

TO DIRECT THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO STUDY THE SUITABILITY AND FEASIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING HIGHWAY 49 IN CALIFORNIA, KNOWN AS THE "GOLDEN CHAIN HIGHWAY", AS A NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR

---

APRIL 9, 2002.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. HANSEN, from the Committee on Resources,  
submitted the following

## R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 3425]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Resources, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 3425) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of establishing Highway 49 in California, known as the "Golden Chain Highway", as a National Heritage Corridor, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

### SECTION 1. STUDY; REPORT.

#### (a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date that funds are first made available for this section, the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the affected local governments, the State government, State and local historic preservation offices, community organizations, and the Golden Chain Council, shall complete a special resource study of the national significance, suitability, and feasibility of establishing Highway 49 in California, known as the "Golden Chain Highway", as a National Heritage Corridor.

#### (2) CONTENTS.—The study shall include an analysis of—

- (A) the significance of Highway 49 in American history;
- (B) options for preservation and use of the highway;
- (C) options for interpretation of significant features associated with the highway; and
- (D) private sector preservation alternatives.

(3) BOUNDARIES OF STUDY AREA.—The area studied under this section shall be comprised of Highway 49 in California extending from the city of Oakhurst in Madera County to the city of Vinton in Plumas County, and lands, structures, and cultural resources within the immediate vicinity of the highway.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after completion of the study required by subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit a report describing the results of the study to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

#### PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 3425 is to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of establishing Highway 49 in California, known as the “Golden Chain Highway,” as a National Heritage Corridor.

#### BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The Golden Chain Highway played a significant role in the history of California and in the settlement of the West resulting from the California Gold Rush. Today, the California State Mining and Mineral Museum, Sutter’s Mill in Coloma State Park, and numerous other historic buildings remain along Highway 49 from the Gold Rush era. H.R. 3245 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to complete a special recourse study to determine the national significance, suitability, and feasibility of establishing Highway 49 from the city of Oakhurst, California to the city of Vinton, California, as a National Heritage Corridor. The study will consider only those lands, structures and cultural resources within the immediate vicinity of the highway.

#### COMMITTEE ACTION

H.R. 3425 was introduced on December 6, 2001, by Congressman George Radanovich (R–CA). The bill was referred to the Committee on Resources, and within the Committee to the Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation, and Public Lands. On December 13, 2001, the Subcommittee held a hearing on the bill. On March 7, 2002, the Subcommittee met to mark up the bill. Mr. Radanovich offered an amendment to clarify that the city of Vinton, California, is in Plumas County, not Sierra County, California. It was adopted by voice vote. The bill was then ordered favorably reported to the Full Committee. On March 20, 2002, the Full Resources Committee met to consider the bill. No amendments were offered and the bill as amended was ordered favorably reported by unanimous consent to the House of Representatives.

#### 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. General Performance Goals and Objectives. This bill does not authorize funding and therefore, clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives does not apply.

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, March 28, 2002.*

Hon. JAMES V. HANSEN,  
*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. 3425, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of establishing Highway 49 in California, known as the "Golden Chain Highway," as a National Heritage Corridor.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Deborah Reis.

Sincerely,

DAN L. CRIPPEN.

Enclosure.

*H.R. 3425—A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of establishing Highway 49 in California, known as the "Golden Chain Highway," as a National Heritage Corridor*

H.R. 3425 would require the National Park Service (NPS) to prepare a special resource study of Highway 49 in California. The study would determine the suitability and feasibility of establishing the highway as a National Heritage Corridor and would explore options for preserving it and interpreting significant features. The legislation would require the agency to complete the study within one year of receiving funding and to report to the Congress on its findings 30 days later.

Based on information provided by the NPS and assuming appropriation of the necessary amounts, CBO estimates that completing the required study and report would cost the federal government \$200,000, mostly over the next fiscal year. H.R. 3425 would not affect direct spending or receipts; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply. H.R. 3425 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform

Act and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Deborah Reis. The 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.

