public Law 94-428) shall apply to the land added to the Mount Nebo Wilderness pursuant to this subsection.

SEC. 302. MAP.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this title, the term “Map” means the map entitled “Mt. Nebo Wilderness Boundary Adjustment”, numbered 531, and dated May 29, 2001.

(b) MAP ON FILE.—The Map and the final document entitled “Mount Nebo, Proposed Boundary Adjustments, Parcel Descriptions (See Map #531)” and dated June 4, 2001, shall be on file and available for inspection in the office of the Chief of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

(c) CORRECTIONS.—The Secretary of Agriculture may make technical corrections to the Map.

SEC. 303. TECHNICAL BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.

The boundary of the Mount Nebo Wilderness is adjusted to exclude the approximately 21.26 acres of private property located in Andrews Canyon, Utah, and depicted on the Map as “Dale”.

TITLE IV—BAINBRIDGE ISLAND JAPANESE-AMERICAN MEMORIAL SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDY

SEC. 401. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) During World War II on February 19, 1942, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066, setting in motion the forced exile of more than 110,000 Japanese Americans.

(2) In Washington State, 12,892 men, women and children of Japanese ancestry experienced three years of incarceration, an incarceration violating the most basic freedoms of American citizens.

(3) On March 30, 1942, 227 Bainbridge Island residents were the first Japanese Americans in United States history to be forcibly removed from their homes by the U.S. Army and sent to internment camps. They boarded the ferry Kehloken from the former Eagledale Ferry Dock, located at the end of Taylor Avenue, in the city of Bainbridge Island, Washington State.

(4) The city of Bainbridge Island has adopted a resolution stating that this site should be a National Memorial, and similar resolutions have been introduced in the Washington State Legislature.

(5) Both the Minidoka National Monument and Manzanar National Historic Site can clearly tell the story of a time in our Nation's history when constitutional rights were ignored. These camps by design were placed in very remote places and are not easily accessible. Bainbridge Island is a short ferry ride from Seattle and the site would be within easy reach of many more people.

(6) This is a unique opportunity to create a site that will honor those who suffered, cherish the friends and community who stood beside them and welcomed them home, and inspire all to stand firm in the event our Nation again succumbs to similar fears.

(7) The site should be recognized by the National Park Service based on its high degree of national significance, association with significant events, and integrity of its location and setting. This site is critical as an anchor for future efforts to identify, interpret, serve, and ultimately honor the Nikkei persons of Japanese ancestry— influence on Bainbridge Island.

SEC. 402. EAGLEDALE FERRY DOCK LOCATION AT TAYLOR AVENUE STUDY AND REPORT.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Secretary of the Interior shall carry out a special resource study regarding the national significance, suitability, and feasibility of designating as a unit of the National Park System the property commonly known as the Eagledale Ferry Dock at Taylor Avenue and the historical events associated with it, located in the town of Bainbridge Island, Kitsap County, Washington.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after funds are first made available for the study under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior shall submit to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report describing the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the study.

(c) **REQUIREMENTS FOR STUDY.**—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the study under subsection (a) shall be conducted in accordance with section 8(c) of Public Law 91-383 (16 U.S.C. 1a-5(c)).

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 1894 went to the Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation and Public Lands, chaired by the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH).

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

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding time to me, and I appreciate the opportunity to come to the floor and speak in favor of S. 1894, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would study the feasibility of including the Miami Circle archeological site within Biscayne National Park. This is a good bill, and deserves the support and endorsement of the House.

S. 1894 also contains a title that incorporates the text of H.R. 4622, which I introduced and which was passed in the Committee on Resources back in July. This title would help facilitate and improve the working relationship between gateway communities and Federal land management agencies.

Too often, Federal land management agencies take for granted local gateway communities in their planning and

decision-making processes, and this bill would go a long way toward engaging gateway communities as meaningful partners in the planning process. The bill would also provide important assistance to these communities in order to allow them to be meaningful participants in the planning process.

Numerous examples have been provided throughout the country of how cooperative efforts have resulted in positive results, including valuable and important environmental benefits. These are real environmental benefits that would not have been realized if the Federal agencies had not consulted with the local gateway community. Some have made the inaccurate accusation that this bill would provide veto power to gateway communities to prevent Federal agencies from taking a particular action. This is simply not true. There is nothing in this bill that would do that.

