

MUSCLE SHOALS NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA STUDY ACT
OF 2001

APRIL 11, 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. 2628]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Resources, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 2628) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of the suitability and feasibility of establishing the Muscle Shoals National Heritage Area in Alabama, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 2628 is to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of the suitability and feasibility of establishing the Muscle Shoals National Heritage Area in Alabama, and for other purposes.

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The City of Muscle Shoals and the surrounding area of Northwest Alabama has played an integral part in shaping many aspects of Alabama and Southern culture. It has been the site of numerous work projects, historical and cultural education, and artistic expression. It is the birthplace of the Tennessee Valley Authority—the first piece of New Deal legislation—and home to a number of historic trails, including the Natchez Trail at the Tennessee River, the Andrew Jackson Road, and the Trail of Tears. It also includes Henry Ford's utopian 75Mile City, which inspired Frank Lloyd Wright's Broadacre City. The area has also spawned regional expressions in music, home crafts, and domestic architecture.

H.R. 2628 would help determine if the proposed Muscle Shoals National Heritage Area would tie these assets together to protect natural and cultural resources of national significance, create a high-quality visitor experience, establish a coherent regional identity, and create an opportunity for region-wide interpretation of its diverse populations and cultural history.

COMMITTEE ACTION

H.R. 2628 was introduced on July 25, 2001, by Congressman Robert “Bud” Cramer (D-AL). The bill was referred to the Committee on Resources and within the Committee to the Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation, and Public Lands. On February 7, 2002, the Subcommittee held a hearing on the bill. On March 7, 2002, the Subcommittee met to mark up the bill. No amendments were offered and the bill was ordered favorably reported to the Full Committee by voice vote. On March 20, 2002, the Full Resources Committee met to consider the bill. No amendments were offered and the bill 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 22, 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. 2628, the Muscle Shoals National Heritage Area Study Act of 2001.

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,

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

Enclosure.

H.R. 2628—Muscle Shoals National Heritage Area Study Act of 2001

H.R. 2628 would require the National Park Service (NPS) to study an area of northern Alabama to determine the suitability and feasibility of establishing it as a National Heritage Area. The legislation would require the agency to report to the Congress on its findings within three years of receiving funding for the study.

Based on information provided by the NPS, CBO estimates that completing the required study and report would cost the federal government \$250,000 over the next three to four years, assuming the availability of appropriated funds. H.R. 2628 would not affect direct spending or receipts; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply. The bill 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.