

ALLEGHENY PORTAGE RAILROAD NATIONAL HISTORIC
SITE BOUNDARY REVISION ACT

SEPTEMBER 4, 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. 4682]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Resources, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 4682) to revise the boundary of the Allegheny Portage Railroad National Historic Site, 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. 4682 is to revise the boundary of the Allegheny Portage Railroad National Historic Site, and for other purposes.

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The Allegheny Portage Railroad was the first railroad constructed over the Allegheny Mountains. It is located in southwestern Pennsylvania approximately 12 miles west of Altoona. The Railroad helped to facilitate trade in the area and contributed to the opening of the interior of the United States to settlement. The Railroad was considered a technological wonder of its day because of its unique construction. This inclined plane railroad operated from 1834 to 1854, but was replaced by a new Portage Railroad without inclined planes. Despite its somewhat short lifespan, the Allegheny Portage Railroad played an important role in uniting the coal-producing western states with the manufacturing eastern states.

The proposed legislation would revise the boundaries of the existing Allegheny Portage Railroad National Historic Site by removing approximately 10 acres of land, authorizing the inclusion of 52 acres, enacting an exchange of approximately 98 acres from willing sellers in exchange for nearly 108 acres, and authorizing the acquisition of an additional parcel of 15 acres from willing sellers. If the value of the parcels of land are not equal, the bill provides for the equalization of values by donation, payment using donated or appropriated funds, or the conveyance of additional land. The boundary of the unit would then be revised to reflect the new boundaries.

COMMITTEE ACTION

H.R. 4682 was introduced on May 8, 2002 by Congressman John Murtha (D-PA) and was referred to the Committee on Resources. On May 14, 2002, the bill was referred within the Committee to the Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation, and Public Lands. On July 24, 2002, the Full Resources Committee met to consider the bill and the Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation, and Public Lands was discharged from further consideration by unanimous consent. No amendments were offered and the bill was ordered favorably reported, without amendment, 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 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. 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 Com-

mittee 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 16, 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. 4682, the Allegheny Portage Railroad National Historic Site Boundary Revision Act.

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

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. SUNSHINE
(For Dan L. Crippen, Director).

Enclosure.

*H.R. 4682—Allegheny Portage Railroad National Historic Site
Boundary Revision Act*

H.R. 4682 would make small changes to the boundary of the Allegheny Portage Railroad National Historic Site in Pennsylvania. In addition, the bill would authorize the National Park Service (NPS) to exchange about 108 acres of park land for 98 acres of private property adjacent to the historic site. If the two tracts to be exchanged are not of equal value, any difference could be eliminated—by either party—by a cash payment or conveyance of other land. Finally, the bill would authorize the acquisition of an additional 15-acre parcel of land by donation or exchange. Following completion of those transactions, any property acquired by the government would be added to the historic site and administered by the NPS.

Based on information provided by the NPS and assuming appropriation of the necessary amounts, CBO estimates that it would cost less than \$200,000 to carry out the acquisitions authorized by the bill, including legal costs, surveys, and mapping. Because it is possible that the federal government could receive a cash equalization payment from the private property owners, pay-as-you-go procedures would apply, but CBO estimates that such a payment, if any, would be less than \$100,000. We expect that additional costs to develop and administer the expanded historic site would not be significant.

This bill contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would have no significant impact on the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

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