However, the premise of the bill is that, just as Federal agencies formally consider impacts upon wildlife, issues of habitat, and natural resource and environmental issues before taking a proposed action, that they should also consider and include gateway communities in their decision-making process. Congress has repeatedly passed laws based upon the supposition that informed decision-making is good decision-making. This bill would simply ensure that that takes place. Cooperation and coordination ought to be the standard operating procedure, rather than simply anecdotal stories of where Federal agencies are doing what they ought to be doing anyway.

Ultimately, the Federal lands and their visitors will benefit from these requirements. For example, transportation plans for Federal lands will be vastly improved when Federal agencies understand, through coordination that has taken place from the earliest stages, where that community plans to direct its own resources and its own traffic outside the park.

It is also interesting to me that some have expressed concern that this bill is flawed because it does not impose new requirements upon a gateway community that would prevent them from going forward with an action unless they have certified that it would not impact a park unit. What this amounts to is that they would like to have veto authority over what takes place outside Federal lands if it is perceived to have an impact upon those lands, but at the same time refuse to allow that simple coordination that must take place with a community as part of the decision-making process.

I believe communities are most likely to take actions that are also in the best interests of the Federal lands when their decision-making rests upon a foundation of cooperation and coordination. Our public lands will be better served by a process that ensures that cooperation and coordination are a standard part of the process.

I am particularly pleased that the ranking Democrat member of the Sub-

committee on National Parks, Recreation and Public Lands, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. CHRISTENSEN), has offered her strong support for this legislation. I appreciate the strong working relationship that we have had with the gentlewoman, and commend her for her efforts in fostering this working relationship. I also appreciate the strong support of the administration for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, as amended, S. 1894 is a package of four pieces of unrelated legislation. The underlying vehicle, S. 1894, authorizes a special resource study to determine the national significance of the Miami Circle, as well as the feasibility of including the site in Biscayne National Park.

In this body, the sponsor of this bill is our dear and departing colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK). She has worked tirelessly, and I mean tirelessly, on behalf of the House companion to this legislation, and we are eager to see this study move forward as a small part of the huge legacy that will remain once the gentlewoman from Florida retires after this Congress.

We shall miss the gentlewoman in this body, but we know we shall always have her friendship and wisdom as we continue to tackle the issues of this Nation.

Also included in H.R. 1894 is the text of H.R. 3747, introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Resources, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE). This provision would provide for a special resource study of the Eagledale Ferry Dock located on Bainbridge Island in Washington State.

This package also includes the text of H.R. 4622, legislation sponsored by our colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH). I remain unconvinced that H.R. 4622 is ready to be enacted. However, we support passage of S. 1894, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), and I want to thank the committee as well. I certainly want to thank him for the very kind remarks he made about me and about my tenure here in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Senate bill, S. 1894, which directs the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a feasibility study on the inclusion in Biscayne National Park, Florida, of the archeological site known as the Miami Circle. I am pleased to be a sponsor of the companion bill, H.R. 3630.

I want to thank the gentleman from Utah (Chairman HANSEN) and the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), the gentleman

from California (Chairman RADANOVICH), and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN), of the subcommittee, and their respective staffs, for the assistance and cooperation we received in getting this bill to the floor.

I also want to thank the south Florida delegation for their help toward this effort.

Mr. Speaker, to give just a little history on this particular site, in September of 1998, workers were preparing land for development at the mouth of the Miami River and they noticed this mysterious circular formation in the limestone bedrock that forms the foundation of the City of Miami.

Then the archeologists came and looked at this site, and they revealed that this particular site was utilized by the Tequesta civilization 2,000 years ago, perhaps serving as an astronomical tool or as a cultural center for their complex maritime society.

So we in Florida are very pleased to be a part of this archeological finding, bringing about the rediscovering of what happened with the ancient Tequesta Indians over 2000 years ago. I think we have a responsibility to preserve and study remains of our heritage, and S. 1894 would be an important step.

If the National Park Service will conduct a feasibility of this Miami Circle as part of the Biscayne National Park, it will be another fulfillment of what the Park Service should be doing to preserve this historically significant site.

Furthermore, the Miami Circle is not only a site of local and regional significance, but also of national significance. It is believed to be the only cut-in-rock prehistoric structural footprint ever found in North America. This archeological site, which potentially qualifies to be included in the National Register of Historic Places, connects all Americans in a special way to the first inhabitants of our continent. Thus, it is very appropriate, Mr. Speaker, that we study its inclusion to our National Park System. We must take seriously our responsibility as guardians of this cultural landmark.

Mr. Speaker, we need to get this important bill to the President's desk for signature before this Congress adjourns. After all, this is my last Congress, Mr. Speaker. I am disappointed that this amendment that is being placed on it is being proposed. All of these amendments are very good, of course. I would like to see this bill go forward as soon as possible. The inclusion of this other legislation I hope will add to it and not compromise the chances of getting this bill to the President.

I urge the chairman to find a way to get this noncontroversial Miami Circle bill to the President as soon as possible. I thank the chairman and the leadership for scheduling S. 1894.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1894, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1630

GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 941) to revise the boundaries of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in the State of California, to extend the term of the advisory commission for the recreation area, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 941

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

TITLE I—GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

SEC. 101. BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.

Section 2(a) of Public Law 92-589 (16 U.S.C. 460bb-1(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(a)” and inserting “(a) RECREATION AREA LANDS.—”;

(2) by striking “The recreation area shall comprise” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The recreation area shall comprise”;

(3) by striking “The following additional lands are also” and all that follows through the period at the end of the paragraph and inserting the following:

“(2) ADDITIONAL LAND.—In addition to the land described in paragraph (1), the recreation area shall include—

“(A) the parcels numbered by the Assessor of Marin County, California, 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;

“(B) land and water 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;

“(C) land acquired under the Golden Gate National Recreation Area Addition Act of 1992 (16 U.S.C. 460bb-1 note; Public Law 10-299);

“(D) land generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Additions to Golden Gate National Recreation Area’, numbered NPS-80-076, and dated July 2000/PWR-PLRPC; and

“(E) land generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Rancho Corral de Tierra Additions to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area’, numbered NPS-80,079A and dated July 2001.

“(3) ACQUISITION AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may acquire land described in paragraph (2)(E) only from a willing seller.”.

TITLE II—ADVISORY COMMISSIONS

SEC. 201. GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA ADVISORY COMMISSION.

Section 5 of Public Law 92-589 (16 U.S.C. 460bb-4) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “(b) The Commission” and inserting the following:

“(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission”;

(B) by striking “Provided, That the” and all that follows through the period; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) (as designated by subparagraph (A)) the following:

“(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In appointing members to the Commission, the Secretary shall ensure that the interests of local, historic recreational users of the recreation area shall be represented.”; and

(2) in subsection (g), by striking “thirty years after the enactment of this Act” and inserting “on December 31, 2012”.

SEC. 202. MANZANAR NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE ADVISORY COMMISSION.

Section 105(h) of Public Law 102-248 (16 U.S.C. 461 note) is amended by striking “10 years after the date of enactment of this title” and inserting “on December 31, 2012”.

TITLE III—YOSEMITE NATIONAL PARK

SEC. 301. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The three elementary schools serving the children of employees of Yosemite National Park are served by the Bass Lake Joint Union Elementary School District and the Mariposa Unified School District.

(2) The schools are in remote mountainous areas and long distances from other educational and administrative facilities of the two local educational agencies.

(3) Because of their remote locations and relatively small number of students, schools serving the children of employees of the Park provide fewer services in more basic facilities than the educational services and facilities provided to students that attend other schools served by the two local educational agencies.

(4) Because of the long distances involved and adverse weather and road conditions that occur during much of the school year, it is impractical for the children of employees of the Park who live within or near the Park to attend other schools served by the two local educational agencies.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this title is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide supplemental funding and other services that are necessary to assist the State of California or local educational agencies in California in providing educational services for students attending schools located within the Park.

SEC. 302. PAYMENTS FOR EDUCATIONAL SERVICES.

(a) AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE FUNDS.—For fiscal years 2003 through 2007, the Secretary may provide funds to the Bass Lake Joint Union Elementary School District and the Mariposa Unified School District for educational services to students who are dependents of persons engaged in the administration, operation, and maintenance of the Park or students who live at or near the Park upon real property of the United States.

(b) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Payments made by the Secretary under this section may not be used for new construction, construction contracts, or major capital improvements, and may be used only to pay public employees for services otherwise authorized by this title.

(c) LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF FUNDS.—Payments made under this section shall not exceed the lesser of \$750,000 in any fiscal year or the amount necessary to provide students described in subsection (a) with educational services that are normally provided and generally available to students who attend public schools elsewhere in the State of California.

(d) ADJUSTMENT OF PAYMENTS.—Subject to subsection (c), the Secretary is authorized to adjust payments made under this section if the State of California or the appropriate local educational agencies do not continue to provide funding for educational services at Park schools